

A Validation of the Iowa Department of Correction's Inmate Classification System

Iowa Department of Human Rights
Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning
Statistical Analysis Center

Sarah Johnson, M.A., Analyst, Principal Author
Paul Stageberg, Ph.D., Administrator

April, 2014



This report was made possible in part through funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics and its program for State Statistical Analysis Centers. Points of view or opinions expressed in this report are those of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP), and do not necessarily reflect official positions of the U.S. Department of Justice.

This page purposely left blank.

A Validation of the Iowa Department of Corrections Inmate Classification System

The purpose of this analysis is to conduct a validation study of the Iowa Department of Correction's (IDOC) current prison Custody Classification instrument. "The Iowa Department of Corrections uses custody level classification to determine the appropriate facility security level for inmates. The process includes an annual review and potential reclassification. Reclassification to a less restrictive custody level"¹ "...is awarded by obeying rules and meeting other mandatory requirements. Other factors are also taken into consideration including pending charges, physical and mental health needs, risk to the community, risk to other offenders and staff, number and nature of infractions, and time since last infraction."² There are three types of custody levels:

"Minimum Custody – This custody is the least restrictive and has the most privileges of the custody grades. Offenders in this level may work on the grounds away from the unit or away from the institution with appropriate supervision.

Medium Custody – This custody is more restrictive than minimum custody. Offenders are generally restricted to working within the boundaries of the institution and are usually assigned to dormitory or cell setting in medium custody".³

Maximum Custody – This custody is more restrictive than medium custody. It is for those who may be an escape risk or have been convicted of violent crimes, or their actions in institutional setting have shown they may be a behavior problem. Maximum custody housing is generally made up of single cells and divided into cellblocks within a building or unit. Offenders in this level are also under constant supervision.⁴

An ideal custody classification system is one that predicts more severe and more frequent institutional violations among maximum custody inmates while predicting fewer and less severe misconduct among lower-level inmates including those classified as medium or minimum. This analysis will examine the extent to which Iowa's custody classification instrument is able to do so.

The cohort for this analysis included all offenders who received an initial custody classification or reclassification of maximum, medium, or minimum custody in FY2013 while in prison. Classification information was gathered using the Iowa Department of

¹ Johnson, S. 2014. An Analysis on the Effects of Earned time for Inmates Charged with Robbery. (In Process)

² State of Iowa, Department of Corrections. 2010. An Introduction to Incarceration in Iowa. p. 6
<http://www.doc.state.ia.us/Documents/OffenderFamilyFriends/IowaIntroductiontoIncarceration.pdf>

³ Ibid

⁴ Ibid.

Corrections' Iowa Corrections Offender Network (ICON). Analysis was limited to offenders who received an initial custody classification within 90 days of their prison supervision start date and whose supervision length was greater than 30 days. The initial classification final sample included 1,696 males and 623 females. The reclassification final sample included 4,946 males and 342 females. If an offender received more than one initial or re-classification within FY2013, the earliest custody classification was selected for analysis.

Information on offender misconduct was also gathered using the ICON database. Misconduct violations which occurred after the initial or reclassification assessment submit date were utilized for analysis. Misconduct violations occurring within one year of the custody classification assessment submission date were included, and were categorized by predatory/violent, institutional management, and non-compliance. For a complete list of how misconduct violations were coded please see Attachment 2.

This analysis utilized an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as well as Post Hoc tests to determine whether significant differences existed between offender custody levels and institutional misconduct. An ANOVA "is used to determine whether there are significant differences between the means of two or more independent (unrelated groups)."⁵ An ANOVA does not indicate which groups are statistically different, only that differences exist. Conversely, the Post Hoc test (a component of the ANOVA) does identify group differences and therefore is utilized to examine variations in rates and types of misconduct between inmates of maximum, medium, and minimum custody. Post hoc data are available in Attachment 1. The ANOVA and Post hoc data were considered significant at the .05, 95% confidence interval.

