

# Understanding Protective Management

Dinah K. Poore

*This study examines the development of protective management programs from the first available written policies to the present day situation. The study includes characteristics of inmates in the program, the reasons for a protection program, and the reasons inmates give for needing protection. The study discusses the problems involved in protective management and suggests remedies. Recommendations considered feasible within the existing system provide realistic approaches to alleviate some of the difficulties.*

## Introduction

Living in prison creates many images in the minds of parents, spouses, victims, and criminals. Fear is one common emotion shared by all. Within the "walls" of major adult facilities, there is a community similar in many ways to the ones shared by ordinary citizens. Fear exists in all communities, but it is intensified in prison, due in part to the restrictions on movement, the type of individual incarcerated, and perhaps the reputation of such settings. While citizens may have the option of locking doors and windows securely, using such weapons as guns, mace and martial arts, or hiring bodyguards, few such devices are legitimately available in prison. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the system to provide care, custody, and control for all inmates, regardless of the crime they committed. In consideration of the aspect of care, the concept of protective management (PM) or protective custody (PC) was created.

## Definitions

There are many definitions of protective custody but four will be used in this study for comparison:

*A form of separation from the general population for inmates requesting protection from other inmates for reasons of health or safety. The inmate's status is reviewed periodically by the classification committee or other designated group (Henderson and Phillips, 1990, p. 53).*

*Special provisions to protect safety and well-being for inmates who, based on findings of fact, would be in danger in general population (National Institute of Corrections, 1986, p. 3-41).*

*Specifically, PC refers to the removal of an inmate from the general population of a penal institution for his own safety and/or for the maintenance and good order of the specific institution. In Canada, this removal of an inmate is an administrative action taken in accordance with either federal or provincial guidelines (Tellier, Wormith & Genreau, 1984, p.1; Genreau, Tellier & Wormith, 1985, p.1).*

*Protective Management is the removal of an inmate from the general*

*population for the protection of the inmate. Placement in protective management is based on procedures set forth in 33-3.0081(5) (Florida Department of Corrections Rule 33-3.0082(1)).*

Comparison of these definitions reveals little substantive difference. In Florida, the Department of Corrections' definition is most familiar. A review of Department of Corrections Rule 33-3.0081 more clearly shows the frame of reference. It reads, in part:

*33-3.0081 Administrative Confinement. (1) Administrative confinement is the removal of an inmate from the general inmate population for one or more of the following reasons:*

*(b) Pending review for protective management, (§3.0082). An inmate shall be placed in administrative confinement by the senior correctional officer when the inmate presents a signed written statement alleging that he fears for his safety in open population and that he feels there is no other reasonable alternative open to him. The senior correctional officer shall encourage the inmate to provide information and otherwise cooperate with efforts by the institution to investigate the matter and eliminate any danger to the inmate...*

*(5) Review for Protective Management*

*(a) In situations included in (1)(b), the institutional special review team shall initiate an investigation to gather information. The investigation shall be completed within 15 days unless an extension not to exceed 10 additional days is approved by the superintendent. The team shall review the Report of Administrative Confinement, Form DC4-813(a), any written statements submitted by the inmate, and the findings of the investigation to determine whether the inmate should be placed in protective management. The following elements shall be considered in determining whether protective management is necessary:*

- 1. A record of having been assaulted;*
- 2. Reputation among population, attested to in writing by staff, as an informant or trial witness;*
- 3. Verified threats, verbal abuse, or harassment;*
- 4. Conviction of a crime repugnant to the inmate population;*
- 5. Reliable, confirmed evidence of sexual harassment;*
- 6. Other factors such as physical size, build and age producing a risk from the general inmate population....*

### In the Beginning

As society has evolved through many stages, so has the prison system. Deprivation, cruelty, and various forms of corporal punishment commonplace in years past have been replaced in modern correctional systems with prisoners' rights issues, televisions, and state-of-the-art medical care. Prisoners today are recognized as human beings with rights, feelings, opinions, and needs previously ignored or ridiculed.

