Failing Grades

States’ Responses to COVID-19 in Jails & Prisons

ACLU
SMART JUSTICE

PRISON POLICY INITIATIVE

June 2020
Failing Grades: States’ Responses to COVID-19 in Jails & Prisons

By Emily Widra and Dylan Hayre
June 25, 2020

When the pandemic struck, it was instantly obvious what needed to be done: take all actions possible to “flatten the curve.” This was especially urgent in prisons and jails, which are very dense facilities where social distancing is impossible, sanitation is poor, and medical resources are extremely limited. Public health experts warned that the consequences were dire: prisons and jails would become petri dishes where, once inside, COVID-19 would spread rapidly and then boomerang back out to the surrounding communities with greater force than ever before.

Advocates were rightly concerned, given the long-standing and systemic racial disparities in arrest, prosecution, and sentencing, that policymakers would be slow to respond to the threat of the virus in prisons and jails when it was disproportionately poor people of color whose lives were on the line. Would elected officials be willing to take the necessary steps to save lives in time?

When faced with this test of their leadership, how did officials in each state fare? In this report, the ACLU and Prison Policy Initiative evaluate the actions each state has taken to save incarcerated people and facility staff from COVID-19. We find that most states have taken very little action, and while some states did more, no state leaders should be content with the steps they’ve taken thus far. The map below shows the scores we granted to each state, and our methodology explains the data we used in our analysis and how we weighted different criteria.

The results are clear: despite all of the information, voices calling for action, and the obvious need, state responses ranged from disorganized or ineffective, at best, to callously nonexistent at worst. Even using data from criminal justice system agencies — that is, even using states' own versions of this story — it is clear that no state has done enough and that all states failed to implement a cohesive, system-wide response.

In some states, we observed significant jail population reductions. Yet no state had close to adequate prison population reductions, despite some governors issuing orders or guidance that, on their face, were intended to release more people quickly. Universal testing was also scarce. Finally, only a few states offered any transparency into how many incarcerated people were being tested and released as part of the overall public health response. Even in states that appeared, “on paper,” to do more than others, high death rates among their incarcerated populations indicate systemic failures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Final score</th>
<th>Letter grade</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Final score</th>
<th>Letter grade</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Final score</th>
<th>Letter grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai’i</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the details of each state’s score, see the appendix. *This report does not provide a grade to Illinois because some of the relevant data is the subject of pending litigation.
The consequences are as tragic as they were predictable: As of June 22, 2020, over 570 incarcerated people and over 50 correctional staff have died and most of the largest coronavirus outbreaks are in correctional facilities. This failure to act continues to put everyone’s health and life at risk — not only incarcerated people and facility staff, but the general public as well. It has never been clearer that mass incarceration is a public health issue. As of today, states have largely failed this test, but it’s not too late for our elected officials to show that they can learn from their mistakes and do better.

Methodology & Scoring

Composite score:

The final composite score for each state equals the total of all points received ranging from zero to 485. To make the scores easier to read, we then divided the final number of points by 4.85 to give each state a grade on the scale of 0-100. Because every state scored so poorly, we decided to adjust the traditional school grading scale down\(^1\) to create some meaningful differentiation in the scores, and to better identify the states that, despite falling far short of these minimum standards, did make some notable strides. This differentiation and specificity is important because this report, while assessing what has happened thus far, should also help create a blueprint for what states can do to save lives as the pandemic continues.

How we graded and what distinguishes a higher score:

To assess the degree to which each state has responded to the COVID-19 pandemic and the particular threat of viral infection behind bars, we looked at whether:

- The state Department of Corrections provided testing and personal protective equipment (PPE) to correctional staff and the incarcerated population. (maximum 65 points)
- The state reduced county jail populations and state prison populations. (maximum 300 points)

\(^1\) Composite Score (out of 100 points)  Letter Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Score (out of 100 points)</th>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 6.9</td>
<td>F-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 13.9</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – 20.9</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 27.9</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – 34.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 41.9</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 – 48.9</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 – 55.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 – 62.9</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 – 69.9</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 76.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 – 83.9</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 – 90.9</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 – 100</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 combined with a public commitment to permanent policy changes to cement the progress made in the COVID-19 response</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The governor issued an executive order — or the Department of Corrections issued a directive — accelerating the release from state prisons of medically vulnerable individuals and/or those near the end of their sentence. (maximum 60 points)