⁵ Laerd Statistics. <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/one-way-anova-using-spss-statistics.php>

Table 1: Initial Custody Classification

Male														
			Any Misconduct			Predatory/Violent			Institutional Management			Non-Compliance		
	N	%	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
			f=2.893			f=12.264***			f=3.551*			f=.138		
Maximum	92	5.4%	.91	.85	.97	.25	.16	.34	.64	.54	.74	.78	.70	.87
Medium	707	41.7%	.87	.84	.89	.17	.14	.19	.51	.47	.55	.77	.74	.80
Minimum	897	52.9%	.90	.88	.92	.10	.08	.12	.56	.52	.59	.76	.74	.79
Total	1696	100%	.89	.87	.90	.14	.12	.15	.54	.52	.57	.77	.75	.79

Female														
			Any Misconduct			Predatory/Violent			Institutional Management			Non-Compliance		
	N	%	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
			f=6.595**			F=8.085***			f=.461			f=6.840**		
Maximum	10	1.6%	.30	-.05	.65	.20	-.10	.50	.20	-.10	.50	.30	-.05	.65
Medium	164	26.3%	.45	.37	.53	.11	.06	.16	.22	.16	.28	.43	.35	.50
Minimum	449	72.1%	.30	.25	.34	.04	.02	.05	.18	.15	.22	.27	.23	.31
Total	623	100%	.34	.30	.37	.06	.04	.08	.19	.16	.23	.31	.28	.35

- The initial custody classification instrument predicted predatory misconduct for both men and women at a statistically significant rate.
 - Post hoc tests revealed that for men, predatory/violence misconduct rates were significantly distinct between the maximum custody offenders and medium/minimum offenders. Offenders assessed at maximum custody had the highest average predatory/violent misconduct (.25), followed by medium (.17), then minimum custody (.10).
 - Post hoc tests revealed that for women predatory misconduct rates were significantly distinct between the maximum and medium custody offenders, although this figure should be interpreted with caution due to the low sample size of maximum custody females. Offenders in maximum custody had higher mean predatory misconducts (.20), than medium (.11), or minimum custody inmates (.04).

- The initial custody classification instrument significantly predicted institutional management misconduct for men. Post hoc tests revealed that variations in institutional misconduct were statistically distinct between the medium and minimum custody offenders, but not in the expected direction with minimum custody offenders having a higher misconduct mean rate than offenders classified as medium custody.
- The initial custody classification instrument predicted higher rates of any misconduct and non-compliance misconduct for women of medium custody than maximum or minimum custody. Due to the small proportion of maximum custody women, an ANOVA was run excluding these offenders. The results held and found that the instrument significantly predicted higher rates of any and non-compliance misconduct for medium than minimum custody offenders.
- The initial custody classification instrument was not a statistically significant predictor of misconduct for any misconduct or non-compliance misconduct for men and for institutional management misconduct for women.

Table 2: Male Re-Custody Classification

Male														
			Any Misconduct			Predatory/Violent			Institutional Management			Non-Compliance		
	N	%	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
			f=51.913***			f=76.931***			f=66.129***			f=44.480***		
Maximum	664	13.4%	.48	.45	.52	.19	.16	.22	.40	.36	.44	.40	.37	.44
Medium	3831	77.5%	.33	.32	.35	.06	.05	.07	.22	.20	.23	.28	.27	.29
Minimum	451	9.1%	.20	.16	.24	.03	.02	.05	.15	.12	.18	.15	.12	.18
Total	4946	100%	.34	.33	.35	.07	.07	.08	.23	.22	.25	.28	.27	.30

Female														
			Any Misconduct			Predatory/Violent			Institutional Management			Non-Compliance		
	N	%	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
			f=24.293***			f=5.170*			f=22.479***			f=23.853***		
Maximum	18	5.3%	.89	.73	1.05	.28	.05	.51	.78	.57	.99	.89	.73	1.05
Medium	121	35.4%	.53	.44	.62	.14	.08	.20	.27	.19	.35	.50	.41	.59
Minimum	203	59.3%	.26	.20	.32	.07	.03	.10	.15	.10	.20	.25	.19	.31
Total	342	100%	.39	.34	.44	.11	.07	.14	.23	.18	.27	.37	.32	.43