Regardless of the nature of the crime, the right of inmates to be treated humanely and with respect is recognized by the federal government and, partly because of the government's position, by every state in the union. As a part such fair treatment, the right of prisoners to be protected from other prisoners has been recognized and provided in the form of protective custody. The Florida system uses the term protective management.

Table 1		
<b>Profile of Offenders in Protective Management September 30, 1992</b>		
Number of cases		308
Primary offense on Current Commitment :		
Murder, Manslaughter	31.2%	96
Sexual Offenses	14.0%	43
Robbery	15.6%	48
Other Violent Offenses	4.2%	13
Kidnapping	6.2%	19
Other	28.8%	89
40% of the offenders in protective management had life sentences.		
The average sentence length for non-lifers was 45.6 Years.		
Average age of the offenders was 33.8 years.		
Source: Florida Department of Corrections, Bureau of Planning, Research & Statistics, 1992.		

Though limited data are available, the early 1960s is probably the period when the need for protecting inmates was recognized. Canadian records of inmates in the protective custody program date back only to 1972. (Buckingham Securities, undated). While it is recognized that violence in American prisons has been escalating since the 1960s, (Bender and Leone, 1985), data regarding the first protective management programs cannot be found. Florida records show the first formal attention was given to the problem in 1979, when a policy on Administrative Confinement included a provision for segregation based on the need for protection. In 1983, a policy titled Protective Confinement was issued.

While there is no data to show when inmates first started asking for protection, it is logical to surmise that in the early days the belief in the "macho man" image would prevent many from "wimping out" and admitting they were fearful, at least to the extent that they required protection from fellow inmates. As the prison system became more compassionate and civil rights groups became more prevalent, the need for assistance was more acceptable. Additionally, when society began to accept the notion that

prisoners may sexually attack each other, those needing protection for reasons associated with such behavior began to see their alternatives. Finally, in the early days of organized prisons, the employees hired to guard prisoners sometimes were involved in the problem and not in the solution. As awareness of the rights of all human beings grew, so did the inmates' awareness of rights. Inmates began to realize they could demand better treatment and get it.

### Characteristics of Inmates in Protective Management

The personal characteristics common to inmates in protective management are difficult to determine because of the variety of reasons inmates give for such placement. Those who are weak or ineffectual often are assumed to be the ones involved, but that is not always the case.

Research has been limited, but in the 1980s, Canadian researchers used five types of variables to compare protective and nonprotective custody inmates. They found that the inmate in protective management was more likely:

- to be a sex offender
- to come from a psychopathological and criminogenic family
- to have received psychiatric attention earlier in life and with greater frequency
- to be diagnosed as having either inadequate or antisocial personality disorders
- to have alcohol or drug dependency problems (Tellier & Wormith, 1986).

The researchers concluded that inmates in protective management could be expected to have poor self-image and lack social skills. No current studies, either in Canada or the United States, could be found to determine the validity of those conclusions. Therefore, the findings remain conjecture until more comprehensive studies are done. While personal characteristics of protective management inmates have not been formally studied in Florida, examination of limited profile information provides interesting information (see Table 1).

Statistics are similar at Martin Correctional Institution, one of the four male prisons in Florida with a long-term protective management program. Of the 149 inmates currently in protective management, the average age is 33.5 years, with the oldest 54 and the youngest 19. Twenty-six percent of protective management inmates are serving life terms while twenty-three percent are serving 20 years or more. Fifty-four percent are first offenders.

The profile of primary offenses is as follows:

Murder	23.5%
Sexual offenses	24.0%
Robbery	15.0%
Other violent offenses	12.7%
Kidnapping	5.4%
Other	19.4%

Observation and minimal review of inmate files shows that protective

management inmates include those who are of small stature, have limited ability to manage their sexual orientation, and are mentally and/or physically weak. Additionally, inmates who may or may not have these characteristics may need protection because their own actions have resulted in other inmates seeking revenge.