• The state published regularly updated, publicly available data on COVID-19 in the state prison system. (maximum 60 points)

Recognizing that no metrics can account for all differences between states, including the fact that the virus reached some states earlier than others, we then deducted points from the final scores of states that have had COVID-19 deaths in their state prisons. Information regarding testing, personal protective equipment (PPE), and regularly updated, publicly available data was collected from the states’ Department of Correction websites in early June 2020. Some states may have implemented more widespread testing — or are providing PPE to all incarcerated people — but if that information is not clearly shared on their website at the time of our data collection, we could not include it in our scoring.

Has the Department of Corrections provided comprehensive testing and personal protective equipment (PPE) to correctional staff and the incarcerated population? (maximum 65 points)

The easiest steps states can take to prevent COVID-19 deaths behind bars are to provide testing and protective equipment to incarcerated people and prison staff. These measures will also slow the spread of COVID-19 into the communities surrounding prisons.

Only five states — Massachusetts, Michigan, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Vermont — were awarded 20 points for completing comprehensive testing of the population in state prisons. Three states — New Mexico, Massachusetts, and West Virginia — completed comprehensive testing of all correctional staff and were awarded 15 points. States that are in the process of comprehensive testing of incarcerated people and correctional staff were awarded 5 points for testing of incarcerated people and 5 points for testing of correctional staff.

---

2 After request from the ACLU of New Hampshire, and to protect incarcerated people from COVID-19, the New Hampshire Department of Correction began publishing on its website daily metrics on the status of COVID-19 inside the prisons; it made facial masks available to all incarcerated people; and reinstated the provision of alcohol-based hand sanitizer, previously prohibited inside the prison due to alcohol content. The Commissioner of Corrections also streamlined the process for administrative-home-confinement (AHC), resulting in a 100% increase in the number of people released on AHC since March, according to the ACLU-NH. And even while this was not factored into our scoring metrics, it should be noted that the DOC has also instituted a policy that it will not admit people admit people from county facilities where there has been a positive COVID-19 case amongst the jail population and that testing is widely available, actions that have been applauded by the ACLU-NH.
We also awarded states 15 points for providing personal protective equipment (PPE) to all staff, and 15 points for providing PPE to all incarcerated people. Most, if not all, PPE in the correctional setting, especially for confined populations, consists of non-surgical masks. States received 5 points for only providing PPE to some incarcerated people and some staff (i.e. incarcerated people who were exposed to someone who tested positive, or only intake unit staff). Only three states — Florida, Rhode Island, and North Dakota — do not have information about providing PPE to incarcerated people.

Because we wanted to keep our scoring consistent across states, we chose to utilize the data provided by individual Departments of Correction on their websites. To the degree that states are not following their own policies mandating access to face masks and other PPE, the reality behind bars may be worse.  

If there was no reliable evidence that states were providing those tests or PPE, we awarded states zero points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVID-19 Testing</th>
<th>No testing or limited testing</th>
<th>Commitment to full testing</th>
<th>Full testing completed</th>
<th>Maximum points available for testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctional staff</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>35 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated population</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>20 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)</th>
<th>No PPE or limited PPE</th>
<th>Commitment to full PPE for all</th>
<th>PPE provided to all</th>
<th>Maximum points available for PPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correctional staff</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>30 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerated population</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How we awarded points for testing and provision of personal protective equipment (PPE). For the details on how your state scored, see the appendix.