- The reclassification instrument significantly predicted predatory/violent, institutional management, non-compliant and any misconduct for both men and women.
 - The reclassification instrument significantly predicted predatory/violence misconduct for men. Post hoc tests revealed that misconduct violations were statistically distinct for offenders reclassified as minimum custody, but predatory violations between medium and maximum custody were not statistically distinct. Men reclassified at maximum custody had higher average predatory misconducts (.19), than medium (.05), or minimum custody offenders (.03).
 - The reclassification instrument significantly predicted predatory/violent misconduct for women. Post hoc tests revealed that predatory/violence misconduct violations were statistically distinct for maximum and minimum offenders but the reclassification instrument did not distinguish well between medium and maximum or minimum

offenders. Women reclassified as maximum custody had higher average predatory misconduct (.28), than medium (.14), or minimum custody (.07).

- The reclassification instrument predicted institutional management, non-compliance, and any misconduct violations distinctly between all custody classifications at a statistically significant level for both men and women.
 - Both men and women in the maximum custody group had higher average rates of misconduct in these categories compared to medium or minimum classified offenders.

Table 3: Male Initial Classification by Race and Age

	N	%	Any Misconduct			Predatory/Violent			Institutional Management			Non-Compliance		
			Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
White Male Initial classification			f=1.675			f=5.369**			f=1.085			f=.277		
Maximum	57	4.9%	.88	.79	.97	.23	.12	.34	.60	.47	.73	.74	.62	.85
Medium	470	40.7%	.86	.83	.89	.17	.14	.21	.51	.47	.56	.77	.73	.81
Minimum	627	54.3%	.90	.87	.92	.11	.09	.14	.55	.51	.59	.75	.72	.79
Total	1154	100%	.88	.86	.90	.14	.12	.16	.54	.51	.57	.76	.73	.78
Minority Male Initial Classification			f=2.078			f=8.683***			f=3.170*			f=.541		
Maximum	35	6.4%	.97	.91	1.03	.29	.13	.44	.71	.56	.87	.86	.74	.98
Medium	237	43.7%	.87	.83	.92	.16	.11	.20	.50	.44	.57	.78	.73	.83
Minimum	270	49.8%	.91	.88	.95	.07	.04	.11	.57	.51	.63	.79	.74	.84
Total	542	100%	.90	.87	.92	.12	.10	.15	.55	.51	.59	.79	.76	.83
Under 30 Male Initial classification			f=1.460			f=4.322*			f=1.252			f=.632		
Maximum	69	7.1%	.93	.86	.99	.26	.15	.37	.65	.54	.77	.84	.75	.93
Medium	440	45.0%	.88	.85	.91	.19	.15	.22	.55	.51	.60	.79	.76	.83
Minimum	468	47.9%	.91	.89	.94	.14	.11	.17	.58	.54	.63	.78	.74	.82
Total	977	100%	.90	.88	.92	.17	.14	.19	.57	.54	.61	.79	.77	.82
Over 30 Male Initial classification			f=1.940			f=6.704**			f=3.197*			f=1.024		
Maximum	23	3.2%	.87	.72	1.02	.22	.04	.40	.61	.39	.82	.61	.39	.82
Medium	267	37.1%	.84	.79	.88	.13	.09	.18	.44	.38	.50	.74	.68	.79
Minimum	429	59.7%	.89	.86	.92	.07	.04	.09	.53	.48	.57	.74	.70	.79
Total	719	100%	.87	.85	.90	.10	.07	.12	.50	.46	.53	.74	.70	.77

- The initial classification instrument may predict violent misconducts slightly better for minority and older males than white and younger males, although the instrument predicts predatory/violent misconducts at a statistically significant rate for all groups.
- The initial classification instrument predicted institutional misconduct for minority and older males at a statistically significant rate, but the instrument was not a significant predictor of institutional management misconduct for whites or younger male offenders.