### Reasons for "Checking In"

Various theories as to why inmates request protection have been offered. A 1975 study (Vantour, 1979) grouped reasons into four categories:

1. The crime(s) which resulted in incarceration
2. The personality of the inmate
3. Problems experienced within the prison
4. Previous street activities.

Later, Toch (1977) claimed that predispositional factors were the primary cause. Toch said that the types most likely to seek protection were inmates who were believed to be informers, who were targets of sexual aggression, who were very old or very young, or who were giving the impression of being afraid. In his 1978 study of Washington State Prison, Barak concluded that it was the prison administration's failure to protect inmates from the increasing violence that led many to request segregation in search of a safe harbor.

After continuing his inquiries, Vantour reported in 1979 that inmates were checking into protective custody for increasingly vague reasons. The Correctional Service of Canada (1983) referred to them as those who "cannot do time" and simply wish to remove themselves from the violence and confusion of prison life.

In 1983, the American Correctional Association conducted a survey and collected data which seems to support Vantour's statement that, increasingly, protective custody inmates no longer fit within any of the convenient categories previously described. In a 1990 nationwide survey, the National Institute of Corrections found agreement with many of Vantour's points. One question asked inmates why they had requested protection. Responses included:

- 58 who claimed to have hits on them, 23 for extortion.
- Ex-law enforcement officers.
- Protection due to media coverage concerning offense.
- First-time offenders just scared.
- Fear due to court testimony and other problems.
- To avoid possibility of problems before parole.
- Fear of death or bodily harm (19 percent gang-related).
- Alleged to be on hit list of various gangs.
- To avoid regular maximum and medium security housing (p. 3).

### The Martin County Study

At Martin Correctional Institution in Indiantown, Fla., reasons given by inmates who "check in" to protective custody vary from sexual harassment by other inmates to an inability to do time. Primary research conducted for this study indicates that only a

small percentage relate their needs to factors outside prison life such as personalities of the offenders and the type of crime committed. It is also true, though perhaps simplistic, that the prison authorities' inability to protect each and every inmate contributes to the need for protective management. For the majority, however, the request for protection comes as a result of activities, reputation, appearance, and/or behavior in jail and later in prison. One difficulty in analyzing such information is that the given reasons may not always be the real reasons. Facing the possibility of disciplinary action for rule violations, inmates are not likely to admit that their own actions contributed to their need for protection. It is often true that they are being threatened or extorted, but the unspoken details may reveal a homosexual triangle or a drug deal that went bad. Racial problems are sometimes at the root of a request. As is the case in society, many people who are in serious trouble were helped into the situation by their own doing.

Finally, there are those who don't want protection at all, but they make the request hoping to convince staff that their safety will be assured by a transfer to another facility. In this case, as the others, the inmate is likely to say what he believes will accomplish his purpose.

With the disclaimers stated, the following are the reasons given by the protective management inmates at Martin Correctional Institution for "checking in":

Sexual harassment	31.4%
Assistance to staff/Informants	29.0%
Debts/Extortion	21.5%
Type/Notoriety of crime	6.0%
Law Enforcement Officers	3.0%
Other	9.1%

Sexual Harassment. Because most inmates know that sexual violation is considered inexcusable, there is a strong suspicion its frequent use as a reason for protective custody may be more for effect than for cause. Nevertheless, there are certainly cases when inmates have been seriously threatened and actually raped. This is a category frequently used by first offenders who fear such activity, even if they have not been subjected to it. In addition, the increase in the number of admitted homosexuals in the prison system certainly adds to the number in this category. Gay inmates who are frail or small may be passed among stronger inmates for their sexual pleasure or may be threatened with physical harm should they not behave according to their current partner's wishes.