3 For example, California has statewide policies mandating access to face masks, but reports from inside state prisons suggest that access and use of face masks are limited. Additionally, this section scores PPE policies in state prisons, but access to PPE is also critical in jails as well. The ACLU of Southern California and Northern California recently filed a statewide lawsuit with declarations from 13 counties saying that PPE was not consistently provided to incarcerated people or worn by the staff in jails.
How much has each state reduced incarcerated populations in both local county jails and state prisons? (maximum 300 points)

The high rate of coronavirus infections and deaths in correctional facilities is due to their population density: incarcerated people frequently have to sleep, eat, and shower within a few feet of one another, and share common amenities such as phones. Public health experts have been clear that reducing facility density — allowing people to return home — is the most critical and necessary step to save lives. States that have reduced the population density in correctional facilities — starting by releasing old and frail people especially vulnerable to COVID-19 — have slowed the spread of the virus more effectively and saved more lives.4

**Jails**

Jail population mitigation needs to be a key part of the national response to COVID-19. If jails fail to drastically reduce their populations, COVID-19 could claim up to 100,000 more people than the current projections. In mid-April, an [epidemiological study](#) conducted by the ACLU and university researchers found that keeping people out of jail saves lives — both inside the jail and in the surrounding communities. And while nationally jail populations have [decreased](#) much more than state prison populations, not all states are taking this call to decarcerate jails seriously. We awarded one point for each percentage point that each state reduced its median jail population.5

The median jail population reductions in each state vary drastically from a 42% reduction in Arkansas to only 2% in Texas, and some states appear to have had increases in jail populations.6 To calculate the median jail population change, we analyzed data collected from the [NYU Public Safety Lab](#), supplemented by data collected by the [Vera Institute of Justice](#), on population changes from January 2020 to June 1, 2020.7 For Massachusetts jail data, we analyzed the [data published](#) by the

---

4 Not all states have taken these steps to reduce their prison populations voluntarily. For example, Hawai‘i (which has a combined prison and jail system), began to reduce the incarcerated population following a lawsuit that resulted in court orders from the Hawai‘i Supreme Court to expedite early releases and provide appropriate personal protective equipment.

5 The median jail population change may be different from the average or total statewide jail population, but by using the median, we are able to show population change across all states, even those for which only some counties have jail data available.

6 Jail population data was only available for 5 of the 27 county jails in South Dakota and the median jail population change in those jails reflected an increase of 3.7%. It is possible that with data for more counties, the median jail population change would look different, but based on the available data, South Dakota was awarded negative points because their jail population went in the wrong direction. In New Hampshire, jail data was only available for two small counties, and we therefore did not include any jail population changes in the New Hampshire score (New Hampshire was awarded 0 points for jail population changes).

7 In order to present a sample that was as representative of the state jail system as possible, we included all jails with available data in our analysis. We only excluded jails with pre-pandemic populations under 10 people, as the movement of a small number of people in and out of these small jails can swing the state’s median percentage of jail reduction in misleading ways. (Previous Prison Policy Initiative briefings on jail reductions during the pandemic excluded jails with populations under 350 because we wanted to lessen the impact of small
ACLU of Massachusetts for all counties. West Virginia and Maryland jail data were provided by ACLU of West Virginia and ACLU of Maryland. The jail population data for the ten largest counties in Missouri came from the ACLU of Missouri, and for the 35 other counties included in this report the data was collected by the NYU Public Safety Lab.

The jail data used for this report has population data over time for over 1,200 county jails, with a nationwide median population reduction of about 20%.8

**Prisons**

The public health response cannot end in jails — states must also address their prisons, with a combined and dense population of 1.3 million. Reducing the number of people who are currently incarcerated will limit the burdens people face due to incarceration or supervision that place them at elevated risk of being affected by the coronavirus pandemic. We awarded two points for each percentage point that a state reduced its prison population.

We analyzed the change in state prison population counts from the start of 2020 (using data from either December 31, 2019 or January 1, 2020) and four months later (using data from April 30, 2020 or May 1, 2020).9 We note that state Departments of Correction have been announcing plans to reduce their prison populations — by halting new admissions from county jails, increasing commutations, and releasing people who are medically fragile, elderly, or nearing the end of their sentences — but our analysis finds that the resulting population changes have been small, at about only 5%.

---

8 Readers may notice that this median jail population reduction is different than the 31% published last month in the Prison Policy Initiative’s May 14th report, While jails drastically cut populations, state prisons have released almost no one. Although it is difficult to identify exactly what accounts for this difference and when the changes started, we know that some jurisdictions — including Philadelphia — have returned to their pre-pandemic policing practices (which leads to an increase in arrests and jail bookings).

9 State prison population counts retrieved from the Vera Institute for Justice’s report, People in Prison 2019, which published population counts as of April 30, 2020 or May 1, 2020 for 41 states. The Prison Policy Initiative updated this data with prison populations as reported by state Departments of Correction for Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Washington. Washington prison population data used for this analysis was retrieved from DOC Fact Cards published on December 31, 2019 and March 31, 2020. The Washington Department of Corrections provided the Prison Policy Initiative with data for April 30, 2020, stating that there were 16,531 people in state prison, but because that population count excludes people held for technical violations, we could not compare it to the December 2019 data.
This report collected data from 49 states. We note that we awarded Maryland zero points in section for the prison population reduction efforts that may or may not have taken place in this study period because that state did not provide April/May data to the Vera Institute of Justice and failed to respond to two requests by the Prison Policy Initiative for April/May data. All other states provided population data to either the Vera Institute of Justice or the Prison Policy Initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points for each percentage point of population reduction</th>
<th>Maximum points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How we awarded points for jail and prison population reductions. For the details on how your state scored, see the appendix.*

Has the governor issued an executive order to halt jail admissions or to mandate the release of medically vulnerable individuals or those who are nearing the end of their sentence? Has the DOC issued a statewide directive to release medically vulnerable individuals or those who are nearing the end of their sentence? (maximum 90 points)

Some governors and Departments of Correction have led their state’s criminal justice systems in a coordinated response to the pandemic in jails and prisons. Others have left it up to local criminal justice stakeholders — police, prosecutors, judges, sheriffs, and supervision agents — to implement their own individual responses to COVID-19, leading to inevitable delays, confusion, and inefficient allocation of resources.

In some states — such as Colorado, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Washington — release orders from the governor or the Department of Correction authorized the release of both medically vulnerable people and those nearing the end of their sentences. Other governors issued executive orders that called for the release of either the medically vulnerable or those nearing the end of their sentence. Every executive release order analyzed contained specific offense criteria, most often excluding those charged with felonies, “violent offenses,” or sexual offenses. Governors in a number of states — including Colorado — that received points for executive orders have since let these executive orders expire.

---

10 Release orders issued by governors and Departments of Correction were compiled by the Prison Policy Initiative based on the Council of State Governments’ executive orders tracking tool.

If any states had issued an order that would release all people who were determined to be medically vulnerable and/or nearing the end of their sentence regardless of offense type, we would have awarded them up to 60 points; but no states took these essential steps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order for halting jail admission</th>
<th>Order for releasing medically vulnerable</th>
<th>Order for releasing people near end of sentences</th>
<th>Maximum points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No order exists</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial order or guidance</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete order</td>
<td>30 points</td>
<td>30 points</td>
<td>30 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How we awarded points for executive orders and Department of Correction directives. For the details on how your state scored, see the appendix.*

Partial release orders — release orders that exclude people based on offense type — or non-mandatory guidance were awarded 10 points, and states with no executive or DOC release orders received 0 points (out of 50 states, only 20 states received any points for executive release orders). States also received 10 points if they suspended incarceration for technical violations of community supervision, which occurred in Alabama, Michigan, and Washington.

States with executive orders that put a moratorium on all jail admissions were awarded 30 points (no states received all 30 points).12 States with executive orders or Department of Correction orders that halted some admissions to jails, for example halting jail bookings for certain misdemeanors or technical violations of probation or parole, received 10 points. States without orders addressing jail admissions received zero points.

---

12 For example, in California, Governor Newsom issued an executive order on March 24, 2020 which suspended admissions to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation state prison system. Shortly after this executive order, the CDCR paroled or released to community supervision approximately 3,500 people who were within 60 days of the end of their terms and met specific offense criteria. However, all of those 3,500 people were already scheduled to be paroled in April or May prior to the pandemic, indicating that these releases would have minimal impact on the long-term planning that is necessary to combat the spread of COVID-19 in prisons. States that took similar steps, including Maine, Virginia, and Wisconsin, would certainly see subsequent prison population reductions. For the purposes of assessing the whole criminal justice system’s response, we only scored executive orders and Departments of Correction initiatives to halt jail admissions in this section. We did not award or subtract points for orders that only halted admissions to state prisons.
Does the state or Department of Corrections provide publicly available, regularly updated data on COVID-19 behind bars? Is this data disaggregated by race? (maximum 30 points)

COVID-19 is killing more Black people and more people of color across the nation. And in a criminal justice system that disproportionately locks up Black people, the threat of the pandemic is heightened. Because of this, we need to know — and address — how COVID-19 is affecting people behind bars in order to slow the continued spread of the pandemic.

To assess states’ responses to COVID-19 behind bars in the appropriate context, it is necessary to know how many incarcerated people and staff in each state have already contracted the virus and how fast it is spreading. We awarded points to states that have published this data for state prisons. States providing frequently updated, accessible, and comprehensive correctional data on COVID-19 received 15 points; those providing more limited data received 5 points.

We awarded additional points to states that have provided data disaggregated by race — data that can help us assess whether prison and jail officials have taken Black individuals’ health complaints less seriously than those of incarcerated white people and staff. (Black people are overrepresented in incarcerated populations and among correctional staff, and the disproportionate number of coronavirus deaths among people of color in the general public is already well documented.) States providing data that is disaggregated by race received 15 points. If only some sections of a state’s correctional data were disaggregated by race, we awarded 5 points.

There are two states with limited correctional COVID-19 data — New Mexico and Wyoming — and those states received only 5 points. 12 states offer publicly available and regularly updated data and received 15 points.13 Only eight of those states’ data includes specifics on race; and those states — Delaware, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Vermont, and West Virginia — received an additional 15 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVID-19 data availability</th>
<th>Disaggregated by race</th>
<th>Maximum points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some data</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full data</td>
<td>15 points</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How we awarded points for Departments of Corrections’ state prison COVID-19 data availability. For the details on how your state scored, see the appendix.*

13 Not all state Departments of Corrections offer this data voluntarily. For example, the Massachusetts Department of Correction data was compiled and released only after an opinion on April 3rd, 2020 by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court in *Committee for Public Counsel Services (CPCS) v. Chief Justice of the Trial Court, SJC-12926.*
**Points deducted for COVID-19 deaths in state prisons**

In recognition of the fact that human life is precious and that policy decisions have real life consequences, we deducted points for deaths in state prison custody. States should have immediately taken the common-sense actions described in the report, but they largely have not, even months later. And even the states that took positive steps did so much later than they should have, raising the human cost.

For that reason, we deducted from the final score of each state 1 point for every 5 prison deaths per 10,000 people in the state’s prison system. (By tying the deductions to the number per 10,000 we account for vastly different prison population sizes in different states.)

We considered weighting this outcome more heavily, but we ultimately did not do so for several reasons. First, the difference in death rates between states is in part the result of policy differences and in large part the temporary result of the fact that the virus started spreading in some places earlier than others. If we weighted this factor more heavily, we’d be giving a pass to states that took little action and saw their deaths predictably spike after publication of this report. Second, even while comparing prison death rates — rather than counts — a single death in any of the smaller states still has an outsized impact on the overall scoring. Third, as this report has argued, prison deaths are just one part of the human cost that we do not, at this time, have a way to calculate. In particular, we do not yet have a reliable way to calculate all of the other ways in which criminal justice failures lead to deaths from COVID-19, including: undisclosed COVID-19 deaths in prisons, deaths from other causes in incarcerated people who were weakened by COVID-19, or deaths from community spread that was first incubated in the state’s prisons. For that reason, for a report written while the pandemic is still in its early stages, we chose to include these deaths and challenge all states to do far better. The final history will not be written until long after the pandemic ends, but elected officials need to be on notice that history is watching.
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Failing Grades: States’ Responses to COVID-19 in Jails & Prisons

Appendix A

Spreadsheet prepared: June 25, 2020
Documentation last updated: June 30, 2020
Prepared by the Prison Policy Initiative & ACLU and published at:  https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/failing_grades_appendix.xlsx

Methodology

**Staff (15 points)**
Does the state Department of Corrections provide COVID-19 testing for all staff?

**Incarcerated (20 points)**
Does the state Department of Corrections provide COVID-19 testing for all incarcerated people?

**Staff (15 points)**
Does the state Department of Corrections provide personal protective equipment for all staff?

**Incarcerated (15 points)**
Does the state Department of Corrections provide personal protective equipment for all incarcerated people?

**Publicly available (15 points)**
Does the state Department of Corrections publish accessible and up-to-date data on COVID-19 in prisons?

**Disaggregated by race (15 points)**
Is the data provided by the Department of Corrections disaggregated by race?

**Halting jail admissions (30 points)**
Did the governor issue an executive order (or did the Department of Corrections enact a policy) to halt jail admissions?

**Medically vulnerable releases (30 points)**
Did the governor issue an executive order (or did the Department of Corrections enact a policy) to release the medically vulnerable from prisons?

**Near-completion of sentence releases (30 points)**
Did the governor issue an executive order (or did the Department of Corrections enact a policy) to release people from prisons who were near the end of their sentences?

**Statewide jail reduction**
What has the median jail population percentage change been across the state as of June 1, 2020? (1 point per 1% reduction of median jail population)

**How many jails do we have data for?**
How many local jails had data available for this analysis?

**Statewide prison reduction**
By what percentage has the state's prison population changed from Dec 31, 2019/Jan 1, 2020 to April 30, 2020/May 1 2020 (unless otherwise noted in sources)? (2 points per 1% reduction)

**Raw score**
Sum of points for testing, PPE, data, executive and DOC orders, and population reduction (maximum 485 points)

**Normalized score out of 100 points**
Raw score normalized by dividing by 4.85 (maximum 100 points)

**Subtracted points for prison deaths**
Subtracted one point for every 5 prison deaths per 10,000 people in the state’s prison system
<p>| State          | Staff (15 points) | Incarcerated (20 points) | PPE in state prisons as of June 6, 2020 (20 points) | Data availability for state prisons as of June 10, 2020 (10 points) | Publicly available (15 points) | Disaggregated by race (15 points) | Halting jail admissions (25 points) | Medically vulnerable releases (10 points) | Near-completion of sentence releases (10 points) | Inmate population reduction as of June 10, 2020 (15 points) | Inmate population reduction as of June 1, 2020 (15 points) | Statewide jail reduction (1 point per % reduction of median jail population) from Dec 31, 2019 to Apr 30, 2020 unless otherwise specified | Raw score (out of 45) | Normalized score out of 100 points (i.e., divide by 4.85) | Subtracted points for prison deaths (i point for every 5 deaths in prison) | Final score | Letter grade | Sources |
|---------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| Alabama       | Testing not provided by DOC (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic or contact (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (15 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | 18.44 | 31 | 7.8 | 86.94 | 16.69 | 0.29 | 16.39 | F | Testing, PPE, data: DOC site Executive orders: Fifth Supplemental State of Emergency: Coronavirus (COVID-19) Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019/20” report |
| Alaska        | Testing not provided by DOC (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic or contact (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (15 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | 7.03 | 8 | 5 | 47.03 | 9.70 | 0.34 | 9.36 | F | Testing, PPE, data: DOC site Executive orders: Modified EPA Updated, June 2020 Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019/20” report |
| Arizona       | Testing not provided only in some (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic or contact (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated regularly (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combination of early release for people nearing end of sentence, with specific inmate categories included (0 points) | Combination of early release for people nearing end of sentence, with specific inmate categories included (0 points) | Combination of early release for people nearing end of sentence, with specific inmate categories included (0 points) | 41.86 | 31 | 4.8 | 106.66 | 20.96 | 0.58 | 20.38 | F | Testing, PPE, data: DOC site Executive orders: Modified EPA Updated, June 2020 Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019/20” report |
| Arkansas       | Commitment to testing all facilities (3 points) | Testing when symptomatic or contact (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated regularly (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (15 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | 30.63 | 58 | 9.8 | 90.43 | 18.65 | 0.18 | 18.48 | F | Testing, PPE, data: DOC site Executive orders: Executive Order N-36-20 Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab &amp; Vera Institute of Justice Prison data: Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019/20” report |
| California     | Commitment to testing all facilities (3 points) | Testing when symptomatic or contact (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated regularly (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (15 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | 21.84 | 13 | 19.3 | 144.92 | 23.70 | 0.33 | 23.27 | D | Testing, PPE, data: DOC site Executive orders: Temporary Suspending Certain Regulatory Statutes Concerning Criminal Justice (4/2020 order) &amp; Governor’s Guidance To Counties, Municipalities, Law Enforcement Agencies, And Detention Centers Jail data: Population counts for March 28, 2020 and June 4, 2020 provided by ACLU of Colorado Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019/20” report |
| Colorado       | Testing not provided by DOC (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic or contact (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated regularly (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (15 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | 8.32 | 64 | 7.8 | 54.78 | 9.43 | 0.39 | 9.04 | F | Testing, PPE, data: DOC site Executive orders: n/a Jail data: n/a Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019/20” report |
| Connecticut    | Commitment to testing all facilities (3 points) | Testing when symptomatic or contact (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated regularly (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (15 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system (0 points) | 8.32 | 64 | 7.8 | 54.78 | 9.43 | 0.39 | 9.04 | F | Testing, PPE, data: DOC site Executive orders: n/a Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab &amp; Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019/20” report |
| State   | Testing completion by DOC (0 points) | Testing some (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (15 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (10 points) | 24.76 | 44 | 8.9 | 76.6 | 15.8 | 0.75 | 15.06 | F+ |
|---------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hawai‘i | No information on testing (0 points) | Testing some (5 points) | Masks provided to some (0 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Combined prison and jail system | 4 | 8 | 8 | 24.3 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 10.41 | F |
| Idaho   | No information on testing (0 points) | Testing some (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | 17.76 | 14 | 8.5 | 70.9 | 14.82 | 0.0 | 14.82 | F+ |
| Illinois | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Indiana | No information on testing (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic or in contact (3 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Grantees DOCD and Parole Board authority to suspend incarcerations for parole violations (10 points) | 28.29 | 92 | 4.3 | 77.7 | 15.96 | 1.42 | 14.95 | F+ |
| Iowa    | Testing some (5 points) | Testing some (5 points) | Masks provided to some (0 points) | Data available and updated regularly (5 points) | Grantees DOCD and Parole Board authority to suspend incarcerations for parole violations (10 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Grants DOC and Parole Board authority to authorize early parole (10 points) | 10.53 | 16 | 8.3 | 84.7 | 17.45 | 0.0 | 17.45 | F+ |
| Kansas  | No information on testing (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic; one facility had complete testing (3 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Grants commutations for people &quot;considered of nonviolent, non-serious offenses&quot; with sentences expiring on or before 9/30/2020 (10 points) | 30.77 | 22 | 8.6 | 89.3 | 18.43 | 0.8 | 17.61 | F+ |
| Kentucky | Testing when symptomatic (3 points) | Testing some (5 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | Ordered early release and commutations for vulnerable people who were sentenced under specific medical medical vulnerability and offenses criteria (10 points) | 34.43 | 69 | 17.4 | 106.8 | 24.19 | 0.19 | 29.28 | D |
| Louisiana | No information on testing (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic; one facility had complete testing (3 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | Not disaggregated by race (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | DOC creation of a temporary furlough (24 vote panel determined within 6 months of sentence completion and dependent on &quot;nonviolent and non-sexual crimes&quot;) (10 points) | 46.58 | 44 | 12.2 | 85.0 | 17.32 | 1.0 | 16.03 | F+ |
| Maine   | No information on testing (0 points) | Testing when symptomatic; one facility had complete testing (3 points) | Masks provided to all (3 points) | Data available and updated daily (5 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | No order (0 points) | All jail facilities | 50.5 | 7.4 | 104.2 | 21.22 | 0.6 | 24.22 | D |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Testing and PPE provided by DOC (0 points)</th>
<th>Complete testing of all (15 points)</th>
<th>Masks provided to all (5 points)</th>
<th>Masks provided to all (5 points)</th>
<th>Data available from ACLU of MA and updated regularly (5 points)</th>
<th>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</th>
<th>No order (0 points)</th>
<th>No order (0 points)</th>
<th>No order (0 points)</th>
<th>All jail facilities (0 points)</th>
<th>Testing, PPE, data: DOC website &amp; the &quot;People in Prison 2019&quot; report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Testing when asymptomatic; reportedly increasing symptomatic testing (5 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>No prison data available</td>
<td>16.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Complete testing of all (15 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>110.57</td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>No information on testing (0 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated daily (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>141.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all (5 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>115.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Testing when symptomatic or in contact (0 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated daily (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>56.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all (5 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated daily (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all (5 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated daily (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>57.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Testing not provided by DOC (0 points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all (5 points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly (5 points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>No order (0 points)</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Testing not provided by DOC 5 (points)</td>
<td>Testing when symptomatic or in contact 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated daily 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Complete testing of all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Testing some 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available, no specific frequency of updates 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available, no specific frequency of updates 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>No information on testing 5 (points)</td>
<td>Testing when symptomatic or in contact 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated daily 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Testing not provided by DOC 5 (points)</td>
<td>Commitment to testing all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>No information on testing 5 (points)</td>
<td>Testing when symptomatic or in contact 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Testing not provided by DOC 5 (points)</td>
<td>Testing when symptomatic; some facilities committed to complete testing 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Testing not provided by DOC 5 (points)</td>
<td>Testing some; testing all who are scheduled to be released within one week 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Testing not provided by DOC 5 (points)</td>
<td>Testing when symptomatic or in contact 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Masks provided to all 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Data available and updated regularly 5 (points)</td>
<td>Not disaggregated by race 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td>No order 5 (points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing, PPE, data: DOC website
Executive orders: Order Of The Gov. Of Penn. Regarding Individuals Incarcerated In State Correctional Institutions
 Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab & Vera Institute of Justice
Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019” report

**Pennsylvania**
Not testing provided by DOC (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (2 points)
Disaggregated by race (3 points)
No order (5 points)

**Rhode Island**
Commitment to testing all (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
No information on PPE (3 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (3 points)
Disaggregated by race (3 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**South Carolina**
Testing not provided by DOC (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (3 points)
Masks available updated daily (3 points)
Disaggregated by race (3 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**South Dakota**
Commitment to testing all (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (5 points)
Orders suspension of jail admissions for people on parole with positive urinalysis test for controlled substance (10 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**Tennessee**
Commitment to testing all (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (5 points)
Disaggregated by race (10 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**Texas**
Testing not provided by DOC (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (5 points)
Disaggregated by race (10 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**Utah**
Commitment to testing all (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (5 points)
Disaggregated by race (10 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**Vermont**
Testing not provided by DOC (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (5 points)
Disaggregated by race (10 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**Virginia**
Testing not provided by DOC (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (5 points)
Disaggregated by race (10 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

**Washington**
Testing not provided by DOC (5 points)
Testing when symptomatic or in contact (5 points)
Masks provided to all (5 points)
Testing when provided to all (5 points)
Masks available updated daily (5 points)
Disaggregated by race (10 points)
No order (5 points)
No order (5 points)

Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (4 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 6 months of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are medically vulnerable and most specific offense criteria (2 points)
Grants receipt of sentence to people who are within 12 months of release eligibility and who "do not pose a risk" to public safety (2 points)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Complete testing of all (20 points)</th>
<th>Completed testing of all (15 points)</th>
<th>Masks provided to all inmates (15 points)</th>
<th>Data available and updated daily (10 points)</th>
<th>State DOC provided data by race to the Marshall Project (5 points)</th>
<th>No order (0 points)</th>
<th>No order (0 points)</th>
<th>No order (0 points)</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Yes (4 points)</td>
<td>Yes (3 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>114.39</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Yes (4 points)</td>
<td>Yes (3 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>No (0 points)</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing, PPE, data: Division of Corrections & Rehabilitation website, the Marshall Project’s report, “Is COVID-19 Falling Harder on Black Prisoners? Officials Won’t Tell Us,” & WV MetroNews article on PPE
Executive orders: n/a
Jail data: ACLU of West Virginia
Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019” report

Testing, PPE, data: DOC website
Executive orders: n/a
Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab
Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019” report

Testing, PPE, data: DOC website
Executive orders: n/a
Jail data: NYU Public Safety Lab
Prison data: Vera Institute of Justice’s “People in Prison 2019” report