Table 4: Male Reclassification by Race and Age

	N	%	Any Misconduct			Predatory/Violent			Institutional Management			Non-Compliance		
			Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
White Male Reclassification			46.933***			80.988***			62.594***			38.395***		
Maximum	415	12.0%	.50	.45	.54	.21	.17	.25	.42	.37	.47	.41	.36	.45
Medium	2726	79.1%	.31	.29	.32	.05	.04	.06	.20	.18	.21	.26	.24	.28
Minimum	304	8.8%	.17	.13	.22	.04	.02	.06	.13	.09	.17	.12	.08	.16
Total	3445	100%	.32	.30	.33	.07	.06	.08	.22	.20	.23	.27	.25	.28
Minority Male Reclassification			F=8.426***			F=9.118***			F=8.915***			F=7.923***		
Maximum	249	16.6%	.47	.40	.53	.14	.10	.19	.37	.31	.43	.40	.34	.46
Medium	1105	73.6%	.39	.36	.42	.08	.06	.10	.27	.24	.29	.33	.30	.36
Minimum	147	9.8%	.26	.19	.33	.03	.00	.05	.19	.13	.25	.20	.14	.27
Total	1501	100%	.39	.37	.42	.09	.07	.10	.28	.25	.30	.33	.30	.35
Under 30 Male Reclassification			F=45.982***			F=58.404***			52.655***			38.991***		
Maximum	253	14.5%	.74	.68	.79	.34	.28	.39	.63	.57	.69	.64	.58	.70
Medium	1354	77.8%	.47	.45	.50	.11	.09	.12	.32	.30	.35	.41	.38	.43
Minimum	133	7.6%	.27	.19	.35	.03	.00	.06	.21	.14	.28	.21	.14	.28
Total	1740	100%	.50	.47	.52	.13	.12	.15	.36	.34	.38	.43	.40	.45
Over 30 Male Reclassification			11.941***			18.689***			16.689***			10.255***		
Maximum	411	12.8%	.33	.29	.38	.10	.07	.13	.26	.22	.31	.26	.22	.30
Medium	2477	77.3%	.25	.24	.27	.03	.03	.04	.16	.14	.17	.21	.20	.23
Minimum	318	9.9%	.17	.13	.21	.03	.01	.05	.13	.09	.16	.12	.09	.16
Total	3206	100%	.26	.24	.27	.04	.03	.05	.17	.15	.18	.21	.19	.22

- The reclassification instrument significantly predicts all misconduct types for all offenders regardless of race and age.

The Iowa Department of Corrections initial custody classification and reclassification instruments appear to significantly predict most types of misconduct. The initial custody classification instrument predicted predatory misconduct at a statistically significant rate for both men and women, with offenders classified as maximum custody having higher averages of predatory misconduct than medium or minimum offenders. The instrument also predicted institutional management misconduct for men and any and non-compliance misconduct for women. The reclassification instrument was generally a better predictor of inmate misbehavior than the original classification. The reclassification instrument was found to significantly predict all misconduct types with male and female offenders, with those of maximum custody having higher misconduct averages than inmates of medium or minimum custody.

The predictive power of the initial and reclassification instrument was also observed by offender race and age for male offenders. The findings suggest that the initial classification instrument may predict violent misconducts slightly better for minority and older males than white and younger males, although the instrument predicts predatory/violent misconducts at a statistically significant rate for all groups. Also interesting is that the reclassification instrument significantly predicts all types of misconduct for offenders regardless of race and age. Observing the predictive power of these instruments for females by race and age was inappropriate due to the small size of the maximum custody female sample.

Attachment 1

Post Hoc Tests

Table 5: Male Initial Classification Post Hoc Tests

Initial Classification Male						95% Confidence Interval	
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Any Misconduct	Minimum	Medium	.047	.035	.370	-.04	.13
		Maximum	.011	.035	.945	-.07	.09
	Medium	Minimum	-.047	.035	.370	-.13	.04
		Maximum	-.036	.016	.060	-.07	.00
	Maximum	Minimum	-.011	.035	.945	-.09	.07
		Medium	.036	.016	.060	.00	.07
Predatory/Violent	Minimum	Medium	.083	.038	.073	-.01	.17
		Maximum	.147*	.037	.000	.06	.24
	Medium	Minimum	-.083	.038	.073	-.17	.01
		Maximum	.064*	.017	.001	.02	.10
	Maximum	Minimum	-.147*	.037	.000	-.24	-.06
		Medium	-.064*	.017	.001	-.10	-.02
Institutional Management	Minimum	Medium	-.131*	.055	.047	.00	.26
		Maximum	.086	.054	.254	-.04	.21
	Medium	Minimum	-.131*	.055	.047	-.26	.00
		Maximum	-.045	.025	.176	-.10	.01
	Maximum	Minimum	-.086	.054	.254	-.21	.04
		Medium	.045	.025	.176	-.01	.10
Non-Compliance	Minimum	Medium	.010	.047	.973	-.10	.12
		Maximum	.019	.046	.912	-.09	.13
	Medium	Minimum	-.010	.047	.973	-.12	.10
		Maximum	.009	.021	.913	-.04	.06
	Maximum	Minimum	-.019	.046	.912	-.13	.09
		Medium	-.009	.021	.913	-.06	.04