Assistance/Informants. In the next category are those who may be paying for their assistance to law enforcement prior to coming to prison. Additionally, a large number of inmates have assisted the officials in prison with preventing escapes, curtailing drug traffic, or handling other illegal activity. These inmates often cannot live in the general prison population. Another important fact about this group is that many are here by reputation only, not because of their actions but because of what they are believed to have done, said, or told. If an inmate is seen talking to authorities or handing a note to an officer, and soon thereafter an inmate known to be his enemy is caught in some rule

infraction, other inmates might assume that his conversation or note was the tip that resulted in the other inmate being in trouble. Perhaps the assumption is accurate; perhaps it is not. No matter, the belief by other inmates that it is true is sufficient to require the inmate to make a plan for his safety.

Debts. Because of the availability of contraband in prison and the prevalence of gambling and other such activities, many inmates get into debt and are unable to pay. Interest rates in prison are considerably higher than those of a commercial lending institution. If there is no other arrangement to satisfy the debt, the lender is obligated to keep his other customers in line by handling those who won't pay. Many inmate arguments, fights, assaults, and even murders have been the end result of bad debts.

Additionally, an inmate may "stand good" for a friend's or lover's debt. He is then as obligated to pay as any cosigner on the outside, and the consequences for not doing so are considerably higher.

The consequence within the system should an inmate admit gambling, borrowing, or lending as the reason he needs protection is that he is likely to receive disciplinary action for violation of the rules. Therefore, he may say the other inmates have accused him of a debt that he actually does not owe. This way he accomplishes his purpose without incriminating himself.

Type of Crime. Contrary to the belief of many citizens, there are relatively few inmates who must seek protection as a result of an especially repugnant crime. Child molesters and rapists, who once faced great difficulties when living with other inmates, often are protected by rules of confidentiality and are aware that it would be in their best interests to lie about their crimes.

Former Law Enforcement. Currently, there are only five former law enforcement officers in the protective management unit.

Other. Finally, it must be realized that approximately 11.6% of the inmates in the unit at Martin Correctional Institution have psychiatric problems severe enough that psychotropic medications are required on a daily basis. The reasons stated for needing protection vary, and often the obvious inability to function among inmates in the general population is the reason for recommending protective program assignments, regardless of the stated problem.

#### Why is it Necessary?

The data concerning convicted felons and the need for protection raises a question about the prison system. Why doesn't the administration just stop the violence, control the activities of those who prey on others and/or simply let each inmate fend for himself or herself? Certainly the data concerning prison violence indicate that prison authorities must seek to prevent what most would agree is the clearly unacceptable alternative of death and destruction by those bigger and stronger. There is little doubt that the change in the philosophy of dealing with prisons and prisoners has contributed to the increased need for protection. As society has changed its ideas about the rights of all individuals, those who set the criteria for penal institutions have determined that

the rights of those inside must also be ensured. No longer are prison administrators endowed with the power that made them virtual demigods. They are expected to respect the rights of all prisoners, assure that all are free to express their concerns, and see that all are treated as equally as their behaviors will permit. Certainly, the corporal punishment of times past is no longer tolerated.

In pursuit of those goals, there are many reasons for the use of segregation for protection, including those listed by Henderson & Phillips (1990, p. 23):

- Increased freedom of movement allowing inmates access to one another.
- Less stringent nature of discipline, providing less of a deterrent for rule-breaking.
- Modern classification of inmates tending to group hardcore inmates together.
- The profile of today's inmates, which reveals greater violence and more drug related offenses.
- Increasing numbers of first-time offenders with little experience in how to "do time."
- The practice of furloughs, which increase the opportunity for contraband to be introduced.
- More news coverage of crimes and trials, increasing the awareness of the inmates about the arrival of an inmate convicted of a notorious crime.
- The comparative quiet of protective custody units makes them an attractive place to live.
- Growth of drug activity which can lead to informants who may need protection.
- The growth of inmate gangs leading to those trying to avoid such activity needing protection and making that area attractive to gang members seeking a "captive audience."
- The requirement for due process in disciplinary procedures, making it simpler and more effective to place the victim in protection than the predator in disciplinary confinement.
- Virtually unlimited access to the courts by inmates, leaving the way clear for suits against prison officials who may be accused of failing to protect inmates.

### Problematic Issues

Protective management presents major concerns for prison systems. In particular, the cost of providing such care is high. For example, it takes more staff to move and supervise groups of inmates who cannot come into contact with each other.

Most facilities permit some free movement within the fenced or walled compounds despite the restrictions prison life mandates. But there are various types of inmates segregated from the general population. Inmates who have broken rules and have been disciplined often do not enjoy such freedoms while paying the penalty for their infractions. Inmates found guilty of rule infractions are placed in confinement and forfeit most privileges while in that status. Inmates who continue to break rules or are threats to the orderly operation of the facility may be removed from the population for an even longer period of time. These inmates are placed in Close Management, a status similar to "solitary confinement." When an inmate in a status such as this must leave the cell for medical or other reasons, it is necessary for two officers to provide escort to the destination, continue supervision during treatment, visitation or counseling, and provide escort back to the cell. This assures that the status which has been imposed is not



violated while the entitled and necessary care is accomplished.

At Martin Correctional Institution the average inmate population is 1,100. Approximately 450 of these inmates are in segregation at any one time. About 250 are in disciplinary or administrative confinement or close management. Approximately 150 are in protective management, and 50 more are awaiting action on their request for protection. Each inmate who has been approved for protection, and ones whose status is being investigated, must be individually escorted to the medical department for sick call and doctor appointments. When the protection inmates are going to the dining hall three times each day, the remaining 600 inmates must be locked in their housing units to assure the protection inmates do not come into contact with them. When working, protection inmates must be separated from other inmates who must also have job assignments. Additionally, there are hourly counts and security checks, issuing of cleaning supplies, disciplinary report hearings, recreation, and trips to the law library. Even with 26 acres inside the secure perimeter, moving and supervising groups of inmates who cannot come into contact with each other presents a logistical nightmare. To accomplish this feat, innovative work assignments at unusual times with additional security must be employed, and strict security must be maintained during movement.

The possibility of removing privileges for protective management inmates does not exist as it does for inmates who have violated rules and have shown that they cannot live in open population without disrupting the order of the institution. Because they are being protected, not punished, the protected inmates must have the same privileges, programs, and opportunities as open population inmates. This presents one main, ever unpopular consequence -- more money is needed. Estimates indicate that costs are as much as seven times higher for staff alone to deal with inmates in segregation (McGee, Warner, & Harlow, 1985).

Housing Six is designated as the protection unit, and the staffing pattern to handle the routine activities is typical of that required for confinement, including Close Management I and II inmates and administrative and disciplinary confinement inmates. All the activities mentioned earlier, however, must go on during a typical day. Attachment #1 represents the current schedule of events for Housing Six. A recent court case, for which a decision is still pending, has required that a current schedule be maintained, which is the reason for the large number of revision dates. While these activities are being conducted, medical rounds, cleaning, and mail delivery/pick up is going on. There are also scheduled and random count times.

Each of these activities is provided for open population and a separate but equal program, as shown on the schedule, is conducted for protective management inmates. The programs must be of equal content and quality in order to preserve the right of protective management inmates to be treated comparably to those in the open population. Such efforts are sometimes perceived as special treatment. Certainly the group activities are smaller and may allow for more individual time to be spent with each participant. Some of the old perceptions of protection inmates being weak and cowardly may add to resentment from staff and other inmates, especially since the crimes they committed were very similar to those of other inmates.

Finally, activities for the open population inmates are curtailed simply because it is not possible to provide the same events for protection inmates. This certainly has added to the ill will between the groups as those in the general population feel they are

suffering unnecessarily.

Where are the answers, then, to the problems presented by the protective management concept?