Table 6: Female Initial Classification Post Hoc Tests

Initial Classification Female						95% Confidence Interval	
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Any Misconduct	Minimum	Medium	-.151	.153	.583	-.51	.21
		Maximum	.004	.150	1.00	-.35	.36
	Medium	Minimum	.151	.153	.583	-.21	.51
		Maximum	.155*	.043	.001	.05	.26
	Maximum	Minimum	-.004	.150	1.00	-.36	.35
		Medium	-.155*	.043	.001	-.26	-.05
Predatory/Violent	Minimum	Medium	.090	.075	.454	-.09	.27
		Maximum	.164	.074	.068	-.01	.34
	Medium	Minimum	-.090	.075	.454	-.27	.09
		Maximum	.074*	.021	.001	.02	.12
	Maximum	Minimum	-.164	.074	.068	-.34	.01
		Medium	-.074*	.021	.001	-.12	-.02
Institutional Management	Minimum	Medium	-.020	.129	.987	-.32	.28
		Maximum	.015	.127	.992	-.28	.31
	Medium	Minimum	.020	.129	.987	-.28	.32
		Maximum	.035	.036	.603	-.05	.12
	Maximum	Minimum	-.015	.127	.992	-.31	.28
		Medium	-.035	.036	.603	-.12	.05
Non-Compliance	Minimum	Medium	-.127	.150	.674	-.48	.23
		Maximum	.028	.147	.980	-.32	.37
	Medium	Minimum	.127	.150	.674	-.23	.48
		Maximum	.155*	.042	.001	.06	.25
	Maximum	Minimum	-.028	.147	.980	-.37	.32
		Medium	-.155*	.042	.001	-.25	-.06

Table 7: Male Reclassification Post Hoc Tests

Reclassification Male						95% Confidence Interval	
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Any Misconduct	Minimum	Medium	.153*	.020	.000	.11	.20
		Maximum	.283*	.029	.000	.22	.35
	Medium	Minimum	-.153*	.020	.000	-.20	-.11
		Maximum	.130*	.023	.000	.07	.18
	Maximum	Minimum	-.283*	.029	.000	-.35	-.22
		Medium	-.130*	.023	.000	-.18	-.07
Predatory/Violence	Minimum	Medium	.129*	.011	.000	.10	.15
		Maximum	.155*	.016	.000	.12	.19
	Medium	Minimum	-.129*	.011	.000	-.15	-.10
		Maximum	.026	.013	.107	.00	.06
	Maximum	Minimum	-.155*	.016	.000	-.19	-.12
		Medium	-.026	.013	.107	-.06	.00
Institutional Management	Minimum	Medium	-.186*	.018	.000	.15	.23
		Maximum	.251*	.026	.000	.19	.31
	Medium	Minimum	-.186*	.018	.000	-.23	-.15
		Maximum	.065*	.021	.005	.02	.11
	Maximum	Minimum	-.251*	.026	.000	-.31	-.19
		Medium	-.065*	.021	.005	-.11	-.02
Non-Compliance	Minimum	Medium	.123*	.019	.000	.08	.17
		Maximum	.255*	.027	.000	.19	.32
	Medium	Minimum	-.123*	.019	.000	-.17	-.08
		Maximum	.132*	.022	.000	.08	.18
	Maximum	Minimum	-.255*	.027	.000	-.32	-.19
		Medium	-.132*	.022	.000	-.18	-.08