### Recommendations

There seem to be some facilities that have little difficulty with protection issues. Inmates either do not request assistance or the management of the program presents few difficulties. Figuring out the reasons for their success is not an easy process. However, when asked to explain the reasons for the differences, administrators and those working with the program listed some common factors:

1. Good management
2. A competent and committed staff
3. A well-designed physical plant
4. Institutional tradition or culture that, even under adverse conditions, somehow makes things work (McGee, Warner, & Harlow, 1985).

The last element is, of course, the most difficult to define and understand. However, good management and high quality staff are probably the most important. Without those elements, there will be little success with whatever new approaches or ideas are introduced.

In searching for practical and immediate solutions to problems of protective custody, a publication for the National Institute of Justice by McGee, Warner, and Harlow (1985) made several suggestions:

Change Classification Procedures. Currently, the initial classification system in Florida is based primarily on factors concerning security or escape potential. The inmate's length of sentence, type of crime, behavior patterns on previous commitments, age, and arrest history indicate whether he can be expected to adjust in a less structured program at a work camp or work release center or requires a facility with high security. If there is a medical problem which requires attention, psychological difficulties which require medication, or other such problems, the physical plant and programs available must be considered.

The question of whether the inmate might require protection is addressed only at his request or as it might relate to these other issues. Once an inmate is classified to a "permanent" institution, he is placed in a dormitory or housing unit rather indiscriminately. If problems arise, they are dealt with by the inmates or staff. This creates a reactive state rather than one of strategic planning.

There have been tests of systems which have developed a set of guidelines to categorize inmates into various groups based on their potential behavior patterns. Those who are likely to act out are housed separately from the ones who are likely to be victims. "Average" inmates are used to fill the remaining majority of beds, some in these special units and some in their own units. When such a system was tested in the federal prison in Tallahassee, "...The overall rate of violence within the institution declined significantly after the system was introduced. More than two-thirds of the assaults occurred in the units housing inmates classified as predators. Less than one-third

occurred in the unit housing 'victims,' and none occurred in the unit reserved for average inmates.

The reduction in assaults recorded during the first year was maintained through the second year." This type of classification system has also shown that the number of protective management cases can be cut by as much as half, probably because borderline "victims" feel safer and borderline "bullies" don't have easy access to victims.

Control Activities Leading to Victimization. In the effort to establish a humane environment, administrators have, in some cases, gone beyond humane to excessive. Personal property is often allowed to an extent that storage space must be expanded and staff must spend additional time searching for contraband. Hiding places for weapons, gambling paraphernalia, drugs, and other contraband are increased as inmates are allowed to keep photo albums, clothing, excessive correspondence, cosmetics and other items which they consider nice but are clearly not necessary. At some institutions, no personal property is allowed. Inmates' visitors may be banned from ever visiting again if caught bringing in contraband, and money of any denomination is prohibited. While such prisons may appear barren, they provide a safer atmosphere and provide more time for staff to attend to other concerns.

Investigate Potential Problems at Reception. When inmates are received at institutions, there may be routine file reviews and attention to inmate concerns, but for the most part, the inmates are placed into general population wherever empty beds are located. At the other extreme, new inmates are placed in special housing units where they remain for a few weeks until management and the inmates have a reasonably good idea of their potential for success in the mainstream of prison life.

Foster and Reward Communication Between Inmates and Staff. A seemingly simple task such as communication brings difficulties when it takes place in a prison setting. Staff and inmates should be encouraged to interact, but staff must be trained in professionalism and take care not to cross into personal relationships. While open communication can remove undesired barriers, personal relationships can lead to favoritism and can compromise an officer's ability to perform his duties. Nevertheless, the other extreme of inmates being in fear of general conversation with staff is clearly not an environment conducive to safety and concern for the general well-being of all involved. Upper management should set the example in this area by showing younger, less experienced staff that being on the compound with the inmates in general conversation is acceptable and encouraged.