Table 8: Female Reclassification Post Hoc Tests

Reclassification Female						95% Confidence Interval	
			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Any Misconduct	Minimum	Medium	.360*	.116	.006	.09	.63
		Maximum	.628*	.113	.000	.36	.89
	Medium	Minimum	-.360*	.116	.006	-.63	-.09
		Maximum	.268*	.053	.000	.14	.39
	Maximum	Minimum	-.628*	.113	.000	-.89	-.36
		Medium	-.268*	.053	.000	-.39	-.14
Predatory/Violence	Minimum	Medium	.137	.077	.175	-.04	.32
		Maximum	.209*	.075	.015	.03	.38
	Medium	Minimum	-.137	.077	.175	-.32	.04
		Maximum	.072	.035	.102	-.01	.15
	Maximum	Minimum	-.209*	.075	.015	-.38	-.03
		Medium	-.072	.035	.102	-.15	.01
Institutional Management	Minimum	Medium	.505*	.100	.000	.27	.74
		Maximum	.630*	.097	.000	.40	.86
	Medium	Minimum	-.505*	.100	.000	-.74	-.27
		Maximum	.125*	.045	.017	.02	.23
	Maximum	Minimum	-.630*	.097	.000	-.86	-.40
		Medium	-.125*	.045	.017	-.23	-.02
Non-Compliance	Minimum	Medium	.385*	.115	.003	.11	.66
		Maximum	.638*	.112	.000	.37	.90
	Medium	Minimum	-.385*	.115	.003	-.66	-.11
		Maximum	.253*	.052	.000	.13	.38
	Maximum	Minimum	-.638	.112	.000	-.90	-.37
		Medium	-.253*	.052	.000	-.38	-.13

Attachment 2

Category	Rule Number and Description
Predatory/Violence	#1 Killing
	#2 Assault
	#3 Kidnapping
	#4 Extortion, Blackmail, Protections (strong-arming)
	#6 Rioting
	#7 Arson
	#8 Robbery
	#11 Criminal Conduct
	#13 Fighting (Class B)
	#14 Threats/Intimidation (Class B) or (Class A)
	#15 Sexual Misconduct (Class B)
	#42 Unauthorized Group/Gang Conduct
#43 Attempted of Complicity (Class A)	
Institutional Management	#5 Escape
	#9 Possession of Dangerous Contraband
	#10 Dealing in Dangerous Drugs/Intoxicants
	#12 Possession of Key or Key Pattern
	#13 Fighting (Class C)
	#14 Threats/Intimidation (Class C)
	#15 Sexual Misconduct (Class C)
	#16 Unauthorized Possession/Exchange (Class C)
	#18 Theft
	#19 Tampering/Interfering with Locks or Security Items
	#20 Possession of Drugs, Intoxicants
	#27 Obstructive/Disruptive Conduct (Class B)
	#28 Counterfeiting/Forging
	#29 Being Intoxicated or Under the Influence
	#30 Gambling/Debts/etc. (Class C)
	#31 Attempted Suicide, Self-Mutilation
#33 Bartering, Selling Goods, Etc.	
#38 Adulteration of Food or Drink	
#43 Attempt or Complicity (Class B)	
Non-Compliance (Control/Disruption of Facility)	#16 unauthorized Possession/Exchange (Class D)
	#17 Damage to Property
	#21 Abuse of Medication
	#22 Refusal to Work
	#23 Disobeying a Lawful Order/Direction
	#24 Violating a Condition of Leave/Furlough (Class C)
	#25 Out of Place of Assignment
	#26 Verbal Abuse
	#27 Obstructive/Disruptive Conduct (Class C)
	#30 Gambling/Debts/etc. (Class D)
	#32 Bribery
	#35 False Statements
	#36 Refusal or Failing to Participate in Treatment
	#37 Habitual Minor Offender
#39 Safety and Sanitation (Class C)	
#40 Misuse of Mail, Telephone, or other Communication	
#43 Attempt or Complicity (Class C)	
Miscellaneous	#34 Entering into Contracts/Agreements, Operating Business
	#39 Safety and Sanitation (Class D)
	#43 Attempt or Complicity (Class D)