Provide Special Programs for Vulnerable Inmates. All too often, once an inmate gets into the protection program, little or no action is taken to make it possible for him to return to the mainstream of institutional life. Provisions for assertiveness training, counseling in self-esteem, or classes in stress reduction might be helpful in at least some cases to assist the inmate to return to open population.

Encourage "Victim" Inmates to Defend Themselves. Clearly there are two schools of thought on this issue. There are not many correctional professionals who would survive

the practice of encouraging physical confrontation among inmates, but there are institutions where it is done. Staff in one facility in Oregon and another in New York tell vulnerable inmates that they should not let other inmates intimidate them -- even if it means that a fight cannot be avoided. They are encouraged to take a stand early in their prison careers to show that they will not let themselves become victims. It is important to note that this practice alone will not work. It must be combined with strict enforcement of rules and heavy penalties for inmates who would behave as predators.

Make Use of Sub-environments. Inmates who seem to be easy targets may be assisted in avoiding trouble by being assigned to work in areas where staff supervision is high. In institutions where single cell housing is provided, inmates often feel safe locked in their cells at night but are concerned about their well-being during the less supervised portion of the day. It may be possible to avoid one more statistic in the protective management unit by placing them in jobs or other assignments in areas where they are visible or under direct supervision.

Modify Use of Less Supervised Areas. Since close supervision can assist in preventing problems, it follows that areas not so well supervised could foster problems. If staffing patterns do not allow supervision of all areas at the same time, those that are more difficult to watch could be closed when staff members are not available. Research into what areas have been the most frequent sites of assaults will lend guidance in this effort.

Train Staff. As discussed earlier, training is an area of great importance. When staff do not act and react in a manner consistent with the philosophy of the institution or organization, all other factors will decrease in their effectiveness or be totally negated. One problem is the attitude of some staff toward the inmates involved in protective custody. Advanced training programs regarding professionalism and equal treatment of persons under supervision will help to change this attitude among staff who can influence other inmates to be more tolerant as well.

Counsel/Train Inmate Targets. Those professionals who have participated in or directed programs on self-defense are aware that those most likely to be attacked are those who present a certain image to the aggressors. Prison administrators might consider training programs designed to help weaker inmates learn methods to deal with stronger inmates in nonviolent ways.

Use Inmates to Help Other Inmates. Studies have shown that inmates who need protection are those who are not gregarious, have few associates among the population, and otherwise are not well connected. If they can be assisted by an inmate club or organization to adjust in the mainstream, their stay in protection, if necessary at all, would be shorter.

Don't Let Protective Custody Become Too Attractive. While administrators do not want to make the protective management unit a place where doing time is more difficult, efforts should be made to see that it is not a preferred place to be for any reason other

than that intended. A valid need for protection should be the factor uppermost in the inmate's mind when considering his alternatives.

### Progress in the Florida System

Now that researchers have helped set a course of action to improve the system of protective management, what action is being taken? While some of these suggestions are too complicated, expensive, or philosophically futuristic to be practical at this point, the Florida Department of Corrections and Martin Correctional Institution, specifically, are taking some steps toward more successful programs.

Review and discussion of four of the areas mentioned will provide information about some modifications which are being made.

Change Classification Procedures. Martin Correctional Institution handles virtually every type of inmate in the system. On the inmate's arrival, files are examined to determine the type of housing that would be most appropriate. If an inmate has a need for segregation, he is placed immediately on the south end of the compound separate from the open population. Inmates who have not yet crossed the line to one extreme or the other are placed in open population until behavior indicates a change is needed. The next step is to divide the open population inmates by their potential for being victims, aggressors or average inmates.

Control Activities Leading to Victimization. Inmates are provided the opportunity to purchase certain items in canteens with the profits going to such things as recreation, library supplies, or religious materials. A cashless canteen system which will allow elimination of all cash from the compound is on-line in some institutions and scheduled for all. Friends and family will continue to send money orders or bank checks to the inmates' bank accounts, but purchases will be handled by I.D./credit cards and computer systems. Although inmates will undoubtedly discover other methods of gambling, removal of cash will deter a great deal of the present activity.

Homosexual activity is another situation that frequently results in protection needs. Such activity in a prison most often leads to problems. When the administration is confronted by a homosexual partnership, the inmates are "special reviewed" against each other. This usually requires that they be housed at separate facilities, thereby reducing the need for special housing for either.

Train Staff. The Department of Corrections has adopted and made mandatory a training program on cultural, racial and gender diversity. It is designed to help staff realize, accept, and appreciate the differences among the people they deal with each day. If effective, this type of training will influence staff to realize that while inmates in protection may have somewhat different needs and philosophies, the officers' approach to them must be as professional and fair as with the mainstream inmates.

Don't Let Protective Custody Become Too Attractive. At Martin Correctional Institution, as at most other facilities, the protective management inmates were required to stay inside the housing units while other inmates were outside, restricting job assignments as well as other outdoor activity. To provide some type of activity, televisions were left

on the majority of the day, telephones were virtually always available, and most of the day was spent in entertaining types of activities. With the fencing of the yard came the opportunity to make that unit operate separately but more equally with the open compound. Television and telephone hours now match that of the open population, and more job assignments are available. Recreation equipment is also available, but hours are virtually the same as for the open compound. The protection inmates will soon be totally responsible for upkeep of the yard inside their fence, and they have recently begun to clear and cultivate a small area for a vegetable garden.

### Conclusion

Achieving a basic understanding of the current status of such protective management issues as inmate characteristics, the reasons they check in and why such a program is necessary in today's prison system, is only a first step at coping with the difficulties they present. The information contained in this report is an overview of the status of protective management based on existing literature and experience.

The fact that research in this complex area is comparatively limited suggests that further study is needed to formulate appropriate management techniques to effectively oversee the problems of protective management. While improvements can be made within the existing framework, ongoing examination of the current situation and forecasting are necessary to adequately plan for the future. Better understanding of the characteristics of protective management inmates, the reasons they give for checking in, and the reasons such a program is needed in today's prison system can lead to the reduction of the escalating need for protective management and to better ways of overseeing those who continue to need such assistance.

Dinah K. Poore began her career in law enforcement in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1962. After working in the related field of social work in Georgia and Alaska, she returned to the criminal justice system in 1976, and has been with the Florida Department of Corrections since that time. Currently Assistant Superintendent for Operations at Gulf Correctional Institution in Wewahitchka, Florida, Ms. Poore has extensive experience in all aspects of Corrections. She has a B.S. from Middle Tennessee State University and is a Certified Public Manager and a recent graduate of the Senior Leadership Program.

### References

Bender, D.L., & Leone, (1985). America's prisons: Opposing viewpoints. St. Paul, Mn: Greenhaven Press.

Buckingham Securities (date unknown). Protective custody alternative.

Correctional Service of Canada (1983). Commissioner's directive: Request for protection. Ottawa, ONT: internal document.

Florida Department of Corrections. Rule 33-3.0081. Tallahassee, Fla.

Florida Department of Corrections (1992). Profile of offenders in protective management. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Planning, Research & Statistics.

Henderson, J.D., & Phillips, R.L. (1990). Protective custody management in adult correctional facilities.

McGee, R.A., Warner, G., & Harlow, N. (1985). The special management inmate. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Corrections (1986). Protective custody: Data update and intervention considerations.

Tellier, M.C., Wormith, J.S., & Gendreau, P. (1984). Protective custody: The emerging crisis within the prison system. National Institute of Corrections.

Tellier, M.C., Wormith, J.S., & Gendreau, P. (1985). A comparison of protective custody and general population inmates in a provincial correctional centre. (Report No. 1985-11).

Toch, H. (1979). The ecology of survival: Living in prison. New York: Free Press.

Vantour, J.A. (1979). A proposal regarding protective custody in federal institutions. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada.