

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8315474

Laubach, Wilburt Kelly

**APPLICATION OF AMERICAN CORRECTIONS STANDARDS ON
ACADEMIC EDUCATION TO THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS EDUCATION SYSTEM, 1975-1981: A PILOT STUDY**

Michigan State University

PH.D. 1983

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

2

APPLICATION OF AMERICAN CORRECTIONS STANDARDS ON ACADEMIC
EDUCATION TO THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
EDUCATION SYSTEM, 1975-1981: A PILOT STUDY

By

Wilburt K. Laubach

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1983

ABSTRACT

APPLICATION OF AMERICAN CORRECTIONS STANDARDS ON ACADEMIC EDUCATION TO THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

By

Wilburt Kelly Laubach

The purpose of this study was to consider the American Correctional Association's standards as they relate to four questions:

1. How adequate are the American Correctional Association education standards as evaluative criteria for a corrections education program?
2. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the American Correctional Association education standards?
3. Are the four additional evaluative criteria reasonable/workable to augment the American Correctional Association criteria?
4. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the four additional evaluative criteria?

Data sources included both material and human resources. Corrections school principals and other Corrections Department administrators rated the American Correctional Association standards relative to the value of the standards as criteria with which to evaluate

a prison education program. The administrators also evaluated the corrections schools relative to compliance with the Correctional Association standards and the criteria developed from the literature. Michigan Department of Corrections policy directives, procedures, Director's Office memos, and administrative meeting minutes were reviewed to determine if authority has been provided for institution schools to comply with the standards.

As a result of the data analysis, it was concluded that the majority of American Correctional Association standards are considered adequate criteria with which to evaluate the Michigan Department of Corrections education programs. A small percentage of the standards are believed to be inadequate criteria with which to evaluate a corrections education program in Michigan prisons. They include criteria dealing with educational programs at a time when the majority of inmates can attend school, the comparison of corrections school personnel policies to local public schools, and the use of community resources to develop educational programs for selected students.

Although the data indicate that the Department of Corrections can meet the majority of the standards, the combination of those standards judged as not being adequate criteria with which to evaluate a corrections education program and those for which the data were not conclusive presents a rather high percentage of standards with which compliance is currently doubtful.

This work is dedicated to my wife, Beth, and daughters,
Kathy, Connie, and Cindie, who shared my goal and many times went
without in order for us to obtain it.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A doctoral committee that is a source of inspiration, information, and continual support is indeed a pleasure with which to work.

For Dr. Peggy Riethmiller, the chairperson of my committee, who guided me to the realization of a lifetime dream, I have the greatest admiration and respect but do not possess the vocabulary to express my gratitude sufficiently.

To Drs. Bader, Blackman, Buschman, and Suehr, my deep appreciation is expressed. Their role as teachers and advisors will always be remembered.

The most praise and gratitude must go to my wife, Beth, whose never-ending support, encouragement, and confidence kept me going when I felt that I could not write another page.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Background of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	8
Importance of the Study	9
Design of the Study	10
Limitations of the Study	14
Organization of the Study	14
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
Corrections Education in Michigan--A Brief History . .	16
Changes That Have Taken Place in Prison Education	
in Recent Years	28
Certified School Staff	33
Federal Funding for the Education of Adult Offenders .	38
Academic Education and Educational Technology	41
Summary	47
The Components of Evaluative Criteria for Education	
Programs in General	49
Summary	56
Chapter Summary	57
III. PROCEDURES	59
Sources of Data	59
Procedures for Data Collection	59
Data From Human Resources: Michigan Department of	
Corrections Administrators	60
Data From Material Resources	62
Procedures for Analysis of Data	63
Chapter Summary	65
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	67
Review of Corrections Education in Michigan, 1975-1981.	67
First Priority: Basic Education	68
Second Priority: Vocational Training	68

	Page
Third Priority: Pre-GED Preparation	69
Fourth Priority: GED Program	69
Fifth Priority: Life-Role Competency Skills	69
Presentation of Data Related to the Research Questions .	71
Research Question 1	72
Research Question 2	79
Research Question 3	97
Research Question 4	103
Summary	106
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	111
Summary of the Study	111
Conclusions	114
Recommendations	116
Suggestions for Further Study	118
Reflections	118
Concluding Statement	121
BIBLIOGRAPHY	122

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of Educational Levels of the General Population and Prisoners	4
2. Enrollment in Education by Class or Program Distribution: January 1931	25
3. Corrections Schools Principals' Ratings of American Correctional Association Standards on Education	73
4. Principals' Ratings of American Correctional Association Standards on Education According to Low, Neutral, or High Value	75
5. American Correctional Association Standards Most Frequently Chosen by Principals as Having the Highest Value as Evaluative Criteria	76
6. American Correctional Association Standards Most Frequently Chosen by Principals as Having the Least Value as Evaluative Criteria	77
7. Department of Corrections Education Consultants' Ratings of How Well They Believe the Michigan Department of Corrections Schools Are in Compliance With the American Correctional Association Standards on Education	81
8. American Correctional Association Standards Rated by Corrections Department Education Consultants as Having Low Compliance by Corrections Schools	82
9. American Correctional Association Standards Receiving Neutral or Undecided Ratings by Corrections Department Education Consultants in Terms of Compliance by Corrections Schools	83
10. American Correctional Association Standards Rated by Corrections Department Education Consultants as Having High Compliance by Corrections Schools	84
11. Corrections Department Education Consultants' Ratings of the Value of Criteria for Evaluating a Corrections Education Program	102

	Page
12. Comparison of Corrections School Principals' Ratings of the Value of the American Correctional Association Standards as Criteria With Which to Evaluate a Prison Education Program With Central Office Education Consultants' Ratings of How Well the Corrections Schools Are Meeting the Standards	108
13. Summary of Data Indicating Adequacy of Compliance With American Correctional Association Standards and Additional Criteria	115

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

I don't think you have to prove that education is good. It has intrinsic value. I am persuaded that education changes people. . . . Every inmate should . . . get as much education as his mentality can absorb.¹

Background of the Problem

The role of prisons in American society has been the focus of controversy for many years. Some individuals assert that prisons are for punishment and that all convicted felons should be locked up and confined to solitary conditions and hard labor. Others emphasize treatment and rehabilitation of those people who are sent to federal and state prisons. Conrad stated: "The conflict begins with the gap between the philosophy of repressive control that too often characterizes the custodial personnel, and the belief in the importance of restorative programs."²

The conflicting philosophies or beliefs concerning treatment versus custody are not easy issues for the public or prison officials to resolve, as Conrad emphasized:

¹John P. Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, Monograph prepared for the National Institute of Justice (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, March 1981), p. 33; quoting George Beto, The Houston Post, December 29, 1979, p. 27C.

²Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 7.

No matter how concerned the warden or superintendent may be about the quality of the educational program to be provided, his first responsibility is the secure custody of the institution. This inescapable priority applies to everyone working on the reservation (including teachers), and all other activities within the prison are subordinate in importance. In the best of circumstances, the prison is not an educational institution; it is an institution to which offenders are sent as punishment. Recognition of this priority should not needlessly obstruct the many secondary programs a prison must administer. It is one thing to declare that the security of the institution has the first claim on the attention of all employees; it is quite another to act as though nothing else matters.¹

The conflicting corrections philosophies are most often evidenced in times of prison uprisings. All too frequently, institution heads who defend the notion that all programs must be stopped indefinitely for security reasons voice their opinion that educational programs really do not matter.

These conflicting philosophies and the many other problems confronting the correctional educator make corrections education a difficult arena in which to work. The educator must face certain realities, however, no matter how idealistic he/she may be. Reagan and Stoughton stated:

The penal facility and its custodial staff, no matter how modern and progressive, tend in too many instances to present a physical and psycho-social setting which is, by itself, not conducive to the educational process. The educator must strive to counteract this while developing a feeling of trust from the corrections world, both staff and inmates. At the same time, he must bear in mind that confinement, as unproductive as it is, is a reality and cannot be abandoned until a better alternative is developed.²

¹ Ibid.

² Michael V. Reagan and Donald M. Stoughton, eds., School Behind Bars (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1976), p. 18.

Even in environments in which corrections beliefs and practices are compatible, the correctional educator still frequently encounters other major roadblocks to success. In their evaluation of correctional education programs for inmates, Bell and his associates asserted that "the most crucial obstacles to achieving a successful educational program are administrative shortsightedness, indifference and neglect."¹

Historically, corrections education as a major part of the rehabilitative effort has been a difficult area of endeavor. It has not been uncommon for untrained individuals to attempt to provide educational leadership in corrections schools. In the early history of education in prisons, the responsibility for educational programs was delegated to the chaplain or an interested guard. All too frequently, the task of instructing the illiterate prisoners was delegated to other prisoners. The goals of the education programs in the early history of education in corrections were to teach illiterate prisoners to read the Bible and to work simple arithmetic problems.

In recent years, many improvements have been made in correctional education nationally, but many prisoners are still leaving prison no better equipped to take their place in society than they were at the time of incarceration. Prisoners still need much more education. The 1967 Task Force on Crime reported that education is a

¹Raymond Bell et al., National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, Correctional Education Programs for Inmates, National Evaluation Programs, Phase I (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1979).

good barometer of the likelihood of success in modern America.¹ That is, the more formal education prisoners receive, the greater their chances of being successful, law-abiding people after serving their terms.

According to the Task Force, 1960 Census data revealed that more than half of adult felony inmates aged 25 to 64 had had no high school education. Table 1 shows a comparison of the educational levels of prisoners and the general population.

Table 1.--Comparison of educational levels of the general population and prisoners.

Years of School Completed ^a		General Population (Percent)	Inmate Population (Percent)
College:	4 years or more	8.4	1.1
	1 to 3 years	9.4	4.2
High school:	4 years	27.5	12.4
	1 to 3 years	20.7	27.6
Elementary:	5 to 8 years	28.0	40.3
	4 years to none	6.0	14.4

Source: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 2.

^aBy persons aged 25-64.

Ryan provided further argument for the need to educate prisoners:

¹The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 2.

Every ten years the census lists characteristics of persons in custodial institutions including federal and state prisons, jails, and work houses. The latest tabulation shows the median years of school completed by state and federal prisoners to be 8.6 years.

Justice Burger comments that "we are paying a terrible price in crime, in part because we have tended . . . to regard all criminals as human rubbish. It would make more sense, from a coldly logical viewpoint, to put all this 'rubbish' into a vast incinerator than simply to warehouse it for a time, only to have most of the subjects come out and return to their old ways." What tools might be used to combat this tragic waste of human resources? Chief Justice Burger believes the best hope lies in swift determination of guilt, comprehensive study of each human being involved, intensive rehabilitation, and especially, education and vocational training. [*Italics mine.*]¹

The truly professional corrections educator who is committed to the same ideals expressed by Justice Burger finds himself in a frustrating world of contradiction. The professional hears and reads criticisms of corrections education and knows what needs to be done, but because of various institutional constraints, including colleagues, he is unable to achieve a designated quality of program. Nationally, corrections education has been plagued with poor educational management, unqualified teachers, inappropriate curriculum, and inadequate funding.

MacCormick and Marsh and Adams concluded that one of the major problems with corrections education has been that corrections has not developed a philosophy of education or a set of goals and purposes.²

¹T. A. Ryan, Goals of Adult Basic Education for Corrections (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1976), p. 5.

²Austin H. MacCormick, The Education of Adult Offenders (New York: National Society of Penal Reformation, 1931), p. iv; John Marsh and Stuart N. Adams, "Prison Education Tomorrow," in School Behind Bars, ed. Michael V. Reagen and Donald M. Stoughton (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1976), p. 14.

Marsh and Adams wrote:

The goals and purpose of correctional education are at present vague, inadequate, and somewhat defensive. Correctional education speaks not with a single voice. In fact, the most vocal elements are persons not working in education in penal systems but in other agencies.¹

They observed that "the Correctional Education Association has yet to state a goal, a purpose, or a philosophy for correctional education."²

Marsh and Adams believed that:

Philosophically the role of correctional education is to:

- a. Function as an agent of change for both the inmate and the system.
- b. Maintain its integrity in terms of its basic commitment to freedom of inquiry, and
- c. Study, evaluate and respond to all variables in the individual, the system and society that are to be benefited by the educational concerns with process, product and social reforms.³

Reagen and Stoughton expressed concern about the lack of evaluation of correctional education programs:

Whatever the reason, it is clear that there is a dearth of evaluative research on the correctional educational process. In a field where there are literally hundreds of studies of the effectiveness of individual and group counseling, of the effects of psychotherapy or other treatment procedures, of the effects of different sized parole or probation caseloads, of the effects of different kinds of treatment environments or settings, it seems remarkable that there are so few studies of the effects of correctional education.⁴

Conrad's concern with the evaluation of prison education programs related to the differing emphases among researchers:

Researchers are at odds about the use of recidivism rates for measuring the effectiveness of education programs. One school of research argues that the only real evaluation of

¹Ibid., p. 27. ²Ibid. ³Ibid., p. 15.

⁴Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 93.

success is impact on recidivism rate, while the other maintains that any attempt to connect educational success to recidivism is unrealistic.

For many correctional administrators, evaluation has been a process by which score is kept, thereby justifying programs in terms of released offenders who do not commit crimes when returned to the community. While this naive approach to evaluation is understandable, the true usefulness of evaluation is in the planning process as a whole. When an administrator knows how many functional illiterates completed Adult Basic Education out of a total number of such prisoners in his charge, he has a basis for planning improvements in the program. That is a much more valuable piece of information than a count of the recidivists produced by the educational program two or three years after the end of their exposure to learning. Little or nothing can be accomplished with the latter data, in spite of attempts by simplistic statisticians to prove that unless recidivism is reduced significantly each year, the program under study should be terminated.

Any programmed effort must be sustained by positive results. An educational program that does not educate is readily seen for what it is and should be replaced. Success in correctional education will seldom be manifest in dramatic results; the human material is too often damaged, the deficiencies are too great to be remedied in a few years in the discouraging environment of a state prison. Objectives should be modestly and realistically stated. Their achievement must be in terms of immediate results.¹

The lack of evaluation of corrections education is, according to Bell and his associates, "the single most important issue to be considered in bringing correctional education to its potential value to prisoners."² They continued, "The lack of any rigorous and systematic evaluation is probably due to many reasons. Four of the 11 reasons they cited that are most relevant to the present study are as follows:

¹Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 11.

²Bell et al., as quoted in Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 10.

1. The lack of measurable objectives.
2. The lack of any mandate to conduct such evaluations by funding agencies.
3. The lack of research and measurement expertise in the system.
4. The lack of interest by many researchers or investigators because of the lack of funds and the low priority of correctional education in the total research spectrum.¹

In recent years, state corrections departments appear to have been placing emphasis on seeking accreditation from the American Correctional Association. This national association has recently developed a set of standards relating to almost every aspect of corrections, including the care and handling of prisoners. This investigator was concerned with examining the American Correctional Association standards on correctional education to determine whether the Correctional Association's standards are adequate criteria with which to evaluate a corrections education program.

Purpose of the Study

Since 1974, many changes have taken place in the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs. However, there has been no systematic effort to evaluate the changes that have taken place during the past several years or to provide direction for the future of corrections education in Michigan.

¹Ibid., pp. 10-11.

It is now the goal of the Michigan Department of Corrections to become accredited by the American Correctional Association by coming into compliance with the Correctional Association standards. The purpose of this writer was to consider the American Correctional Association education standards in terms of the following four research questions:

1. How adequate are the American Correctional Association education standards as evaluative criteria for a corrections education program?
2. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the American Correctional Association education standards?
3. Are the four additional evaluative criteria reasonable/workable to augment the American Correctional Association criteria?
4. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the four additional evaluative criteria?

Importance of the Study

Assessment and evaluation of movement toward an acceptable set of standards is a process by which an educational institution continues to grow toward providing maximal effective service to its students and society. It would seem, therefore, that the importance of this study is related to the following points:

1. This study is a pilot study in the application of the recently revised American Correctional Association standards for

corrections education. The writer attempts to answer the questions about the comprehensiveness and usability of the criteria. Recommendations are made for the modification of these standards so that they can be a more valid measurement of the quality of a state's corrections education system.

2. There is a need to provide specific information to the respective policy makers of the Michigan Department of Corrections concerning the compliance of that department's educational program with nationally accepted standards of corrections education.

3. Such information will help the central office education staff of the Corrections Department by providing them with guidelines that are useful in assessing corrections education programs during state-required bi-annual assessments of all of the Michigan Department of Corrections' educational programs.

4. This study provides guidelines to corrections-institution school administrators by giving direction for program growth toward the Department of Corrections' educational goals. In addition, it provides an indicator for school administrators concerning the compliance of their programs with state and national goals and standards.

Design of the Study

In January 1981, the American Correctional Association, in cooperation with the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, through a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice, issued the second edition of

a set of standards for adult correctional institutions.¹ Some of these criteria were earmarked for academic and vocational education. These standards are accepted by American correctional officials as the guiding criteria for the development and evaluation of institutional academic and vocational programs. Accreditation by the American Correctional Association is based on these standards.

The investigator focused on the American Correctional Association standards as they relate to academic education in corrections and on any additional evaluative criteria in the education literature that would be useful in evaluating a corrections education program.

The American Correctional Association has developed 20 standards with which to evaluate prison educational programs. Of the 20 standards, 18 were considered in this study. These standards, along with the additional supporting evaluative criteria, were used to evaluate the educational programs of the Michigan Department of Corrections.²

The 18 American Correctional Association standards considered in this study are listed below:

- 2-4422 - There is a comprehensive education program available to all eligible inmates that extends from literacy training through high school and includes communication skills, mathematics, and social science.

¹American Correctional Association, Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions, 2nd ed. (College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, January 1981), pp. 109-12.

²See the limitations of the study relating to vocational and postsecondary education.

- 2-4423 - The academic education programs are accredited by the state department of education or a recognized accreditation association. Programs up to the completion of high school and/or GED are available at no cost to inmates.
- 2-4424 - There is a standardized competency-based curriculum supported by appropriate materials and classroom resources.
- 2-4425 - There is a system for ensuring that the academic education programs continue to meet the needs of the inmate population.
- 2-4426 - Some educational programs are provided at a time when the majority of inmates can take advantage of the opportunity.
- 2-4427 - There is a systematic approach to determine the personnel requirements for the academic programs to ensure all inmates access to staff and services.
- 2-4428 - All academic education personnel are certified by a state department of education or other comparable authority.
- 2-4429 - Academic personnel policies and practices are comparable to local jurisdictions or other appropriate jurisdictions.
- 2-4430 - Salary and benefits for academic personnel are at least the same as state minimums for teachers performing comparable work.
- 2-4431 - The educational program is supported by specialized equipment, including, at a minimum, classrooms, teaching carrels, audiovisual materials and facilities, chalkboards, and administrative space.
- 2-4432 - The institutional staff and/or parent agency conducts an annual evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the academic education program against stated performance objectives.
- 2-4433 - There is a system whereby the academic programs are assessed against stated objectives by qualified individuals, professional groups, and trade associations; this assessment is done at least every three years.
- 2-4434 - Academic counseling is provided so that inmates are placed in that phase of the educational program suited to their needs and abilities.

- 2-4435 - The educational program allows for flexible scheduling that permits inmates to enter at any time and to proceed at their own learning pace.
- 2-4437 - The institution uses community resources in developing academic programs for selected inmates.
- 2-4438 - The educational program in coordination with other institutional services provides instruction in functional social skills.
- 2-4440 - Written policy and procedures govern the maintenance and handling of educational records.
- 2-4441 - Provision is made for formal recognition of specific educational accomplishments.¹

The major sources of data that were studied and analyzed with regard to the research questions were the following:

1. Library-housed materials, including Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) holdings and documents published by the various correctional associations.
2. Reports and publications of the United States government and the United States Bureau of Prisons and studies completed by the corrections agencies of other states.
3. Literature pertaining to the evaluation of education programs that are similar to correctional education programs.
4. Data from human resources in the corrections field.
5. The Michigan Department of Corrections' policy directives, procedures, and Director's Office memos pertaining to the department's educational programs.

¹American Correctional Association, Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions, pp. 109-12.

Limitations of the Study

The evaluative criteria were used only for the study of the corrections school academic programs. The vocational program of the Michigan Department of Corrections was excluded from the study.

The environment of correctional institutions is unstable. The movement of prisoner/students and educational personnel and such phenomena as riots are ever-present realities and potentialities affecting corrections education. Aspects of the educational programs studied may have been affected by these and other conditions.

Community college programs, which are available in all Michigan correctional institutions, were not dealt with in this study. Also, other outside state and federal program influences like special education, adult basic education, and Title I ESEA were not identified separately.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I comprised the background of the study, which included a brief review of corrections in general; the purpose, importance, and basic design of the study; and the limitations of the study. Chapter II includes a brief history of corrections education in Michigan to 1975, a review of the literature concerning changes that have recently taken place in corrections education, and a review of the important criteria that are being used to evaluate educational programs in general. The procedures employed in the study are presented in Chapter III. Included are the sources of data and the procedures for data collection and data analysis. Chapter IV contains

a brief overview of corrections education in Michigan from 1975 to 1981, a presentation of data related to the four research questions, and an overall review of the data collected on the research questions. The summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further study are contained in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The process of change within the field of corrections education and in education in general is the focus of this chapter. Emphasis is placed on the following three areas, which are of major importance to this study:

1. The history of corrections education in Michigan to 1975,
2. The changes that have recently taken place in prison education, and
3. The components of evaluative criteria for education programs in general.

Corrections Education in Michigan--A Brief History

Roberts wrote:

The decade of the 1870's marks the culmination of the gradual transition in correction education from basic reading and writing to an organized system of formal academic vocational and social education with solid underlying principles. Brockway, the first warden in the Elmira [New York State Prison System] Reformatory, developed an industrial program at the Detroit House of Corrections in 1861. Though some two-thirds of the inmates were involved in the school program, this was undoubtedly an exception to a national pattern in 1870, in which only 8,000 of some 20,000 illiterate prisoners were receiving some form of instruction.¹

¹Albert R. Roberts, Sourcebook on Prison Education (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971), p. 6.

Reagen and Stoughton observed that a descriptive overview of correctional education in the United States does not exist.¹ Their observation is especially true in Michigan. Authority for the historical documentation in this dissertation was derived primarily from Michigan annual and biennial reports and from occasional unpublished papers. The writer drew heavily on an unpublished paper written by Michael Auer in 1966.²

The impetus for introducing an educational program at the State Prison of Southern Michigan in Jackson, Michigan, was the same as that which led to the establishment of schools in early New England. In 1846, the Michigan legislature enacted a bill that decreed:

The agent shall furnish at the expense of the State, a Bible to each of the convicts who can read, and such convicts as cannot read, he shall cause to be instructed in the principles of reading, writing, and arithmetic.³

In 1858, Chaplain Crawford reported that "we have two Bible classes, and of the students the balance are engaged in reading and spelling, with one class in arithmetic."⁴ Classes were held for one hour on Sunday mornings. Eventually, inmate instructors replaced freemen who had volunteered to teach but who were deemed undependable.

¹Michael V. Reagen and Donald M. Stoughton, eds., School Behind Bars (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1976), p. xii.

²Michael Auer, "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan: The Little Brick School House, 1949-1966" (unpublished term paper, July 1966).

³Michigan Revised Statutes of 1846, Chapter 172, Section 50, p. 47.

⁴Michigan, Annual Report of the Inspectors of the State Prison, 1858, p. 78.

According to Auer, a committee of the Board of Commissioners of Charitable, Penal, Pauper, and Reformatory Institutions declared in 1874 that a Sabbath school meeting one hour each Sunday was considered inadequate to guarantee that the released inmates would be reformed.¹ The committee report stated:

If our prison system is in any sense a failure, it is not because it fails to punish criminals, but because it fails to reform them. If reformation is to be accomplished, it must be done largely through the instrumentality of that education that forms the common mind and fits it for the duties of life. It is useless, therefore, to hope for the most successful results from prison discipline, so long as this important agency is so much neglected.²

In an attempt to remedy the situation, the Committee suggested hiring a full-time teacher. No reforms were initiated, however. Chaplain Hickox stated in his report to the warden that improvements were necessary. The enrollment of scholars who met for one hour each Sunday morning continued to decline. In 1879, Chaplain Hickox requested that an evening school be established, "leaving exclusively the school of Lord's day morning to the undivided attention of the Lord."³ It appears that school attendance was compulsory, but only at night--after a hard day's work.

In the early 1870s, the school was under the jurisdiction of the prison chaplain, George Hickox. The reports of John Purves, the

¹Auer, "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan," p. 3.

²Michigan, Biennial Report of the Board of the State Commissioners of Charitable, Penal, Pauper, and Reformatory Institutions for the Two Years Ending June 30, 1874.

³Michigan, Annual Report of the Inspectors of the State Prison, 1879, p. 116.

nightkeeper, to the chaplain, and it is apparent that these two were not the best of friends. The following two quotations from Captain Purves indicate how serious the prison administration was about illiterates attending school.

June 29--I report No. 255, Fitch for refusing to attend school. He is determined not to go, but I believe a touch of the "bat"¹ might change his mind in this regard. For a man who can neither read nor write he is singularly obstinate. James Curtis, Cass County, was brought in at 11 p.m. Crime of murder in the second degree, sentence 15 years. He was here before and had threatened to kill the very man whom he has now done away with. The Sheriff said he could not understand how Curtis was able to get lighter time than natural life for a cold-blooded, premeditated murder.²

In a similar incident of a convict's refusal to attend school, another type of punishment was administered:

September 30--Mascivell is still his old defiant self despite a bit of "treatment." When I took him down from hanging by his handcuffed wrists last evening he growled, "I'll hang here till hell freezes over and my arms are ten feet long before I'll agree to attend your screwy school." This convict is determined to remain uneducated, and is the most stubborn and rebellious man I have encountered in a long time. He wants no part of our attempts to bring him intellectual aid. It is apparent that the recalcitrant rebel does not hunger for the other things of life. Incidentally, Carey was quiet all night. He's been whooping it up so much lately that he grew steadily more hoarse, and he must be resting up his pipes for a new outburst in the very immediate future.³

State historical records reveal that in 1880 the school was taken out of the chaplain's office, where it had been for 35 years, and was placed under the leadership of a certified teacher.⁴

¹The "bat" was a leather strap that was applied to the bare back.

²John H. Purves, The Nightkeeper's Report (Jackson: The State Prison of Southern Michigan, 1977), p. 16.

³Ibid., p. 46.

⁴Michigan Department of Corrections, The Michigan State Prison, 1837-1928, p. 7.

According to the report, with the addition of the teacher, assisted by prison guards, the number of courses was increased over the number that had been available in previous years.

According to Auer, the course of instruction covered three years of six terms each as follows:

- First Year: Reading, spelling, geography, writing, arithmetic through functions.
- Second Year: United States history, spelling, grammar, geography, bookkeeping, civil government, natural philosophy.
- Third Year: Philosophy, hygiene, civil government, natural philosophy,¹ bookkeeping, geography, mental or moral philosophy.

Classes met for three hours each evening; however, the warden noted in 1881 that the upper-level classes met but once every two weeks. The reason, according to the warden, was lack of space.²

During the years that followed, the school curriculum seemed to be more concerned with discipline and making good prisoners than it was with making good citizens.³ The reports of the Michigan State Conference of the Charities and Corrections for 1883 through 1887 contain only an occasional reference to education.

J. J. Wheeler, a speaker at the 1883 Conference, proposed:

The true reformation of a criminal is largely dependent upon a discipline that will make him self-controlling and self-reliant.

¹Auer, "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan," p. 4.

²Michigan, Annual Report of the Inspection of the State Prison, 1881, p. 12.

³Ibid.

Hard work, kind treatment, and strict discipline will do more to reform than any other method now in vogue.¹

Education seems to have occupied a minor role in the prison in the late 1800s. Auer wrote:

In 1885, H. F. Hutch was made warden of the Jackson Prison and began a policy of reform penology. Urging the necessity of education, he advocated a system of education "of a character to teach the criminal how to live and perform the duties of a citizen."²

In the introduction of The Nightkeeper's Report, Purves stated that Warden Hutch "was generally looked upon as the man who fathered modern penology in Michigan, and has been often referred to as the 'Reform Warden.'"³ Purves wrote:

December 13--I talked with the new schoolmaster last night and he tells me that your education plans are quite a success, and that the ignorant and poorly educated are eager to grasp this opportunity to gain knowledge. There are a good many here, who, if they had had proper schooling, would never have turned to crime. Hannibal "the Bear" is a good example of what I mean. He is just a big, dumb ape who acts like normal children do; the only thing he knows is his strength, and I don't think he realizes the full extent of that. He has a sort of animal loyalty to almost anyone who is kind and friendly to him. Schooling can be a big help to this type of convict.⁴

Auer observed that, in the late 1890s, interest in school began to disintegrate.⁵ The subject matter, listed earlier, did not appear to meet the needs of the convicts/students. Prisoner

¹Michigan, Michigan State Conference of the Charities and Corrections, 1883, p. 62.

²Auer, "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan," p. 8.

³Purves, The Nightkeeper's Report, p. 6.

⁴Ibid., p. 96.

⁵Auer, "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan," p. 9.

instructors were once again introduced into school programs to assist the guards; furthermore, neither prisoner instructors nor the guards whom they were assisting were likely to have received training in the art of pedagogy. Auer wrote, "The school, then, seems to have been hamstrung by a traditional curriculum presented during an abbreviated school year by teachers of dubious confidence."¹

The salaries reported by the schoolmaster for the 1897 were: Warden Chamberlain, \$2,000; Chaplain Hickox, \$1,000; and H. N. Thompson, Superintendent of Schools, \$800. The same wages were paid to the guards and keepers.²

The years following 1900 were probably the dark ages for education at Jackson Prison. The reports of the Board of Control and Officers for 1904 through 1908 contain no reference to course offerings;³ since references were made in earlier and in later reports of this board, it is possible that education was given an even lower priority than it had been in earlier years.

At any rate, according to Auer, the school had made very little progress since 1897.

During 1909 and 1910, the school met for 128 sessions during ten and one-half of the twenty-four months. This is equivalent to twenty-one six-hour days per year. In 1897, the school had met for the equivalent of twenty-five days.⁴

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 10.

³Michigan, Biennial Report of the Board of Control and Officers of the Michigan State Prison, June 30, 1904-1908.

⁴Auer, "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan," p. 11.

The report of the Board of Control and Officers for 1915-16 was optimistic about the academic school, for the school had been reorganized under the supervision of the Michigan Department of Education.¹ A graduate of the prison school was able to earn "a diploma entitling him to the same consideration as credits granted by any other school."²

In 1913-14, a new attendance ruling was initiated, which required all men to attend school except those who had completed a common-school education, who had passed their fiftieth birthday, or who were excused by the physician or by the superintendent.³ The new ruling elevated the educational-attainment level to the completion of a high-school diploma.

In addition to the new attendance requirement, the school sessions were increased to two hours nightly for six nights per week for 40 weeks. This was a significant increase over the hours per week and the number of weeks per year that were cited earlier.

The statistics on the number of years of schooling completed by the prisoners before incarceration revealed that only 210 men out of a prison population of 3,500 were capable of working at the high-school level. Seventy percent of the prisoners were at or below the third-grade level.

¹Michigan, Biennial Report of the Board of Control and Officers of the Michigan State Prison, 1915-16, p. 26.

²Auer, "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan," p. 12.

³Michigan, Biennial Report of the Board of Control and Officers of the Michigan State Prison, 1915-16, p. 26.

There is no evidence of educational programs in the annual reports for the years 1916 to 1930. It is doubtful that educational programs did not exist, but the authorities' lack of interest in such programs is apparent. In 1930, MacCormick observed, "No education programs presently exist in the Marquette Branch Prison and the Michigan Reformatory in Ionia, Michigan. The only education program for prisoners in Michigan is at the State Prison of Southern Michigan."¹

The enrollment by class or program distribution in January 1931 is shown in Table 2. From this table, two noteworthy points can be observed. First, 1,061 men or 83 percent of those enrolled in school were at or below the sixth-grade level. Second, although some men were enrolled in University of Michigan correspondence courses, the high-school program had apparently disappeared. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, a major change in the State Prison of Southern Michigan in Jackson was taking place.

The current State Prison in Jackson was constructed in stages between 1928 and 1952. In comparison to the old prison, the new institution provides ample space for the educational programs.

In 1940, MacCormick commented that the Jackson Prison should undoubtedly be ranked among the best in the country on several points.² Commenting on the school program, he wrote:

¹Austin H. MacCormick, The Education of Adult Offenders (New York: National Society of Penal Reformation, 1931), p. 96.

²Austin H. MacCormick, Survey of Michigan Penal Institutions (New York: The Osborne Association, Inc., 1940), p. 7.

The educational program is extensive and varied with excellent classrooms, a staff of well trained directors and a variety of courses in which over 800 men are enrolled on a full-time basis with several hundred others taking extension courses.¹

MacCormick observed that the Michigan Branch Prison in Marquette and the Michigan Reformatory, "the only other prisons in the state, have mediocre education programs."²

Table 2.--Enrollment in education program by class or program distribution: January 1931.

Class	Size
Primer	70
1	40
2	98
3	201
4	200
5	302
6	150
7	41
8	27
9	14
Arts	10
Commercial	30
University of Michigan English ^a	42
University of Michigan mathematics ^a	18
Other correspondence ^a	35
Total	1,278

Source: Michigan State Prison, Statistical Reports, 1931.

^aUniversity courses are through correspondence.

The available literature did not reveal any significant changes in Michigan prisons or prison education until the mid-1950s, when a new medium-security institution for youthful offenders was

¹Ibid., pp. 4-5.

²Ibid., p. 8.

opened. This institution, the Michigan Training Unit, was to be Michigan's showpiece. It was designed to be a prison high school and was the first school in the Michigan Department of Corrections to employ a principal and certified teachers to teach in all classrooms. The total school staff, including the principal and a school secretary, numbered 32.

When the Michigan Training Unit was opened, the combined educational staff of Michigan's five other institutions numbered approximately 23 teachers and school supervisors. The role of the majority of this staff was to train inmates to instruct less-educated inmates. In 1956, the total educational certified staff in the school at the State Prison of Southern Michigan comprised the school supervisor, one elementary-school teacher, and a high-school teacher. Prisoners were trained to teach classes that ranged from reading for illiterates through high-school completion.

Roberts expressed the opinion that the decade from 1961 to 1971 reflected the beginning of more effective and innovative educational programs in corrections institutions.¹ This was certainly true for corrections education in Michigan. The decade from 1961 to 1971 saw some impressive and significant changes in prison education in Michigan.

The Michigan legislature removed the upper age limit of 21 years for students who were eligible to be counted for state aid. This decision was a boon to adult education in Michigan and, more

¹Roberts, Sourcebook on Prison Education, p. 23.

specifically, to corrections education. Prisoners/students who were being taught by certified teachers could be counted for state aid in the same way that students in the public schools were counted for this purpose. The funds generated were used to employ additional school staff and to purchase more adult-oriented teaching materials and supplies. The funds generated from state aid were passed through the public schools that were close to the prisons; consequently, the teachers who were employed to work in the prisons were contracted by cooperating public schools.

In the late 1960s, the Michigan legislature ruled that the state aid funds would be paid directly to the Michigan Department of Corrections. Thus, for the first time in the history of penal education in Michigan prisons, schools enjoyed adequate funds, had their own budgets, and were fully staffed with certified teachers.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, six correctional institutions were operating in Michigan. As stated earlier, each of the prisons provided educational programs for the prisoners; however, the schools were autonomous, and consequently the curriculum and the teaching methods and materials were left primarily to the discretion of the individual teachers and the school principals. As the number of prisoners and institutions increased, it was apparent to the administrative leaders of the Michigan Department of Corrections that if the Department was to improve the quality of education for prisoners and to provide continuity in programming for those prisoners who were transferred between institutions, it would be necessary to coordinate the efforts of the Department's schools.

To help accomplish this goal, a Director of Education was appointed in 1974. It became his responsibility to work with prison school administrators to develop a coordinated prison school curriculum that would be individualized and could provide for an open entry/open exit delivery system. This major change in the educational philosophy of the Michigan Department of Corrections created a shift from the lock step, high-school-diploma-oriented classes to a completely individualized, self-paced high-school-equivalency program.

Changes That Have Taken Place in Prison Education in Recent Years

A review of the literature revealed that very little research and evaluation on corrections education has been done. An analysis of the literature by the Syracuse University Research Corporation staff in 1973 suggested that "a sizable variety of programs, projects and courses are underway in a number of penal institutions, which have not been publicized."¹

Reagen and Stoughton added that a descriptive overview of correctional education in the United States did not exist. They found, for example, that between 1940 and 1968 only six doctoral dissertations focused on the subject of correctional education.²

In 1927, MacCormick was commissioned to write an overview of corrections education, but after visiting several prisons, he decided to develop a model for corrections education. He explained:

¹Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. xii.

²Ibid.

It would be possible, within the compass of a brief volume, to record what is now being done in penal institutions, how existing educational work can be made more effective without any substantial increase in appropriations, and how the present low aim can be achieved a little more successfully. The writer does not believe this to be worth doing. He has consciously and deliberately set an aim higher than any penal institution can achieve with present appropriations and present personnel. The attempt has been made to formulate a complete and well-rounded program of education such as no penal institution can put in effect until it receives more substantial support from legislators and administrative officials. Without trained personnel this program can never be put in effect.¹

MacCormick concluded that prison education has failed for many reasons, but the chief reason for failure is lack of funds.² In spite of MacCormick's observation and possible lack of despair concerning the poor performance of corrections education, Roberts stated that the year 1929 has been considered the beginning of the modern trend in prison education. He wrote:

The year 1929 has been selected by some criminologists as the date of the beginning of the modern trend in correctional education, and efforts made prior to this time are viewed as scarcely worth mentioning, except possibly for the reformatory developments. This period in history has been appraised by many criminologists as the point at which education began to be recognized and developed as an essential element in a program of correctional treatment.³

However, according to Roberts, the decade from 1961 to 1971 marked the beginning of more effective and innovative programs in corrections education.⁴

¹MacCormick, The Education of Adult Offenders, p. xi.

²Ibid., p. 10.

³Roberts, Sourcebook on Prison Education, p. 6.

⁴Ibid.

More recent authors have agreed with MacCormick that a lack of funding is the single greatest deterrent to the success of corrections education programs. Ryan wrote that a major incentive to corrections education was the 1966 legislation that provided funds for Adult Basic Education programs, including those in corrections (Public Law 89-750, 1966).¹ Ryan stated,

Never before in the history of corrections has there been such an opportunity for positive change, and a change for continuing improvement. The climate today, inside and outside the criminal justice system, supports the idea of change.²

Ryan's optimistic attitude, which identified the 1970s as a time for positive change in corrections education, paralleled McPherson's statement about the challenges of the 70s. He wrote:

Educators of the 70's have opportunities and challenges that are unprecedented in history. The climate for educational research and curriculum experimentation is highly favorable. After a decade in which "innovation" has been the password in education circles, individual citizens as well as public and private institutions have developed a keen interest in education and the effects of change in education.³

The public attitude toward change, and in particular the changes that were taking place in public education, undoubtedly had a positive effect on corrections. According to Ryan, a wide variety of educational programs was functioning in numerous correctional settings in the United States. She wrote:

¹T. A. Ryan, Model of Adult Basic Education in Corrections (Honolulu: Education Research and Development Center, University of Hawaii, 1970), p. 1.

²T. A. Ryan, paper presented at a Workshop for Michigan Corrections Teachers, 1974.

³Alfred Angus Murray McPherson, "An Analysis of Selected Perceptions of Curriculum Development as Expressed by Pupils and Instructional Personnel in Manitoba" (Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976), p. 18.

Many of those programs, like their institutional counterparts, provide a wide diversity of instructional services. Many have philosophies, complete with goals and objectives, that provide a worthwhile gain to their learners.¹

Ryan continued that, by the same token, "many institutions provide inadequate services with unrealistic goals, and no meaningful evaluation; and some state institutions have no education programs available for their students."²

Supporting Ryan's claim of the lack of educational programs in some correctional facilities are statistics provided by Reagen and Stoughton.³ Their research revealed that educational programs were provided in all of the federal prisons, whereas only 81 percent of the state prisons provided academic education for their prisoners. These writers reported that

In some prisons or systems, prisoners participate in at least one, and often more than one, of the several formalized institutionalized school programs which include Adult Basic Education, High School Equivalency preparation, and miscellaneous opportunities for personal enrichment and self improvement.⁴

Conrad believed that the increased status of education was evident throughout the country, although the increase in enrollments and the augmentation of services hardly kept pace with the rhetoric.⁵ Reagen and Stoughton contended that there has been an ascendance of

¹Ryan, Model of Adult Basic Education in Corrections, p. 5.

²Ibid.

³Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 61.

⁴Ibid., pp. 60-61.

⁵John P. Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1981), p. 34.

education, particularly academic education, in the corrections process: "Prisons emerged two hundred years ago as industrial centers, with opportunity for penitence. They are gradually transforming themselves into educational institutions."¹

Several forces were at work during the mid-1960s and 1970s that motivated the evolution from penitence-oriented prisons to educational institutions. According to McCollum,

While education and training programs in the federal prison system are admittedly in a dynamic state of flux, educators and other staff are trying to work as a team to create an institutional tone that communicates to the inmate population that the purpose of the federal correctional system is not punishment but help.²

Although McCollum was discussing the attitude in the federal system, the rehabilitation model appeared to be gaining acceptance in many state prison systems as well.

President Johnson's Task Force on Corrections reported that:

In several senses, corrections today may stand at the threshold of a new era, promising resolution of a significant number of the problems that have vexed it throughout its development. At the very least, it is developing the theory and practical groundwork for a new approach to rehabilitation.³

According to the Task Force, the increasing focus on rehabilitation found widespread acceptance among members of the general public.

¹Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 95.

²Sylvia G. McCollum, "Say, Have You Got Anything Around Here for a Dummy?" Federal Probation 35,3 (1971): 37-42.

³The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 2.

The attitude of the public toward rehabilitation and education for inmates and increased funding brought about several important changes in school programs and programming. The more significant changes were employment of education staff (including teachers and administrators) to replace inmate instructors; innovations in corrections school structure; and the use of technology in the classroom or learning center.

Certified School Staff

One of the major changes that has taken place in corrections education in recent years is the gradual replacement of the inmate instructors with certified teachers. Concerning the future needs of corrections, MacCormick wrote in 1930 that "the hope for the future rests on expert staff, adequate appropriations and complete recognition of the validity of the claim of education to a place in the penal system."¹

The President's Task Force on Corrections reported that, in 1967, the following conditions existed:

In institutions for adult offenders in all but a few states, most notably California and New York, academic education is provided mainly by inmate instructors. . . . When civilians are employed as teachers at correctional institutions, those hired are sometimes the castoffs of the public school system.²

The Task Force noted, however, that many good teachers are also involved in the total institutional program.

¹MacCormick, The Education of Adult Offenders, p. 49.

²Task Force Report: Corrections, p. 54.

³Ibid.

Certified teachers are now employed in the majority of corrections schools. As a result of increased funding and public attitude toward prison education, the state of Michigan has employed certified teachers and has completely eliminated the use of inmates as instructors. Roberts noted that, in Florida,

The Florida Division of Corrections was authorized by the Florida State Legislature to establish 133 permanent, full-time positions for various types of educators, each requiring a college degree and teacher certification.¹

Teaching in a corrections school is not an easy task, however.

Reagen and Stoughton pointed out that

When "push comes to shove," the instructor--"the man"--must prove himself before prisoners will even listen to him, much less learn from him. Intimidation is always possible. Convicts cope by turning everything to their own advantage, be it "black power" or their own form of group therapy. Typically, teachers who survive do so on the strength of their personalities, not because of their training or expertise. Successful prison courses are a function of the personalities of the instructors who can motivate reluctant learners in far from pleasant learning conditions.²

Because the majority of teachers employed in corrections are trained to be public-school teachers, the task of corrections administration is to provide considerable inservice training to help teachers learn how to do their job. Reagen and Stoughton's findings were:

Persistence of traditional forms in the prison educational process: At first glance, the education department in the modern prison looks like the school system in a backward neighborhood. Staff is marginal, facilities are poor and crowded, books in the library are old, procedures are often archaic. Some of this backwardness is related to lack of resources;

¹Roberts, Sourcebook on Prison Education, p. 54.

²Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 81.

some to the fact that the education department takes its cues from the nearby school district.¹

In addition to employing certified teachers, the majority of states employ school principals for their corrections institutions. Reagen and Stoughton made the following observations about school principals or education directors in state prisons:

The educational directors or coordinators at the state prisons visited by our staff were generally young. Most had been graduated about two years prior to assuming their duties at the prison. The majority have taught after college graduation at either public schools or at junior colleges. Their college training was typically in liberal arts, social science, vocational education or physical education. Few had any prior experience or training in corrections. Our staff observed that they looked, acted, and were perceived by other prison personnel as "school teacher types," i.e., they behaved and dressed differently from the majority of the prison staff. While all were responsible to the warden for the prisoner education programs in their prisons, many are clearly isolated from the mainstream of prison life. Their staffs are small and appear to be weakly organized. Most were perceived as having low status in the prison hierarchy by the wardens, guards, and prisoners we interviewed. Many expressed frustration at having a "treatment and rehabilitation" philosophy in conflict with the predominant "custody and control" philosophy and policy of the prison staff.²

The feeling of low status in the prison hierarchy and differences in philosophy between education and other corrections staff have created many problems in the past for educational programs in which the above-mentioned differences existed.

Many state corrections departments have added another level in the education hierarchy. This is the position of the school director or consultant-coordinator in the central office. Reagen and Stoughton found that several states had educational directors at the state level. According to these researchers:

¹Ibid., pp. 92-93.

²Ibid., p. 53.

The educational directors at the state central office are almost all qualified people with educational backgrounds who said that they are more interested in "treatment and rehabilitation" than in "custody and control." Their average age is 35. Only a few hold civil service or merit-rated positions. All are enthusiastic about their programs and mission. Their tenure in office is an average of two years. Most have no background in corrections and evidenced little appreciation or understanding of prison management and prison life problems.¹

Reagen and Stoughton found that the state-level directors had small staffs and typically said they had little status in their departments. They also felt that prisoner education ranked low among the department's priorities.²

The addition of certified teachers, school principals, and directors of education in the corrections central office has been a major and expensive reformation in corrections education. In the several states in which this pattern of school administration and teaching exists, the school staff is under the control of the institution head.

In contrast, several state legislatures have designated their prison educational systems as school districts. According to Conrad,

Seven states, notably Connecticut, Ohio, and Texas, have formed central school districts for the entire correctional system. Where this is done, a school board is created, and the superintendent of schools reports directly to it. Support of the school district comes from funds allocated by the State department of education in the correctional budget.³

One of the more notable corrections school districts is the Windham School District of the Texas Department of Corrections.

¹Ibid., pp. 52-53. ²Ibid., p. 53.

³Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 55.

According to Reagen and Stoughton, "In such an instance as Windham School District, for example, an individual institution may be virtually autonomous and independent of the local prison director and subordinate to the central office staff."¹ The Windham School District, with "schools," "principals," and students in the individual adult correctional facilities, is state-accredited.

The Board of Corrections is on the same footing as all the local school districts in Texas in terms of eligibility for support from the Texas Foundation School Program Fund, from which all state aid to elementary and secondary schools is disbursed. In addition to foundation funds, the school district receives funds from federal grants.

In 1980, 237 certified classroom teachers were distributed among the 15 units in the Texas Corrections System.² An administrative section of 47 persons provides managerial, supervisory, and technical support functions. Texas prisoners are allowed one full day per week in school; the remainder of the week is spent on full-time work assignments.³

In addition to the Corrections-Department-administered school system and the Corrections Department's school-district concept, Conrad noted that, in many states, school law allows and even encourages school districts adjacent to a prison to contract with prison

¹Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 19.

²Murray Lane, "The School District Concept," Adult Leadership (June 1975): 358-60.

³Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, pp. 58-59.

authorities to provide educational services.¹ Reagen and Stoughton indicated in their 1973 survey that 33 percent of the federal institutions and 18 percent of the state institutions contracted with local school districts.² According to Conrad,

In California, where local school districts provide most of the educational services, there is considerable variation from institution to institution. Some prisons contract with the school district for all adult basic education and secondary school instruction. . . . Teachers are working in a structure with which they are familiar; they report ultimately to a school superintendent rather than to administrators with no professional identification with them.³

In addition to the state funds made available for corrections education, the federal government has made funds available through many different titles and grants. The three main sources of funds for academic education are the Adult Education Act, Public Law 91-230; Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; and the Special Education Act, Public Law 94-142. The purpose and intention of these acts are described in the following section.

Federal Funding for the Education of Adult Offenders

Adult Education Act.--The statement of purpose of the Adult Education Act, Public Law 91-230, is found in Section 302, as follows:

It is the purpose of this title to expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will:

- (1) Enable all adults to acquire basic skills necessary to function in society,

¹Ibid., p. 55.

²Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars.

³Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 55.

- (2) Enable adults who so desire to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school, and
- (3) Make available to adults the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.¹

Under the terms of this act, "adult basic education" is defined in Section 303(c) as follows:

- (c) The term "adult basic education" means adult education for adults whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability, which is designed to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education of such individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, to improving their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities.²

Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law

95-561.--The purpose of Title I is:

Purpose: Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965, as amended, the secretary provides financial assistance to local educational agencies for projects designed to meet the special needs of children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children. The term also includes an adult correctional.³

Individuals who qualify for instruction in Title I projects are those who are 21 years of age or less and whose needs-assessment results indicate that they are in need of basic-education skills development.

¹Michigan Department of Education, "The Adult Education Act," Public Law 91-230 Amended Through November 1, 1978, Compilation by the Michigan Department of Education, p. 1.

²Ibid.

³"Purpose of Title I Grants for Local Education Agencies," Federal Register 46, no. 12, 19 January 1982, S162.

Title I is a supplemental program. Section 200.92 states:

An agency that receives Title I assistance shall use Title I funds to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of Title I funds, be made available for the education of children participating in Title I projects from non-Federal sources.¹

According to Conrad, the majority of states have Title I projects in operation in their adult prisons.²

Special Education, Public Law 94-142.--The purpose of Public Law 94-142 is stated as follows:

Purpose:

- (a) The purpose of this law is to insure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education which includes special education and related services to meet their unique needs,
- (b) To insure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected,
- (c) To assist states and localities to provide for the education of all handicapped children, and
- (d) To assess and insure the effectiveness of efforts to educate those children.³

Public Law 94-142 requires the education of all handicapped children from 3 through 21 years of age. Paragraph 121(a)2 states in part:

The provisions of this part apply to all political subdivisions of the State that are involved in the education of handicapped children. These would include: . . . (3) Other State agencies and schools (such as Departments of Mental Health and Welfare and State schools for the deaf or blind), and (4) State correctional facilities.⁴

¹ Ibid.

² Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 32.

³ "Education of Handicapped Children," Federal Register 23 August 1977, Part II, pp. 42477-42478.

⁴ Ibid., p. 42478.

Many state correctional facilities have just recently started to develop special-education projects. Wisconsin and Illinois have the most notable special-education programs for prisoners.¹ Special-education programs require corrections education departments to employ special education teachers and, in many instances, school psychologists. Total funding for special education is much lower than the funding for either Adult Basic Education or Title I projects. Special education, because of the additional expense for special-education teachers and school psychologists, actually places a financial burden on corrections departments.

Academic Education and Educational Technology

With the increase in both state and federal funds beginning in the mid-1960s and increasing in the early 1970s, the organizational superstructure changed, and certified teachers replaced inmate instructors in the majority of state institutions. These changes, in turn, engendered additional program revision in many states.

One of the major changes in many state and federal prisons was the introduction of the high-school-equivalency examination, the General Education Development (GED) examination. The GED is widely used in most of the corrections education programs in the United States. Conrad reported that:

Nearly every prison system in the country with a program of secondary education uses the GED as the main target for its

¹Mark Brown, "Preparing Correction Educators to Teach Delinquents With Learning and Reading Disabilities," Journal of Correctional Education 33 (March 1981): 15.

high school curriculum. The diploma at the end is a tangible sign of achievement. . . . Preparation for the GED examination constitutes a large share of the correctional education effort.¹

Conrad's observation implies that the successful completion of the GED examination is the terminal objective of many prison secondary education programs.

The widespread use of the GED examination is in contrast to Reagen and Stoughton's observation of prison secondary education in 1976. They wrote:

Formal, accredited high school programs are in the minority. Generally they will follow the traditional high school curriculum except for certain classes such as laboratory sciences, physical education, foreign languages, etc.²

In California and Minnesota, it has been reported that students who successfully complete the GED examination are granted high school credit according to their scores on the exam.³ The students are then required to complete traditional high school courses to receive a high school diploma.

According to Conrad, although many corrections teachers place high value on the GED examination in lieu of the traditional diploma, not everyone agrees that "the benefits of the GED are unmixed with disadvantages. Skeptics point to its similarity to a cram course."⁴

¹Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 35.

²Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 23.

³Interview with Ann Taylor, Assistant Director of California Department of Corrections, December 1981; interview with Al Maresh, Education Coordinator, Minnesota Corrections Department, December 1981.

⁴Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 36.

New technology: programmed instruction.--Roberts wrote that the decade between 1961 and 1971 was the beginning of more effective and innovative programs in correctional institutions. He cited the introduction of programmed instruction and other self-instructional methods that were initiated in the Draper Correctional Project at Elmore, Alabama; the Robert F. Kennedy Federal Youth Correctional Center in Morgantown, West Virginia; and the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility as examples of institutions that were experimenting with the programmed method of instruction. Roberts reported that a survey of institutions using programmed instruction revealed the following:

Three hundred ninety-five out of 488 or 81 percent of all the superintendents of correctional institutions in the United States responded. Of the 395 respondents, 169 or 43 percent indicated that they definitely did use programmed instruction and 226 or 57 percent indicated that they definitely did not.¹

He also found that:

Of the 169 institutions reporting the use of programmed instruction, a majority devoted over one hour per day, five days per week, and between thirty-three to fifty-two weeks per year on all grade levels to self-instructional techniques. In almost one-half of the institutions using programmed instruction, from 0 to 25 percent of their entire educational program that could be taught by programmed instruction actually was taught by programmed instruction; 23 percent of the institutions used programmed instruction in 26 to 50 percent of their entire program; and only 17 percent used programmed instruction in from 76 to 100 percent of their entire program.²

Reagen and Stoughton mentioned the Draper Correctional Center in Alabama, the national training school for boys; the Robert F. Kennedy Federal Youth Center; and the Hawaii Youth Correctional

¹Roberts, Sourcebook on Prison Education, p. 23.

²Ibid., p. 92.

Facility as three institutions that were experimenting with programmed instruction in the mid-1960s and early 1970s. However, Roberts' statistics indicated that programmed instruction did not have universal appeal. Reagen and Stoughton wrote:

It would be reasonable to assume that programmed instruction would have universal appeal, that its success at Draper and other institutions would prompt other prison officials to use it. But that is not the case.¹

New technology: television.--A few corrections education programs tried educational television, or instructional television, in the late 1960s. Bates reported:

The State Prison of Southern Michigan started using its own closed circuit educational network in 1967. This is believed to be the first prison to do so in the nation. The network offers programs ranging from how to address a letter to college level mathematics. . . . Television to prison officials in Michigan provides a wide range of benefits for inmates.²

According to Roberts and Coffey:

Some thought has been given to the creation of a national correctional education program administered by the American Correctional Association, or some other central coordinator, which would have the capability of bringing a variety of programs designed specially for inmates of prisons and youth training schools. Suggested plans for the application of this technology to prison education have been outlined in detail, but no actual implementation has yet been undertaken.³

Currently, without the national corrections education network envisioned by Roberts and Coffey, there are problems in the use of

¹Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 78.

²Gerald K. Bates, "Prison TV for Education," American Journal of Corrections 29,1 (1967): 20-22.

³Albert Roberts and Osa Coffey, A State of the Art Survey for a Correctional Education Network (College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1976), pp. 114-38.

instructional television. Conrad's assessment was that most instructional television materials are developed for the public schools; the Sesame Street approach to elementary education does not enthrall the adult learner as it does the child in the primary grades.¹

One series of instructional television topics, designed to help students pass the GED examination is "The Kentucky GED Studies Series."²

New technology: computer-assisted instruction.--Conrad wrote:

New in the mid-seventies was the advent of the computer to the educational process. Some of the applications of the computer to education were mechanical and merely eased some of the drudgery of scoring tests and maintaining school records. Some services provide testing programs of considerable sophistication, combined with conventional materials to which the testing is keyed. Much of the computerized educational programs used in prisons now are of this variety, and there are a considerable number of them on the market. These systems have a number of advantages over traditional examining methods. Not only do they inform the student that he has the right answer--if he has--but they keep score on his progress.

Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) promises and already delivers a transformation of the educational process. This product of the computer revolution is still in its infancy. It would not have been conceivable without the accumulating experience of the computer industry in organizing and communicating huge amounts of knowledge with astonishing speed and versatility.³

He continued:

The most advanced and versatile CAI system now in use is PLATO VII, a computerized instructional program that takes the learner from an assessment of his needs through programmed instruction,

¹Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 43.

²Michigan Corrections Education GED Completion Resource List, 1979.

³Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 43.

drill and practice, and examination. It was developed in a collaboration between the University of Illinois at Urbana and the Control Data Corporation, and uses the equipment manufactured by the latter. It is capable of providing instruction from the latter phases of primary education through graduate school and professional refresher courses. PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automatic Teaching Operations) contains about 100,000 hours of instructional material and continues to expand with the varied demands of the educational public.¹

Eleven states are using the PLATO system in their correctional education programs. The number of terminals available in each state ranges from 1 to 41.²

Competency-based instruction.--Another recent innovation in corrections education is the competency-based model. Programmed instruction and competency-based instruction have much in common. Material to be learned is developed through a structured set of objectives, taking the student through easily understood steps.³ The influence of both delivery systems can be seen in the computer-assisted format. Conrad wrote: "Because competency is the base of and the objective of so much adult education today, many educators have devoted special attention to the development of model curricula to achieve it."⁴

Cram described the competency-based approach as follows:

In part, the competency based approach may be understood by contrasting it with the traditional (teacher controlled) approach. In traditional education programs, instruction is

¹Ibid., p. 44.

²Information supplied by James Rocco, Central Data Corporation, Southfield, Michigan, March 1982.

³Conrad, Adult Offender Education Programs, p. 19.

⁴Ibid.

carried out for a fixed period of time; with competency based instruction, on the other hand, instruction continues until the student can perform as desired, or better.¹

Perhaps the most important difference between traditional and competency-based education programs, according to Cram, is in the outlook toward success. He suggested that "in competency based programs, achievement is the goal."² Competency-based instruction is well suited to the individualized-instruction models described by Roberts and by Reagen and Stoughton.³

Summary

The most important change in corrections education has been the increase in funds from a number of sources, both state and federal. With this increase in funds, corrections departments were able to add certified teachers to school staffs, thereby replacing inmate instructors.

Along with the increase in the numbers of certified teachers, four major strategies have evolved for administering prison education programs. They are:

1. Legislative action that declared the state corrections departments to be school districts.

¹David D. Cram, "Preparation and Use of Instructional Modules in Driver and Safety Education" (Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility, n.d.), p. 2.

²Ibid., p. 2.

³Roberts, Sourcebook on Prison Education, p. 92; Reagen and Stoughton, School Behind Bars, p. 93.

2. Legislation allowing public schools to contract with nearby prisons to provide educational programs.

3. An organizational structure within the department, including a central office education staff and principals in charge of their respective programs.

4. Autonomous education programs in each institution with a school principal, but little or no coordination between facilities.

The major portion of funding is provided by the state, but three major sources of continuing federal support are Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Adult Education Act, and a more recent development but certainly not a financially profitable one--special education, which is required by Public Law 94-142. These sources of federal funds, along with state funding, have made it possible to introduce new technology into the learning laboratory in corrections institutions. Most noteworthy are instructional television and computer-assisted instruction.

Programmed instruction and competency-based instruction are two delivery systems that are having a major influence on corrections education and have facilitated the individualization of corrections school curricula. High school equivalency instead of the traditional high school diploma program, made possible by the General Education Development examination, has been a major change in the majority of state corrections institution educational programs.

The Components of Evaluative Criteria for
Education Programs in General

A review of some of the written and recorded material on the components of evaluative criteria in public education, along with an analysis of these materials, is presented in this section. Emphasis is placed on the beliefs of authorities in the field as well as the policies and standards of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Black wrote:

In order for correctional education to maintain integrity, the education system must become innovative--innovative in a sense that requires educators to forget the traditional system. The students correctional educators deal with have had a taste of the traditional school system and rejected it.¹

McPherson concurred: "Educators of the 1970's have opportunities and challenges that are unprecedented in history. The climate for educational research and curriculum experimentation is highly favorable."²

Whatever the reason for changing the curriculum, the change must be made according to the needs divulged through an evaluation of that curriculum. Caswell and Campbell wrote that "provision should be made for the results of evaluation to be utilized in continuous revision of the curriculum."³ They added: "Provision should also be made for the teacher to report consistently upon the success of the instructional program and to suggest ways of improving it."⁴

¹Hartzel Black, "Innovation: Key to Success," Region III Newsletter (Vienna, Ill., Correctional Assoc.) 6 (Winter 1982): 5-6.

²McPherson, "Analysis of Selected Perceptions," p. 18.

³Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, Curriculum Development (New York: American Book Company, 1935), p. 374.

⁴Ibid.

Hass believed that, before curriculum can be evaluated, standards must be developed. He defined "criterion" as "a standard on which a decision can be based; it is a basis for discrimination. Curriculum criteria are guidelines or standards on which curriculum and instructional decisions can be made."¹

In a discussion of the "evaluative criteria" developed by the 1940 Cooperative Study of Secondary Education, Gwynn cited the following evaluative criteria that are of special importance to the curriculum:

1. Section B on "Philosophy and Objectives,"
2. Section D on "Curriculum and Course of Study," and
3. Section I on "The Outcomes of the Educational Program."²

He added, "All activities and work of a particular secondary school are supposed to be evaluated according to the philosophy and objectives of that school as they have been determined cooperatively by the faculty and administration."³

Caswell and Campbell emphasized that "curriculum study includes in its major classification the following topics: objectives, learning activities . . . and providing for mastery."⁴

Hass, on the other hand, believed that the four bases of the curriculum--social forces, human development, the nature of learning,

¹Glen Hass, Curriculum Planning: A New Approach, 3rd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980), p. 6.

²Minor J. Gwynn, Curriculum Principles and Social Trends (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1943), pp. 310-11.

³Ibid., p. 311.

⁴Caswell and Campbell, Curriculum Development, p. 67.

and the nature of knowledge and cognition--provide a major source of guidance for decision making in curriculum planning. He wrote:

The planned objectives are among the most significant criteria for developing and evaluating any curriculum plan. This is true regardless of what the objectives are or how they are stated. The four bases of the curriculum should also be used as curriculum criteria in curriculum planning.¹

Hass continued:

The purposes of a curriculum . . . are the most important curriculum criteria. They should provide the first guidelines for determining the learning experiences to be included in the curriculum. Unfortunately, schools commonly lack a comprehensive and reasonably consistent set of objectives on which to base curriculum decisions, and teachers often fail to use a set of objectives to guide their planning for teaching.²

Broad, general goals, according to Hass, are needed in planning the objectives of an educational program and teaching it. These broad, general goals fall in four areas: education for "citizenship," "vocation," self-realization, and critical thinking.³ Hass noted that "thoughtful leaders," however, "differ on the goals that they think should be emphasized."⁴

Broudy discussed what he labeled the "uses of cognitive forms" or uses of schooling, which he identified as "vocational life," citizenship, self-concept, and "interpretive and associative uses of schooling."⁵ Although Broudy did not state his "uses of schooling" as goals or aims of curriculum, a literal interpretation could denote

¹Hass, Curriculum Planning, pp. 6-7.

²Ibid., p. 7.

³Ibid., p. 8.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Harry S. Broudy, "Uses of Cognitive Form," in Curriculum Development: Issues and Insights, ed. Donald E. Orlosky and Othanel B. Smith (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1978).

a similarity between Hass's goals of curriculum and Broudy's uses of schooling.

Stratemeyer believed that:

The curriculum must help each individual to become competent not only in school but also when he leaves school, in his home and family relations, his work, and leisure-time activities, his spiritual and civic-social life.¹

As previously stated, Hass believed that "curriculum criteria are guidelines or standards for curriculum decision making, and the objectives of a curriculum."² He developed six criterion questions on the objectives of a curriculum or teaching plan. They are as follows:

1. Have the goals of the curriculum or teaching plan been clearly stated, and are they used by the teachers and students in choosing content, materials, and activities for learning?
2. Have the teachers and students engaged in student-teacher planning in defining the goals and in determining how they will be implemented?
3. Do some of the planned goals relate to the society of the community in which the curriculum will be implemented or the teaching will be done?
4. Do some of the planned goals relate to the individual learner and his or her needs, purposes, interests, and abilities?
5. Are the planned goals used as criteria in selecting and developing learning activities and materials of instruction?
6. Are the planned goals used as criteria in evaluating learning achievement and in the further planning of learning subgoals and activities?³

Hass felt that if most of the preceding questions cannot be answered affirmatively, the curriculum planning has probably been

¹Florence B. Stratemeyer, Hamden L. Forkner, and Margaret G. McKim, Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living (New York: Columbia University, 1947), p. 545.

²Hass, Curriculum Planning, p. 7.

³Ibid., p. 9.

inadequate, and steps should be taken to correct the identified deficiencies.¹ Writing about the six criterion questions, Hass stated, "The criterion questions bring into clear focus the fact that teachers are important partners in curriculum planning and that the planning of a curriculum cannot be completed until there are engagements with learners."²

Standard III of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools supports the majority of the criterion questions. This standard on the educational programs is quoted in its entirety as follows:

Educational Program: The educational program is developed from the school's stated goals and objectives and from a knowledge of the unique needs of its students. The program is designed to carry out the educational purpose of the school.

The school's program is designed to develop feelings of self-acceptance and self-worth; to develop the talents and competencies of each individual; and to develop the basic skills. The program assists the students in coping with changing environments; it encourages the student to take an active role in the determination of society's alternative futures; and it enables the student to make more responsible decisions concerning his/her future.

The scope of the school's program of studies is such as to meet adequately within the context of its stated purposes the educational and developmental (affective, cognitive, psychomotor) needs of the students it admits.

An inservice program is provided to stimulate ongoing appraisal and improvement of the educational program.³

North Central Association's Standard II, "Organization, Administration, Control and Decision-Making," lists the following enabling criteria to be met:

1. The relationships between the school and its governing body are effective in helping the school carry out its major purpose.

¹Ibid., p. 9.

²Ibid.

³North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, "Policies and Standards for the Approval of Optional Schools and Special Function Schools," pp. 10-11.

2. The school is organized to assure the maximum achievement of its stated purpose.
3. The school functions in a fashion that assures the involvement of students, staff, parents and community in the major facets of decision making.
4. The school maintains adequate records and reports regarding staff and program.¹

Writing on the administration and school organization, Stratemeyer et al. asserted that both must contribute to the maximum growth of the students, teachers, and school program. They believed that mutual respect of school board members, school administrators, and teachers is necessary to help meet the goal of maximum growth.²

An appropriate provision to help meet the goal of maximum growth of the students, teachers, and school was stated by the North Central Association as an enabling criterion:

A professional staff member with appropriate preparation has been designated to coordinate the total learning resource program. The coordinator is directly involved in all major curriculum and instructional planning in the school. The coordinator has access to sufficient clerical assistance. Sufficient financial provisions are made for the development and the operation of the learning resource program.³

Regarding trained leadership, Short and Marconnit stated:

1. Trained leadership is provided for curriculum work. Those responsible for the organization and conduct of the improvement program are provided with specific preparation in the principles and techniques of curriculum improvement and in the skills and understandings necessary to successful group leadership.
2. General responsibility for all services related to curriculum and teaching is assigned to a single administrative officer or department. Unless responsibility for the teaching and learning program is clearly designated, problems of overlapping

¹North Central Association, "Policies and Standards," pp. 9-10.

²Stratemeyer et al., Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living, pp. 546-47.

³North Central Association, "Policies and Standards," p. 14.

responsibility and duplication, with resultant damaging conflict, are almost certain to arise. One central office should be responsible for overall direction and coordination.¹

Short and Marconnit agreed that sufficient funds must be made available to conduct a curriculum-improvement program. They stated that a good curriculum makes maximum provision for the development of each learner. This can be accomplished, they believed, by providing a wide range of opportunities for individuals of varying abilities, needs, and interests. The curriculum should also provide an opportunity for self-directed independent study.²

These beliefs support the North Central Association Standard on "Learning Resources Program," which is as follows:

A coordinated learning resource program makes available a wide array of human and material resources for students and teachers. The program supports learning through the adequate provision of appropriate and other pertinent instructional/learning resources.

The resources are of such diversity and variety as to foster the individualization of learning. The learning resource program derives from the philosophy and objectives of the educational program. Staff and students participate in the selection of learning resources.³

North Central Association standards call for continual and systematic evaluation through collection and analysis of the school's progress toward its goals.⁴

¹Edmund C. Short and George D. Marconnit, Contemporary Thought on Public School Curriculum: Readings (Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown and Company, Publishers, 1968), p. 179.

²Ibid., p. 180.

³North Central Association, "Policies and Standards," p. 14.

⁴Ibid., p. 15.

Saylor and Alexander's checklist for appraising a school's program included the following:

- I. A good curriculum is systematically planned and evaluated
 - A. A definite organization is responsible for coordinating planning and evaluation.
 - B. Steps in planning and evaluation are logically defined and taken.
 - C. Ways of working utilize the contributions of all concerned.
- II. A good curriculum reflects adequately the aims of the school.
 - A. The faculty has defined comprehensive educational aims.
 - B. The scope of the curriculum includes areas related to all stated aims.
 - C. Each curriculum opportunity is planned with reference to one or more aims.
 - D. In planning curriculum opportunities from year to year and in each area, teachers consider the total scope of aims.¹

Summary

The literature indicated that there should be a continuous evaluation of a school system's education plan and methods of curriculum change and development. Evaluative criteria that are of special importance are a school's philosophy, goals, and objectives, and the needs and interests of learners. Other evaluative criteria that should be considered are:

1. A plan for continuing curriculum improvement, which includes:
 2. A plan for staff development,
 3. The provision for adequate instructional resources, which make

¹Galen J. Saylor and William M. Alexander, "The Marks of a GOOD Curriculum," as reprinted in Edmund C. Short and George D. Marconnit, Contemporary Thought on Public School Curriculum: Readings (Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown and Company, Publishers, 1968), p. 179.

4. Provision for individualized instruction and independent study, and

5. A plan for on-going evaluation.

To accomplish these goals, it is necessary to provide professional leadership with adequate funding to conduct a curriculum-improvement program.

Chapter Summary

Chapter II was presented in three parts as follows: (1) the history of Michigan corrections education to 1975, (2) changes that have taken place in prison education programs in recent years, and (3) the components of evaluative criteria for public education programs.

Michigan historical records refer to a bill enacted by the state legislature in 1816 requiring that all convicts who could read be given a Bible, and that those who could not read should be given instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic. The chaplain, with the aid of prisoners who could read, taught classes for one hour each Sunday. In 1880, a certified teacher replaced the chaplain as the head of the school. Inmate instructors did the teaching until 1964. They were gradually replaced by certified teachers.

The six prison schools in Michigan were autonomous, and there was little or no attempt to coordinate curriculum or teaching resources. In 1974, a director of education for corrections was appointed. The first priority of this position was to coordinate all Michigan prison education programs.

The history of penal education in Michigan is but a micro-cosm of penal education in the nation as a whole. The majority of states now have certified teachers, principals, and a director of education, with a central office staff of educational consultants. The curriculum is individualized, and programmed instruction or competency-based instruction is used as the delivery system.

Modern technological aids such as films, filmstrips and sound filmstrips, television, and, more recently, computer-assisted instruction are being used as educational resources in many states. Yet a survey of the literature revealed that the majority of the states do not have a corrections education philosophy, and they have not developed written goals and objectives for their programs.

In the literature surveyed, a continual, on-going process of evaluation was advocated. Evaluative criteria that are of special significance are a school's philosophy, goals, and objectives.

Other evaluative criteria of importance are:

1. Consideration of student needs and interests.
2. Plans for continuing curriculum improvement.
3. On-going staff development.
4. Provision for adequate resources.
5. Provision for individualized instruction and independent study.
6. A plan for on-going evaluation.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

This chapter includes an investigation and a listing of the data sources, a description of the procedures used in collecting the data, and an explanation of the method used to analyze the data.

Sources of Data

The data used in this study came from a number of sources. The sources may be classified into two major divisions: human and material. The people who acted as resources included most of those who have been closely affiliated with the development of the Michigan prison schools over the past seven years.

Material resources included Michigan Department of Corrections policy directives; procedures, Director's Office memos, administrative guides, miscellaneous papers and documents, and "central office" promulgated directives; and the central office education division's twice-yearly school-assessment reports. These materials are on file in the central office education files.

Procedures for Data Collection

Data for this study were collected in several ways. These included interviews with selected Michigan Department of Corrections administrators, rating scales completed by the corrections school

administrators and Michigan Department of Corrections education consultants, and a search for material resources generated from 1975 to 1981.

Data From Human Resources: Michigan
Department of Corrections Administrators

Interviews.--Interviews were held with Perry Johnson, Director of the Michigan Department of Corrections; Robert Brown, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Correctional Facilities; H. Gary Wells, Superintendent of the Muskegon Correctional Facility; and Joe Abramjyets, Deputy Superintendent of the Muskegon Correctional Facility and former corrections school principal at the Muskegon Correctional Facility. The interviewees responded to the following three questions:

1. Drawing upon your experience with the American Correctional Association's standards on education, do you believe that the standards provide sufficient criteria to adequately evaluate a corrections school program?

2. What are some additional criteria that you would recommend to be used in conjunction with the American Correctional Association standards to evaluate a corrections school program?

3. Which of the following additional evaluative criteria do you think are important considerations for evaluating a corrections school program?

- a. There is a plan for including teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum change process.
- b. There is a plan for continuing curriculum improvement.
- c. There is a plan for on-going education staff development.

- d. The education program is assessed through regularly scheduled evaluations of the prison education program by the principal. The evaluation should include:
- (1) assessment of teacher classroom performance, such as student orientation to the program, use of competency-based instruction modules, and recommended resources including audio-visual;
 - (2) record keeping;
 - (3) general classroom appearance; and
 - (4) school-facility cleanliness and maintenance.

School principals' ratings.--The Michigan Department of Corrections school principals discussed the American Correctional Association's standards on correctional education at their quarterly principals' meeting in February 1982. They were instructed to consider their programs' compliance with the American Correctional Association's criteria. Immediately following this discussion, the principals were asked to rate each of the criteria. The following instructions were on the form:

Please rate each American Correctional Association standard on academic education, on a scale of one to five, as to its value as a criterion with which to evaluate a corrections school academic program.

The results were collected immediately upon completion of the rating.

Central office education consultants' ratings.--The Michigan Department of Corrections' education consultants and the director of education assess each school program bi-annually. In addition, the consultants visit the schools several times each year.

In May 1982, the education consultants were asked to rate the corrections schools' compliance with each of the American Correctional Association's standards on correctional education. The following directions were given:

Please rate each of the following American Correctional Association standards on academic education, on a scale of one to five, as to how well you believe the corrections schools as a whole are in compliance with each standard.

Data From Material Resources

Data were collected from the following written documents:

Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 12, 1980, "Educational Programs for Prisoners"

Policy Directive PD-BCF-40.01, February 1, 1979, "Institutional Program Classification of Residents"

Policy Directive PD-BCF-40.02, October 15, 1979, "Diagnostic Assessment of Correctional Residents"

Policy Directive PD-DWA-40.01, April 1, 1975, "Program for Rehabilitation"

Procedure OP-BCF-23.02, December 1, 1980, "Transfer of Educational Records"

Corrections Department Classification Manual, 1980

Letters to institution head announcing assessment visits, listing assessment objectives for the current year

Various Director's Office memos on educational matters between 1975 and 1981

Minutes of wardens' and superintendents' meetings from 1975 to 1981

Minutes of principals' meetings from 1975 to 1981

Other miscellaneous documents written between 1975 and 1981

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The material was investigated for evidence related to each of the American Correctional Association's education standards. From the original group of 20 standards, only 18 are applicable to academic corrections programs. These 18 standards minus the criteria related to post-secondary education¹ were used to evaluate the educational programs of the Michigan Department of Corrections. The standards are listed below:

- 2-4422 - There is a comprehensive education program available to all eligible inmates that extends from literacy training through high school and includes communication skills, mathematics, and social science.
- 2-4423 - The academic education programs are accredited by the state department of education or a recognized accreditation association. Programs up to the completion of high school and/or GED are available at no cost to inmates.
- 2-4424 - There is a standardized competency-based curriculum supported by appropriate materials and classroom resources.
- 2-4425 - There is a system for ensuring that the academic education programs continue to meet the needs of the inmate population.
- 2-4426 - Some educational programs are provided at a time when the majority of inmates can take advantage of the opportunity.
- 2-4427 - There is a systematic approach to determine the personnel requirements for the academic programs to ensure all inmates access to staff and services.
- 2-4428 - All academic education personnel are certified by a state department of education or other comparable authority.
- 2-4429 - Academic personnel policies and practices are comparable to local jurisdictions or other appropriate jurisdictions.

¹See limitations of this study relating to vocational and postsecondary education.

- 2-4430 - Salary and benefits for academic personnel are at least the same as state minimums for teachers performing comparable work.
- 2-4431 - The educational program is supported by specialized equipment, including, at a minimum, classrooms, teaching carrels, audiovisual materials and facilities, chalkboards, and administrative space.
- 2-4432 - The institutional staff and/or parent agency conducts an annual evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the academic education program against stated performance objectives.
- 2-4433 - There is a system whereby the academic programs are assessed against stated objectives by qualified individuals, professional groups, and trade associations; this assessment is done at least every three years.
- 2-4434 - Academic counseling is provided so that inmates are placed in that phase of the educational program suited to their needs and abilities.
- 2-4435 - The educational program allows for flexible scheduling that permits inmates to enter at any time and to proceed at their own learning pace.
- 2-4437 - The institution uses community resources in developing academic programs for selected inmates.
- 2-4438 - The educational program in coordination with other institutional services provides instruction in functional social skills.
- 2-4440 - Written policy and procedures govern the maintenance and handling of educational records.
- 2-4441 - Provision is made for formal recognition of specific educational accomplishments.¹

In addition to the American Correctional Association standards, the following four criteria were taken from the literature:

¹American Correctional Association, Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions, 2nd ed. (College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, January 1981), pp. 109-12.

1. There is provision for the continuous evaluation of the school system's education plan.
 2. The system's education plan includes consideration of teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum-change process.
 3. There is provision for on-going evaluation of the local school by the school principal.
 4. There is a plan for continuing staff development.
- The material sources were investigated for evidence pertaining to each of these criteria. Notes and direct quotations relating to each of the criteria of the screening device were taken from every source. Each of the criteria was focused on separately, not as part of a group. The results of the interviews as well as principal and consultant ratings were also considered.

Chapter Summary

This chapter included a description of the study's human and material data sources and the procedures for data collection. Data from human resources included interviews with four Michigan Department of Corrections administrators and rating scales completed by Michigan Department of Corrections school principals and educational consultants. The material-resource data were derived from the Michigan Department of Corrections policy directives, procedures, Director's Office memos, administrative guides, and miscellaneous papers and documents. Eighteen of the 20 American Correctional Association's education standards, which were applicable to this study, were also presented.

Chapter IV presents a review of corrections education in Michigan from 1975 through 1981 and the 18 American Correctional Association education standards, with the evidence gathered to indicate the degree or extent of compliance with each criterion.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter includes a review of corrections education in Michigan from 1975 to 1981 and a presentation of the data related to the research questions.

Review of Corrections Education in Michigan, 1975-1981

Currently, Michigan's correctional institutions house approximately 13,500 male and female felons. Of this number, 500 are women. They are housed in the state's only women's prison and the state's only women's corrections camp.

The need for educational programs at all levels is great, and the demand is of unbelievable proportions. A statistically summary of the entry-level test scores released in 1976 revealed the following data:¹

0-6 grade reading level	33%
6-8 grade reading level	28%
8-10 grade reading level	23%
10-12 grade reading level	15%

These findings, coupled with the fact that more students were receiving high school equivalency certificates than were receiving high school diplomas (710 GED certificates compared to 136 high school

¹Michigan Department of Corrections, "Entry Level Test Scores of Male Felons, for Year 1975" (computer printout), October 1976.

diplomas during 1976), prompted corrections educators to reevaluate the intention and efficacy of the existing courses of study. In an effort to enlarge the scope of corrections education, the Michigan Department of Corrections embarked on an educational model that incorporated the realities of the aforementioned trends into a viable system of providing prisoner/students with the necessary tools to succeed in our increasingly complex society.

The Department's educational model is addressed to the following major-priority components: basic reading instruction, pre-GED preparation, GED completion, vocational training, and life-role competencies.

First Priority: Basic Education

Reading instruction to enable all functionally illiterate prisoners to become literate is the Department's highest educational priority. The Department's reading-curriculum committee chose the Educational Development Laboratories "Learning 100"¹ program as the delivery system to accomplish this goal.

Second Priority: Vocational Training

Entry-level vocational training for those prisoners who need it is the second priority in the educational plan. Every person must know how to earn an honest living, for without this know-how, he/she is more likely to find less socially acceptable ways of living, thereby increasing the chance of incarceration. Nearly all vocational-education

¹McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, New York, New York.

programs require academic competence at least at the sixth-grade level. Literacy training is needed before vocational training can begin. Prisoners may enroll in certain vocational programs while enrolled in the 4-6 level reading program. Prevocational training is offered to all levels of students.

Third Priority: Pre-GED Preparation

The pre-GED preparation program comprises three areas: math, English, and reading. Students may enroll in pre-GED preparation courses when their reading competency is at the fourth-grade level. If a student demonstrates competency on the course pretest, in math for example, he/she may be enrolled in the corresponding GED program. The primary concern is that the student can read and comprehend the course resource materials.

Fourth Priority: GED Program

Students are enrolled in the GED program after showing competency at the pre-GED preparation level. The GED program is designed to develop competency in students, enabling them to complete the GED test successfully--the terminal objective of the academic program. Satisfactory completion of the GED test provides the basic educational component of the life-role competency model.

Fifth Priority: Life-Role Competency Skills

The life-role competencies, as a specific area, have just recently come into the vocabulary of the education profession. Life-role competencies can be defined as those skills that allow an

individual to function effectively in everyday life by applying those academic and vocational skills he/she has already learned. These skills pertain to the areas of family living, family planning, budgeting, use of credit, and job holding and job seeking, to name a few.

As part of implementing these five priorities, the Michigan Department of Corrections has designed all education programs along the lines of competency-based instruction. This system provides prisoner/students with a self-paced instructional format that includes discrete learning objectives, criterion tests, course maps, and other control documents that allow students and teachers consistently to monitor progress in learning laboratories instead of traditional classrooms. Students are encouraged to progress as rapidly as their capabilities allow.

The most recent major educational activity of the Michigan Department of Corrections occurred in the summer of 1979, when a task force was appointed whose goal was to revise and rewrite the 1975 Policy Directive on Education. The task was accomplished and the directive became effective on June 12, 1980.

One of the provisions of the policy directive on education provides for staff curriculum committees. The GED preparation courses, English and mathematics, have been developed by teacher-principal curriculum committees. The policy directive on education provides for the continuation of these committees. The curriculum committees meet when problems arise or when feedback from teachers indicates that

curriculum committees need to consider certain revisions in modules or criterion tests or changes in resources.

The Michigan Department of Education is helping with many of the prisoner-education projects or problems. In addition, individual Michigan Department of Education consultants are working freely with corrections education in numerous areas.

Now that the Department of Corrections education program has undergone several major changes in the delivery system that have in turn changed the roles of teachers and students, the Department is having its programs evaluated by outside sources. The majority of the corrections schools in Michigan are seeking accreditation from the North Central Association or from the American Correctional Association. The ultimate goal is to have all of Michigan's corrections schools accredited by both accrediting agencies. The following section provides some insight into the realities of this goal.

Presentation of Data Related to the Research Questions

The data for this study relate to the four research questions, which are as follows:

1. How adequate are the American Correctional Association education standards as evaluative criteria for a corrections education program?
2. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the American Correctional Association education standards?

3. Are the four additional evaluative criteria reasonable/ workable to augment the American Correctional Association criteria?

4. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections/ education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the four additional evaluative criteria?

Human resources supplied some of the data for this study. These data include principals' ratings of the standards, administrator interviewees' opinions of the standards as evaluative criteria, and the Corrections Central Office education consultants' ratings of how well they thought Department of Corrections schools, as a whole, were meeting the American Correctional Association standards. Some of the data were derived from material resources, including office records.

Research Question 1

How adequate are the American Correctional Association education standards as evaluative criteria for a corrections education program?

Principals' ratings of the standards.--At a principals' meeting in February 1982, school principals were asked to rate the American Corrections Association standards for corrections education. The principals responded to the following statement:

Please rate each ACA standard on academic and vocational education, on a scale of one to five, as to its value as a criterion with which to evaluate a corrections school academic program.

A rating of one indicates little or no value. A rating of five indicates highly valuable.

The results of the principals' ratings are shown in Table 3. The number in the upper-left diagonal indicates the number of responses

Table 3.--Corrections schools principals' ratings of American
Correctional Association standards on education (N = 16).

Standard Number	Rating Scale ^a					Averages
	1	2	3	4	5	
2-4422	1 1		2 6	3 12	10 50	4.3
2-4423	2 2	3 6	4 12	2 8	5 25	3.3
2-4424			2 6	6 24	8 40	4.4
2-4425		2 4	3 9	4 16	7 35	4.0
2-4426	6 6	3 6	1 3	5 20	1 5	2.3
2-4427	1 1		6 18	5 20	4 20	3.7
2-4428			3 9	5 20	8 40	4.3
2-4429	5 5	5 10	1 3	3 12	2 10	2.5
2-4430	2 2	2 4	3 9	3 12	6 30	3.6
2-4431		1 2	3 9	5 20	7 35	4.1
2-4432	1 1	1 2	5 15	6 24	3 15	3.6
2-4433	2 1	1 2	5 15	4 16	4 20	3.4
2-4434		2 4	3 9	5 20	6 30	3.9
2-4435			2 6	6 24	8 40	4.4
2-4437	7 7	4 8	4 12	1 4		1.9
2-4438	1 1	3 6	6 18	4 16	2 10	3.2
2-4440		1 2	3 9	6 24	6 30	4.1
2-4441		1 2	6 18	6 24	3 15	3.7

^aA rating of 1 indicates little or no value; a rating of 5 indicates. The number in the upper-left diagonal in each cell indicates the number of responses in a given cell. The number in the lower-right diagonal represents the weighted value for the respective cell. This value was determined by multiplying the responses in a cell by the cell value.

in a given cell. The number in the lower-right diagonal is the weighted value of the responses.

Table 4 indicates the percentage value of the principals' responses when grouped according to low value, neutral, or high value relative to the principals' opinions of the value of the American Correctional Association standards as criteria for evaluating corrections school academic programs.

Table 5 shows the six standards chosen by the principals as having the highest value as evaluative criteria.

Summary of principals' ratings: In their ratings of the standards, the principals indicated a decidedly higher value for eight of the standards as evaluative criteria for a corrections academic program. These eight standards are as follows:

- 2-4422 - There is a comprehensive education program available to all eligible inmates that extends from literacy training through high school and includes communication skills, mathematics, and social sciences.
- 2-4424 - There is a standardized competency-based curriculum supported by appropriate materials and classroom resources.
- 2-4425 - There is a system for ensuring that the academic education program continues to meet the needs of the inmate population.
- 2-4428 - All academic education personnel are certified by a state department of education or other comparable authority.
- 2-4431 - The educational program is supported by specialized equipment, including, at a minimum, classrooms, teaching carrels, audiovisual materials and facilities, chalkboards, and administrative space.
- 2-4434 - Academic counseling is provided so that inmates are placed in that phase of the educational program suited to their needs and abilities.

Table 4.--Principals' ratings of American Correctional Association standards on education according to low, neutral, or high value (in percentage) (N = 16).

Standard Number	Low Value	Neutral	High Value
2-4422	6.25	12.50	81.25
2-4423	31.25	25.00	43.75
2-4424	...	12.50	87.50
2-4425	12.50	18.75	68.75
2-4426	56.25	6.25	37.50
2-4427	6.25	37.50	56.25
2-4428	...	18.75	81.25
2-4429	62.50	6.25	31.25
2-4430	25.00	18.75	56.25
2-4431	6.25	18.75	75.00
2-4432	12.50	31.25	56.25
2-4433	18.75	31.25	50.00
2-4434	12.50	18.75	68.75
2-4435	...	12.50	87.50
2-4437	68.75	25.00	6.25
2-4438	25.00	37.50	37.50
2-4440	6.25	18.75	75.00
2-4441	6.25	37.50	56.25

Note: The low, neutral, and high percentages were determined by combining the high-value responses or the low-value responses in Table 3 and then dividing by N. The neutral percentages were determined by dividing the number of responses in Cell 3 by N.

2-4435 - The educational program allows for flexible scheduling that permits inmates to enter at any time and to proceed at their own learning pace.

2-4440 - Written policy and procedures govern the maintenance and handling of educational records.

Table 5.--American Correctional Association standards most frequently chosen by principals as having the highest value as evaluative criteria (N = 16).

Standard Number	Percentage Scores			
	Low Value	Neutral	High Value	Average Score
2-4422	5.25	12.50	81.25	4.3
2-4424	...	12.50	87.50	4.4
2-4428	...	18.75	81.25	4.3
2-4431	6.25	18.75	75.00	4.1
2-4434	12.50	18.75	68.75	3.9
2-4435	...	12.50	87.50	4.4

Three of the standards were rated as not having high value as evaluative criteria for a prison academic education program. (See Table 6.) These criteria are as follows:

2-4426 - Some educational programs are provided at a time when the majority of inmates can take advantage of the opportunity.

2-4429 - Academic personnel policies and practices are comparable to local jurisdictions or other appropriate jurisdictions.

2-4437 - The institution uses community resources in developing academic programs for selected inmates.

Table 6.--American Correctional Association standards most frequently chosen by principals as having the least value as evaluative criteria (N = 16).

Standard Number	Percentage Scores			
	Low Value	Neutral	High Value	Average Score
2-4426	56.25	6.25	37.50	2.3
2-4429	62.50	6.25	31.25	2.5
2-4437	68.75	25.00	6.25	1.9

Administrator interviews.--Administrator interviews were conducted on May 12 and May 25, 1982. To conceal the identity of the persons interviewed and to ensure confidentiality, respondents are referred to as A, B, C, or D in the following discussion.

The interviewees were asked to respond to two questions relevant to the American Correctional Association criteria:

1. Drawing upon your experience with the American Correctional Association's standards on education, do you believe that the standards provide sufficient criteria to adequately evaluate a corrections school program?
2. What are some additional criteria that you would recommend to be used in conjunction with the American Correctional Association standards to evaluate a corrections school program?

Respondent A:

Question 1: Respondent A stated that the American Correctional Association standards are adequate for the present. He observed, however, that some of the standards on education do not provide enough information or guidelines for the noneducator evaluator. An example is Standard 2-4431, quoted below:

The educational program is supported by specialized equipment, including, at a minimum, classrooms, teaching carrels, audio-visual materials and facilities, chalkboards, and administrative space.

His opinion was that a noneducator would not know what specialized equipment should be considered or the quantity that would be needed.

"The criterion does not speak to quality or quantity."

Question 2: Respondent A did not believe additional criteria should be added to the current standards at this time. He believed the current standards represent a first step in what will become a "quantum leap." There has been no coordination among state corrections departments, according to Respondent A. He believed that if the standards were too oppressive, some states would not even try to become accredited. Respondent A believed that states will work hard to maintain their accreditation, once they are accredited. He believed that the standards will become less ambiguous and more involved.

Respondent B:

Question 1: Respondent B thought that the American Correctional Association standards are adequate to evaluate a corrections education program.

Question 2: The respondent did not know of any additional criteria to be added to the current standards.

Respondent C

Question 1: Respondent C agreed that there was some weakness in the current standards but believed that the standards are adequate for now. Respondent C felt that the evaluator should talk with

teachers and students to get a better perspective of the institution's programs.

Question 2: Respondent C did not know of any additional criterion that should be added to the American Correctional Association standards at this time.

Respondent D:

Question 1: Respondent D reported that he did not view the standards as being specific enough to tell one how to go about meeting the standards.

Question 2: Respondent D did not believe the standards to be adequate, in and of themselves, but felt that, with the addition of North Central accreditation and the goals of the Department of Corrections policy directive on education, the department would have a complete evaluation system.

Summary of administrator interviews: The administrators who were interviewed believed that all of the Correctional Association standards were adequate for evaluating a corrections education program.

Research Question 2

To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the American Correctional Association education standards?

Education consultants' ratings.--The Department of Corrections education consultants were asked to rate the department's education programs relative to their compliance with the American Correctional

Association education standards. The consultants were asked to respond to the following statement:

Please rate each of the following American Correctional Association standards on academic education on a scale of one to five, as to how well you believe the corrections schools, as a whole, are in compliance with each standard.

A rating of one would indicate little or no compliance.

A rating of five would indicate compliance.

The results of this rating are shown in Table 7.

Summary of education consultants' ratings: Ratings by the Central Office education consultants indicated low compliance with the following three American Correctional Association standards by corrections schools:

- 2-4433 - There is a system whereby the academic programs are assessed against stated objectives by qualified individuals, professional groups, and trade associations; this assessment is done at least every three years.
- 2-4437 - The institution uses community resources in developing academic programs for selected inmates.
- 2-4438 - The educational program in coordination with other institutional services provides instruction in functional social skills.

The Central Office education consultants were neutral or undecided about corrections schools' compliance with the following five standards:

- 2-4423 - The academic education programs are accredited by the state department of education or a recognized accreditation association. Programs up to the completion of high school and/or GED are available at no cost to inmates.
- 2-4425 - There is a system for ensuring that the academic education programs continue to meet the needs of the inmate population.

Table 7.--Department of Corrections education consultants' ratings of how well they believe the Michigan Department of Corrections schools are in compliance with the American Correctional Association standards on education (N = 16).

Standard Number	Rating Scale ^a					Averages
	1	2	3	4	5	
2-4422				1 4	2 10	4.7
2-4423	1 1		1 3		1 5	3.0
2-4424				1 4	2 10	4.7
2-4425			2 6	1 4		3.3
2-4426			1 3	1 4	1 5	4.0
2-4427			2 6		1 5	3.6
2-4428					3 15	5.0
2-4429				2 8	1 5	4.3
2-4430				2 8	1 5	4.3
2-4431				1 4	2 10	4.7
2-4432		1 2	1 3		1 5	3.3
2-4433	1 1		2 6			2.3
2-4434			2 6	1 4		3.3
2-4435			1 3	1 4	1 5	4.3
2-4437	1 1	1 2		1 4		2.3
2-4438		1 2	2 6			2.7
2-4440				1 4	2 10	4.7
2-4441			1 3	1 4	1 5	4.3

^aA rating of 1 indicates little or no compliance; a rating of 5 indicates compliance. The number in the upper-left diagonal in each cell indicates the number of responses in a given cell. The number in the lower-right diagonal represents the weighted value for the respective cell. This value was determined by multiplying the responses in a cell by the cell value.

- 2-4427 - There is a systematic approach to determine the personnel requirements for the academic programs to ensure all inmates access to staff and services.
- 2-4432 - The institutional staff and/or parent agency conducts an annual evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the academic education program against stated performance objectives.
- 2-4434 - Academic counseling is provided so that inmates are placed in that phase of the educational program suited to their needs and abilities.

The average ratings and the percentages for each standard receiving a low-compliance rating are shown in Table 8. Table 9 shows the average ratings and the percentages for each standard receiving a neutral or undecided rating.

Table 8.--American Correctional Association standards rated by Corrections Department education consultants as having low compliance by corrections schools (N = 3)

Standard Number	Percentage			Average Rating
	Low Compliance	Neutral or Undecided	High Compliance	
2-4433	33	66	..	2.3
2-4437	66	..	33	2.3
2-4438	33	66	..	2.7

Table 9.--American Correctional Association standards receiving neutral or undecided ratings by Corrections Department education consultants in terms of compliance by corrections schools (N = 3).

Standard Number	Percentage			Average Rating
	Low Compliance	Neutral or Undecided	High Compliance	
2-4423	33	33	33	3.0
2-4425	..	66	33	3.3
2-4427	..	66	33	3.6
2-4432	33	33	33	3.3
2-4434	..	66	33	3.3

The Central Office education consultants were unanimous in rating the Department of Corrections schools in high compliance with the following seven American Correctional Association standards:

- 2-4422 - There is a comprehensive education program available to all eligible inmates that extends from literacy training through high school and includes communication skills, mathematics, and social sciences.
- 2-4424 - There is a standardized competency-based curriculum supported by appropriate materials and classroom resources.
- 2-4428 - All academic education personnel are certified by a state department of education or other comparable authority.
- 2-4429 - Academic personnel policies and practices are comparable to local jurisdictions or other appropriate jurisdictions.
- 2-4430 - Salary and benefits for academic personnel are at least the same as state minimums for teachers performing comparable work.
- 2-4431 - The educational program is supported by specialized equipment, including, at a minimum, classrooms, teaching carrels, audiovisual materials and facilities, chalkboards, and administrative space.

2-4440 - Written policy and procedures govern the maintenance and handling of educational records.

Table 10 shows the average ratings and the percentages for each standard receiving a high-compliance rating.

Table 10.--American Correctional Association standards rated by Corrections Department education consultants as having high compliance by corrections schools (N = 3).

Standard Number	Percentage			Average Rating
	Low Compliance	Neutral or Undecided	High Compliance	
2-4422	..	..	100	4.7
2-4424	..	..	100	4.7
2-4428	..	..	100	5.0
2-4429	..	..	100	4.3
2-4430	..	..	100	4.3
2-4431	..	..	100	4.7
2-4440	..	..	100	4.7

Material resources.--The material resources relevant to the American Correctional Association criteria were taken from the Department of Corrections policy directives and procedures. Additional relevant resources were gleaned from Director's Office memos, letters to wardens and superintendents, and other miscellaneous documents. In this section, the American Correctional Association standard is stated, followed by the Department of Corrections policy that indicates compliance with the criterion.

Standard 2-4422 calls for a comprehensive education program for eligible inmates from literacy training through high school completion, as follows:

2-4422 - There is a comprehensive education program available to all eligible inmates that extends from literacy training through high school and includes communication skills, mathematics, and social science.

The Department of Corrections policy directive "Educational Programs for Prisoners" states:

All major institutions will provide instruction in the areas of reading, mathematics, and English for levels "0" through GED test completion.¹

Several of the Department of Corrections goals, in Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, address this issue. Goal 7 states:

Develop procedures to ensure that residents who need education programming are classified to school. Residents not initially enrolled in school or not completing education assignments should be periodically reconsidered for classification to school.²

In addition to the goals, one of the "considerations" of the Michigan Department of Corrections Policy Directive on "Programs for Rehabilitation," DD-DWA-40.01, emphasizes school attendance:

Educational Preparedness: Offenders who are functionally illiterate or educationally retarded, shall be strongly encouraged to remedy these deficiencies. The functionally illiterate should be provided with an opportunity to achieve at least the sixth grade reading level; those with average intelligence, a high school equivalency.³

¹Michigan Department of Corrections, "Educational Programs for Prisoners," Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 2.

²Ibid.

³Michigan Department of Corrections, "Programs for Rehabilitation," Policy Directive PD-DWA-40.01, April 1975, p. 2.

Standard 2-4423 requires that academic programs be accredited.

The standard is as follows:

2-4423 - The academic education programs are accredited by the state department of education or a recognized accreditation association. Programs up to the completion of high school and/or GED are available at no cost to inmates.

There is no Department of Corrections policy on this issue. The Michigan Department of Education does not accredit educational programs. However, corrections schools are seeking North Central Association accreditation.

Standard 2-4424 calls for a competency-based curriculum:

2-4424 - There is a standardized competency-based curriculum supported by appropriate materials and classroom resources.

The Michigan Department of Corrections educational programs have all been developed on a competency-based model. The following quotation was taken from the Department of Corrections Education Management Manual:

The Department of Corrections has designed all education programs along the lines of competency based instruction, a system which provides prisoner-students with a self-paced instructional format which includes discrete learning objectives, criterion tests, course maps, and specifically designated resources.¹

An additional source of evidence is a Department of Corrections procedure establishing guidelines for assessing the implementation of the competency-based instructional model. The information section of the procedure states:

¹Michigan Department of Corrections, "Introduction," Education Management Plan, 1975, p. 2.

The education staff involved will be assessing individual courses and/or learning laboratories on the basis of the following:

- A. Course map
- B. Performance objectives
- C. Criterion tests
- D. Progress plotters
- E. Resources¹

American Correctional Association Standard 2-4125 calls for ensuring that programs meet inmate needs. It requires that:

2-4425 - There is a system for ensuring that the academic education programs continue to meet the needs of the inmate population.

Providing educational programs to meet the needs of inmate students is inherent in the philosophy and goals of the Department of Corrections policy directive on education. The second paragraph of the philosophy states:

Educational programs must respond to the legitimate interests and needs of prisoners. These needs and interests should be reflected in programs which incorporate specific goals and objectives with measurable outcomes. Prisoners often have long histories of academic and social failure so it is important that education programs be conducted in a success-achievement oriented atmosphere.²

The recognition of developing student needs is specified in Goals 4 and 7, respectively:

Goal Four--Design educational programs which recognize individual student needs, interests, and learning styles.

Goal Seven--Develop procedures to ensure that residents who need education programming are classified to school.³

¹Michigan Department of Corrections, "CRI Assessment," Procedure DP-BCF-41.01, November 1976, p. 1.

²Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 1.

³Ibid., p. 2.

Active teacher curriculum committees have been organized to help ensure the consideration of student needs. The Department of Corrections policy directive on education states:

Curricula and resource standards for each program will be recommended by the Department Curriculum Committee for that area and must be approved by the Corrections Education Superintendent.¹

A system has been developed to ensure that all staff members have an opportunity to effect program change. The Education Superintendent's Office Memorandum 1981-1 states:

Attached is a copy of the existing CBI Revision Form. The form is intended to be used for modifying and/or adding resources to existing curriculum lists.²

Criterion 2-4426 provides for the availability of education for the majority of prisoners:

2-4426 - Some educational programs are provided at a time when the majority of inmates can take advantage of the opportunity.

Education policy directive Goal 7 provides for students who are in need of education. It states:

Develop procedures to ensure that residents who need education programming are classified to school. Residents not initially enrolled in school or not completing education assignments should be periodically reconsidered for classification.³

The implication of this goal is that the majority of prisoners who wish to attend school may do so. Prisoners whose educational skills are below the eighth-grade level are strongly encouraged to

¹ Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 4.

² Education Superintendent's Office Memorandum 1980-1, August 4, 1982.

³ Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 2.

skills are below the eighth-grade level are strongly encouraged to attend school.

The Michigan State Industries allows educational leaves of absence for prisoners employed in industries. Following is a quotation from the Michigan Department of Corrections "Program Classification Manual":

"Educational Leaves of Absence--Residents" (PD-BSI-40.01) permits prisoners employed in industries to be assigned to school programming through GED achievement without forfeiting longevity or seniority. It gives assurance that they may return to the original industry on an equal assignment directly, without being subject to a wait on the Industries list.¹

Standard 2-4427 mandates access to staff and services:

2-4427 - There is a systematic approach to determine the personnel requirements for the academic programs to ensure all inmates access to staff and services.

The Department of Corrections student-teacher ratio is 25:2.

The section in the Department of Corrections policy directive on education states:

Staffing for a standard twenty-five student classroom will consist of a certified teacher and a civilian aide or a certified teacher and two resident tutors. Any variances for cause from these standards must be approved by the institution head and the department's Corrections Education Superintendent.²

Item 5 under standards states that "six fifty-minute periods of student contact per day are required of each teacher."³ Teachers are required to work eight hours per day. It is believed that this

¹Michigan Department of Corrections, "Program Classification Manual," p. 30.

²Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 5.

³Ibid., p. 6.

work schedule with the nongraded learning concept should allow ample time for student access to staff and services.

Compliance with Standard 2-4428 requires that all teachers be certified:

2-4428 - All academic education personnel are certified by a state department of education or other comparable authority.

All teachers must hold current State of Michigan certification. The Michigan Department of Civil Service job specification for school teachers specifies that "an employee [in this classification] possess a bachelor's degree in a field of education and possess appropriate certification by the Michigan Department of Education."¹

The Michigan Department of Corrections policy directive on education states in Item 6 under Standards, "Teachers and principals will maintain valid certification."²

2-4429 - Academic personnel policies and practices are comparable to local jurisdictions or other appropriate jurisdiction.

Civil Service wage scales and fringe benefits are determined by a statewide sample. To ascertain if personnel policies are appropriate to local jurisdictions, each school principal would be required to contact local school districts to determine comparable factors.

Standard 2-4430 requires that teacher salary and benefits be commensurate with state minimums, as follows:

¹Michigan Department of Civil Service, Job Specification Manual, School Teachers, revised December 1979.

²Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 6.

2-4430 - Salary and benefits for academic personnel are at least the same as state minimums for teachers performing comparable work.

Civil Service pay scales are determined on state averages. The majority of Michigan corrections teachers are at pay levels comparable to or better than state minimums for public-school teachers. Fringe benefits are comparable to those of public-school teachers.

Standard 2-4431 mandates classrooms, specialized equipment, and adequate resources:

2-4431 - The educational program is supported by specialized equipment, including, at a minimum, classrooms, teaching carrels, audiovisual materials and facilities, chalkboards, and administrative space.

All of the teaching resources and furniture are available in the corrections schools. Furnishings or the type of furniture in the classroom is a teacher option. The audiovisual materials and equipment in the learning laboratory are determined by the teacher curriculum committees.

There is no information from the Department of Corrections mandating or suggesting how a learning laboratory should be furnished.

Standard 2-4432 recommends annual evaluations to assess the school system against stated performance goals:

2-4432 - The institutional staff and/or parent agency conducts an annual evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the academic education program against stated performance objectives.

Role 3 of the Corrections Education Superintendent, as specified in the Michigan Department of Corrections policy directive on education, states:

Monitors [the Corrections Education Superintendent], reviews and assesses institutional educational programming for compliance with Corrections Department Education Policy, and works cooperatively with Program Bureau to ensure evaluation of educational programs.¹

To comply with this mandate, the Department of Corrections central office education staff formally assesses each educational program every six months. The assessment-visit objectives for the 1982 fiscal year are as follows:

School Program Assessment Visit Objectives

*The Education Central Office staff is concerned with the Department of Corrections' efforts in trying to conform with ACA standards. As of January 1982, the major objective will be compliance with the FY 81-82 school spending plans.

During assessment visits, it will most definitely be necessary for students to be present during the classroom observations. If several teachers will be absent on the planned assessment visit date, then the school should notify the Education Central Office so that the date can be changed.

We will also look at the progress made in those areas for improvement that we agreed upon at the last post assessment conference.

In addition, the following items will be considered and observed during the school assessment visits:

1. Teacher assessments completed by school administrations.
2. Compliance with safety practice.
3. Transfer of records--what has come in--how and when did they come in.
4. Teacher records.
5. Proper use of course modules.
6. Proper use of reading materials.
7. Availability of resources.
8. Student enrollment figures.
9. Student attendance figures.
10. Those facilities that have special education students, we will review IEP forms, transfer records and services provided.

¹Policy Directive on Education, PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 8.

11. Those facilities with college programs, we will review enrollment figures.

*PLEASE HAVE ALL PURCHASE ORDERS AVAILABLE IN ORDER TO SHOW COMPLIANCE WITH SCHOOL SPENDING PLANS.¹

In addition to Central Office or local principal assessments, Standard 2-4433 requires evaluation by professional groups against stated objectives:

2-4433 - There is a system whereby the academic programs are assessed against stated objectives by qualified individuals, professional groups, and trade associations; this assessment is done at least every three years.

An advisory team has been established, as required by Standard 2-4433. Below is a copy of a form letter sent to prospective assessment team members:

Dear :

The Department of Corrections is organizing an advisory team to review and assess our academic and vocational programs. The American Corrections Association's (ACA) standards require that this assessment must be performed by qualified professionals representative of the various educational programs operated by the Department of Corrections. To assist the Department of Corrections in meeting the ACA standards, as well as our own internal assessment standards, the Department is requesting the services of professionals such as yourself to serve on the advisory team. You have been recommended to the Department as a professional who is concerned about education and who might be willing to serve as a member of the advisory team.

If you are able to serve on this advisory team, or you can recommend someone that would be willing to serve on the advisory team, please respond to Dr. Patrick Williams, 3222 South Logan, Lansing, Michigan 48913, as soon as possible. Your assistance in this endeavor will be greatly appreciated and beneficial to our educational programs.²

¹Michigan Department of Corrections Assessment Objectives, December 1981.

²Directory Perry Johnson, letter inviting chosen professionals to become members of the advisory team, November 17, 1981.

The first assessment conducted by the Department of Corrections' Advisory Team for Academic and Vocational Education Programs was of the Muskegon Correctional Facility's school program. The assessment was conducted on May 11-12, 1982.¹

Standard 2-4434 calls for program placement suited to student needs:

2-4434 - Academic counseling is provided so that inmates are placed in that phase of the educational program suited to their needs and abilities.

Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, "Educational Programs for Prisoners," mandates:

Each institution will offer education counseling services and will be allocated counselors based on the following:

<u>Average Daily Student Enrollment</u>	<u>Position</u>
150-300	1/2 Counselor
300-400	1 Counselor
400-500	1-1/2 Counselor

Counselors shall possess Michigan counseling certification, or shall meet North Central standards.¹

Flexible scheduling is required by Standard 2-4435:

2-4435 - The educational program allows for flexible scheduling that permits inmates to enter at any time and to proceed at their own learning pace.

The Michigan Department of Corrections' educational programs are all individualized, self-paced programs that students may enter at any time. The following quotation was taken from the Department of Corrections' education management manual:

¹Dr. Patrick Williams, letter to Superintendent Wells, Muskegon Correctional Facility, April 29, 1982.

²Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 12, 1980, p. 6.

The Department of Corrections has designed all education programs along the lines of competency based instruction, a system which provides prisoner-students with a self paced instructional format.¹

The competency-based instruction format has made "open-ended" or "flexible" scheduling a reality. The following quotation is from a report to the Director of the Corrections Department:

"Open ended scheduling" is allowing students to enter a program at any time without the restrictions of a time or date when new classes open for enrollments. As soon as a student has met the objectives of the course, the student is eligible to enroll in the next level or enroll in a different course. It is not necessary for the individual to wait for the end of a term, or for the total class to complete the course.²

To comply with Standard 2-4437, community resources should be used to develop programming for some students:

2-4437 - The institution uses community resources in developing academic programs for selected inmates.

Goal 9 of the Department of Corrections' policy directive on education, PD-BCF-41.03, states:

Establish cooperative relationships with community agencies for the utilization of additional resources where feasible.³

Standard 2-4438 calls for coordination between educational programs and other institutional services providing instruction in social skills:

2-4438 - The educational program in coordination with other institutional services provides instruction in functional social skills.

¹Michigan Department of Corrections, Education Management Plan, 1975, p. 2.

²Wilburt Laubach, Report to the Director on the Education Program, 1975, p. 10.

³Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 12, 1980, p. 6.

Although the corrections schools are encouraged to coordinate with other institutional services, policy and other material resources are silent on this issue.

Standard 2-4440 requires the maintenance of educational records through written policies and procedures:

2-4440 - Written policy and procedures govern the maintenance and handling of educational records.

The objective of the Department of Corrections "Transfer of Educational Records," Procedure DP-BCF-23.02, is:

To provide a method to ensure the prompt and orderly transfer of resident students' cumulative educational records, and to ensure the continuity of student programming, and to minimize the occurrence of education program dropout.¹

The information section states:

For continuation of resident students' growth, both academic and vocational, and the coordination of education programs, student records will be reported on the Student Record Form. . . .²

Standard 2-4441 recommends recognition of student achievements:

2-4441 - Provision is made for formal recognition of specific educational accomplishments.

No Michigan Department of Corrections policy or other documentation provides for recognition of students' educational accomplishments. The majority of institutions issue completion certificates. However, this decision is left to the discretion of the institution staff.

¹Michigan Department of Corrections, Procedure DP-BCF-23.02, Transfer of Education Records, December 1980, p. 1.

²Ibid.

Summary of material resources: Material resources relevant to the American Correctional Association standards for corrections education provided evidence that the Michigan Department of Corrections is in compliance with the majority of the standards.

Conversely, for Standards 2-4437, 2-4438, and 2-4441, material resource data are weak and indicate questionable compliance. The three criteria concern the use of community resources for selected individuals, the coordination of the school program with other institutional service programs, and recognition of academic achievement, respectively. In these three instances, compliance appears to be implied rather than directly stated.

Research Question 3

Are the additional evaluative criteria reasonable/workable to augment the American Correctional Association criteria?

Four additional evaluative criteria were taken from the literature to augment the American Correctional Association standards in areas the researchers believed to be lacking. The administrators and education consultants who participated in the study were asked to react to the four criteria listed below:

1. There is a plan for including teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum change process.
2. There is a plan for continuing curriculum improvement.
3. There is a plan for on-going education staff development.
4. The education program is assessed through regularly scheduled evaluations of the prison education program by the principal. The evaluation should include:

- a. Assessment of teacher classroom performance, such as student orientation to the program, use of CBI modules, and recommended resources including audio-visual;
- b. Record keeping;
- c. General classroom appearance; and
- d. School facility cleanliness and maintenance.

Administrator interviews.--Four individuals were interviewed concerning the importance of the additional criteria for evaluating a corrections school program. The Director of the Michigan Department of Corrections, the Deputy Director in charge of the Bureau of Correctional Facilities, the Superintendent of the Muskegon Correctional Facility, and the former principal of the Muskegon Correctional Facility program were interviewed. To protect the confidentiality of the interviewees, they are referred to by letter designations.

Respondent A: This respondent believed that all of the evaluative criteria taken from the literature were important but that criterion one, "a plan for including teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum change process," was the least important of the four criteria. Respondent A believed that the most important criterion was "a plan for regularly scheduled evaluations of the school program by the principal." He also responded that criterion three, "a plan for on-going staff development," was important but difficult to provide because of the cost of bringing teachers together and paying substitute teachers.

Respondent B: Interviewee B did not believe that the additional evaluative criteria were necessary. His reactions to each of the criteria were as follows:

1. The American Correctional Association standard, quoted below, is sufficient:

2-2245 - There is a system for ensuring that the academic education programs continue to meet the needs of the inmate population.¹

According to this respondent, Standard 2-4425 provides for the inclusion of teacher and student needs in the curriculum change process.

2. Respondent B felt that several of the standards, in combination, ensure that "continuing curriculum improvement will take place."

3. The evaluative criterion, "a plan for on-going education staff development," is mandated by the following American Corrections Association standards, according to this interviewee:

2-4091 - Written policy and procedure provide that all professional specialists employees who have inmate contact receive an additional 40 hours of training during their first year of employment, and an additional 40 hours of training each subsequent year of employment.

2-4099 - Written policy and procedure encourage employees to continue their education.

2-4100 - The institution encourages staff participation in criminal justice and allied professional associations and activities on a local and national level.

2-4101 - The institution provides administrative leave and/or reimbursement for employees attending approved professional meetings, seminars and/or similar work-related activities.²

4. Respondent B also believed that the fourth additional evaluative criterion, "regularly scheduled evaluation of the prison

¹American Correctional Association, Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions, 2nd ed., January 1981, p. 109.

²Ibid., pp. 22-25.

education program by the principal," is effectively covered by the following standard:

2-4078 - Written policy and procedure provide for a written annual performance review of all employees, which is based on defined criteria, and is reviewed and discussed with the employee.¹

This interviewee believed that Standard 2-4078, as well as the central office education staff-assessment programs and the Department of Corrections Advisory Team on education programs, provides a "three-prong" evaluative approach that is more than adequate. He concluded that the American Correctional Association standards should be looked at as a total document, not in isolated sections.

Respondent C: Respondent C's opinion agreed in part with that of Respondent B on the four evaluative criteria from the literature. He believed that criteria one and three, "a plan for including teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum change process" and "the system's plan for on-going education staff development," are definitely covered in the American Correctional Association standards.

Respondent C also concluded that criterion two, "a plan for continuing curriculum improvement," is not represented in the standards. He stated that criterion four, "regularly scheduled evaluation of the school program by the principal," is partially covered in other standards. This respondent felt the standards do not adequately cover criterion four, but he concluded that, to meet the American

¹Ibid., p. 18.

Correctional Association standards, a principal would need to implement the four criteria in the process of collecting his data.

Respondent D: Respondent D's opinion was that all of the evaluative criteria taken from the literature are needed to evaluate a school program but that criterion four, "principal evaluations of the school program," is more important than the other three criteria. This interviewee believed that criterion two, "a plan for on-going curriculum improvement," is needed, but he felt that compliance would be difficult. This would be especially true, he thought, if the plan called for a considerable amount of time out of the classroom. It would also be expensive, he concluded, because substitutes would be necessary, and the cost of travel and lodging would be high because many of the teachers would need to travel long distances to a central location.

Central Office education consultants' ratings.--The education consultants were asked to perform the following task:

Please rate each of the following criteria taken from the literature as to their value for evaluating a corrections education program. (A rating of one would indicate little value, and a rating of five would indicate highly valuable.)

1. The system's plan for including teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum change process.
2. Plans for continuing curriculum improvement.
3. The system's plan for on-going education staff development.
4. The system's plan for regularly scheduled evaluation of the prison education program by the principal. This plan would include:
 - a. Assessment of teacher classroom performance, such as student orientation to the program, use of CBI modules, and recommended resources including audio-visual;
 - b. Record keeping;

- c. General classroom appearance; and
- d. School facility cleanliness and maintenance.

The results of the consultants' ratings are shown in Table 11.

Table 11.--Corrections Department education consultants' ratings of the value of criteria for evaluating a corrections education program.

Criterion Number	Rating Scale					Total	Average
	1	2	3	4	5		
1	1		3		2	13	4.3
2				1	2	14	4.6
3				1	2	14	4.6
4					3	15	5.0

Note: The number in the upper-left diagonal in each cell indicates the number of responses in a given cell. The number in the lower-right diagonal represents the weighted value for the respective cell. This value was determined by multiplying the responses in a cell by the cell value.

Summary of administrators' and education consultants' opinions:

Administrator interviews: There was not total consensus among the persons interviewed concerning the value of the four evaluative criteria taken from the literature. Two of the individuals believed that it is not necessary to supplement the American Correctional Association standards with the four evaluative criteria. They seemed to feel that the Correctional Association standards, as a whole, address these issues.

The other two interviewees emphasized a need of a plan for principals to perform an on-going evaluation of their respective

prison school programs (criterion four). These two individuals appeared to agree that the other three evaluative criteria were important and needed, but these criteria did not receive the positive recognition criterion four did.

Central Office education consultants' ratings: The Central Office education consultants rated the four evaluative criteria taken from the literature in terms of the value of the criteria for evaluating a corrections education program. The data indicated complete agreement among the three consultants about principal evaluation of the prison schools. On criteria two and three there was strong agreement among the consultants. The average score for each rating was 4.6. This average rating score indicates strong agreement with the values of criteria three and four.

For evaluative criterion one, two of the consultants indicated strong agreement concerning its value as a criterion by which to evaluate corrections education programs. One consultant indicated a neutral position on criterion one.

Two interviewees appeared to agree on the value of all four of the criteria taken from the literature. There was consensus between the administrators and consultants concerning the need for a principal-directed evaluation of his school's program.

Research Question 4

To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs as a whole in compliance with the four additional evaluative criteria?

Data from material resources.--As noted before, four additional evaluative criteria were taken from the literature to augment the American Correctional Association standards in areas the researchers believed to be lacking. In this section, each of the additional criteria is restated, followed by data from the material resources that are relevant to each criterion.

Evaluative Criterion One:

There is a plan for including teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum change process.

The second paragraph of the Department of Corrections educational philosophy addresses students' educational needs:

Education programs must respond to the legitimate interests and needs of prisoners. These needs and interests should be reflected in programs which incorporate specific goals and objectives with measurable outcomes.¹

The Department of Corrections' educational goals 4 and 7 also address students' needs. These goals are as follows:

Goal 4: Design educational programs which recognize individual student needs, interests, and learning styles.

Goal 7: Develop procedures to ensure that residents who need education programming are classified to school.²

To ensure that teachers have an avenue for input into the system and that both student and teacher needs are considered, active teacher curriculum committees have been developed. The Department of Corrections policy directive PD-BCF-41.03 states:

¹Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980, p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 2.

Curricula and resource standards for each program will be recommended by the Department Curriculum Committee for that area and must be approved by the Corrections Education Superintendent.¹

Teachers are provided a means for continuous input into the education system through the Competency-Based Instruction (CBI) revision form. The Education Superintendent's Office Memorandum 1981-1 states:

Attached is a copy of the existing CBI Revision Form. The form is intended to be used for modifying and/or adding resources to existing curriculum lists.²

Evaluative Criterion Two:

There is a plan for continuing curriculum improvement.

The primary opportunity for education staff to have input into the curriculum change process is through the use of the CBI Revision Form. The Education Superintendent's Office Memorandum issuing the direction to use the CBI Revision Form was quoted above. Although teacher curriculum committees have been organized, no resource-materials data establish teacher curriculum committees.

Evaluative Criterion Three:

There is a plan for on-going education staff development.

Policy directive PD-BCF-41.03 states: "Successful completion of orientation and on-going Department in-service training will be conditions of continued employment." This appears to be the only

¹Ibid., p. 4.

²Education Superintendent's Office Memorandum 1981-1, August 4, 1981.

reference to staff development in the material resources relevant to evaluative criterion three.

Evaluative Criterion Four:

The education program is assessed through regularly scheduled evaluations of the prison education program by the principal. The evaluation should include:

1. Assessment of teacher classroom performance, such as student orientation to the program, use of CBI modules, and recommended resources including audio-visual;
2. Record keeping;
3. General classroom appearance; and
4. School facility cleanliness and maintenance.

A search of the material resource data relevant to this study did not reveal data pertinent to evaluative criterion four.

Summary of material-resources data: Material-resources data supporting the Michigan Department of Corrections education programs' compliance with the four additional evaluative criteria, which are believed by various researchers to be lacking in the American Correctional Association standards, are not presently available.

The needs of resident students are covered in the Department of Corrections policy directive PD-BCF-41.03, "Educational Programs for Prisoners." Provisions for meeting teacher needs in the curriculum change process are not clearly defined.

Department of Corrections policies and procedures also appear to be silent in providing relevant supportive data indicating compliance with evaluative criteria two, three, and four.

Summary

As a result of analyzing the data, the following conclusions were drawn in relation to the research questions of the study:

1. How adequate are the American Correctional Association standards as evaluative criteria for a corrections education program?

The four Michigan Department of Corrections administrators who were interviewed expressed the opinion that all of the standards are good evaluative criteria for a corrections education program. However, the ratings completed by the corrections principals indicated that they strongly agreed on only eight of the American Correctional Association education standards. Opinions were divided on seven of the standards, and three of the standards were judged as having little value as evaluative criteria for a corrections education program.

2. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the American Correctional Association education standards?

Material resources relevant to the Correctional Association standards for corrections provided documentary evidence that the Michigan Department of Corrections is in compliance with 15 of the 18 standards considered appropriate for this study. Conversely, regarding Standards 2-4437, 2-4438, and 2-4441, material resources appeared to be weak and indicated questionable compliance.

The Central Office education consultants did not believe that the corrections schools are in compliance with the three standards the principals indicated were not good evaluative criteria. The consultants rated the schools, as a whole, in compliance with only 6 of the 18 standards. (See Table 12.)

The data were not conclusive on five of the standards, and the consultants' opinions were evenly distributed from three to five on Standards 2-4426, 2-4435, and 2-4441.

Table 12.--Comparison of corrections school principals' ratings of the value of the American Correctional Association standards as criteria with which to evaluate a prison education program with Central Office education consultants' ratings of how well the corrections schools are meeting the standards.

Standard Number	Principals			Central Office Consultants		
	High	Low	Not Definite	High	Low	Not Definite
2-4422	X			X		
2-4423			X			X
2-4424	X			X		
2-4425	X					X
2-4426		X				X
2-4427			X			X
2-4428	X			X		
2-4429		X		X		
2-4430			X			X
2-4431	X			X		
2-4432			X			X
2-4433			X		X	
2-4434	X					X
2-4435	X					X
2-4437		X			X	
2-4438			X		X	
2-4440	X			X		
2-4441			X			X
Total	8	3	6	6	3	9

A comparison of the data collected from the material resources and the human resources revealed that standards for which the material data indicated noncompliance received low or undecided ratings from both the corrections principals and the Central Office education consultants.

3. Are the four additional evaluative criteria reasonable/workable to augment the American Correctional Association criteria?

The four Corrections Department administrators were not in total agreement on the value of the additional evaluative criteria. The two institution administrators believed that the additional standards were not necessary. They thought that other American Correctional Association standards, not identified as education standards, provide for the additional criteria.

The Central Office administrators believed that all of the criteria were important but prioritized them, with "a plan for including teachers and students' needs in the curriculum change process" being the least important and "principal evaluations of the school program" being the most important. They also agreed that criterion three, "on-going staff development," was desirable but difficult to achieve because of cost.

The Central Office consultants' ratings revealed that the consultants agreed with the Central Office administrators, the Director of the Department of Corrections, and the Deputy Director in charge of the Bureau of Correctional Facilities.

4. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the four additional evaluative criteria?

The needs of students are addressed in policy directives; however, provision for meeting teacher needs is not clearly defined. In addition, there are no relevant supportive data indicating compliance with additional evaluative criteria two, three, and four. Department of Corrections documentation is not available to direct the prison schools to comply with the four additional evaluative criteria that were drawn from the education literature.

In Chapter V, a summary of the study is presented, conclusions are drawn from the data, and recommendations are made for additions to the Department of Corrections policies and procedures to ensure compliance with the American Correctional Association standards and with the additional evaluative criteria. Suggested changes in the American Correctional Association standards are also delineated.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This chapter contains a summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the data analysis, recommendations for the Michigan Department of Corrections relevant to program evaluation, and suggestions for further study.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to consider the American Correctional Association education standards as they relate to the following research questions:

1. How adequate are the American Correctional Association education standards as evaluative criteria for a corrections education program?
2. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the American Correctional Association education standards?
3. Are the four additional evaluative criteria reasonable/workable to augment the American Correctional Association criteria?
4. To what extent are the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs, as a whole, in compliance with the four additional evaluative criteria?

The literature review included a history of education in the Michigan prison system, a look at what is happening in corrections education in general, and a review of the educational literature relevant to evaluative criteria in use today.

From the review of the literature in education, four evaluative criteria that are of special importance in evaluating an educational program were selected for inclusion in this study. These criteria are:

1. There is a plan for including teachers' and students' needs in the curriculum change process.
2. There is a plan for continuing curriculum improvement.
3. There is a plan for on-going education staff development.
4. The education program is assessed through regularly scheduled evaluations of the prison education program by the principal. The evaluation should include:
 - a. Assessment of teacher classroom performance, such as student orientation to the program, use of CBI modules, and recommended resources including audio-visual;
 - b. Record keeping;
 - c. General classroom appearance; and
 - d. School facility cleanliness and maintenance.

The review of the literature revealed additional evaluative criteria for educational programs relate to a sound philosophy and adequate goals and objectives. The educational philosophy and the goals and objectives of a program are high on the scale of criteria for evaluating an educational program. However, these criteria were not included in this study as criteria with which to evaluate the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs. The Department of Corrections policy directive "Education Programs for Prisoners, PD-BCF-41.03" includes the Michigan Department of Corrections'

philosophy of education and the goals and objectives of the educational programs.

This study also included a brief history of education in Michigan corrections from the mid-1800s to the present. Findings revealed that corrections education in Michigan experienced a slow evolution from its early beginnings as a church school to a standard, rather conservative, high school program closely embracing the tenets of the public school. The education programs in each institution were autonomous, with little or no attempt at coordination.

In 1974, the staff position of Director of Education was created and filled. The first tasks of the Director of Education were (1) to coordinate the prison schools and (2) to develop stronger remedial programs. Since 1974, the Michigan Department of Corrections' education programs have not identified with the public high school. Programs have departed significantly from the public high school model. The Department of Corrections teachers have endorsed the completion of the General Education Development examination as the terminal objective of the corrections academic programs. Competency-based courses, which were developed by the teachers' curriculum committees, aid students in reaching the terminal objective of satisfactory completion of the General Education Development examination.

Some of the data for this study, relevant to the American Correctional Association standards on education and the four additional evaluative criteria chosen from the literature, were provided by human resources. These resources included the Director of the Michigan Department of Corrections, the Deputy Director in charge of the Bureau

of Correctional Facilities, the superintendent of a correctional institution, and a former school principal. The prison school principals and the Central Office education consultants also provided data relevant to the value of the American Correctional Association standards as criteria with which to evaluate an educational program. The Central Office education consultants also provided data relevant to the four additional evaluative criteria as standards with which to evaluate an educational program.

In addition to the data from the human resources, an in-depth analysis was made of the formal and informal documents of the Michigan Department of Corrections for data that would indicate Department of Corrections compliance with the American Correctional Association standards on corrections education and with the four additional evaluative criteria.

Conclusions

As a result of the data analysis, it can be concluded that the majority of the American Correctional Association standards are considered as adequate criteria with which to evaluate the Michigan Department of Corrections' educational programs. A small percentage of the standards are believed to be inadequate criteria with which to evaluate a corrections education program in Michigan prisons. (See Table 13.) They include criteria dealing with the provision of educational programs at a time when the majority of inmates can attend school, the comparison of corrections school personnel policies to those of local public schools, and the use of community resources to develop educational programs for selected students.

Table 13.--Summary of data indicating adequacy of compliance with American Correctional Association standards and additional criteria (in percent).

	Adequacy of Compliance		
	Not Adequate	Undecided	Adequate
The American Correctional Association standards in general	16.0	17.2	66.8
Michigan Department of Corrections compliance with Correctional Association standards	12.5	20.8	66.6
Four additional criteria in general	0.0	10.0	90.0
Michigan Department of Corrections compliance with four additional criteria	75.0	25.0	0.0

Note: Table 13 was compiled from the data for the respective listed conditions.

Although the data indicated that the Department of Corrections can meet the majority of the standards, the combination of those standards judged as not being adequate criteria with which to evaluate a corrections education program and those for which the data were not conclusive present a rather high percentage of standards with which compliance is currently doubtful.

The data definitely revealed that the additional evaluative criteria drawn from the educational literature are adequate criteria to augment the American Correctional Association standards. (See Table 13.) The data also revealed that the Michigan Department of

Corrections would have difficulty complying with the four additional criteria at this time.

Recommendations

Several recommendations might be offered to the Michigan Department of Corrections and the American Correctional Association. These are:

1. The American Correctional Association is encouraged to include as one of its essential standards for a corrections education program that it be essential for an educational program to have a philosophy of education and a well-developed set of goals and objectives.
2. The Michigan Department of Corrections' policy directive PD-BCF-41.03, "Education Programs for Prisoners," should be revised to provide the necessary direction encouraging the individual corrections schools to work toward compliance with the American Correctional Association standards and with the suggested additional evaluative criteria that were included in this study.
3. The revision of the Michigan Department of Corrections' Policy Directive on "Education Programs for Prisoners" should mandate the development of procedures to implement the American Correctional Association standards.
4. To ensure compliance with the third additional evaluative criterion, a plan for on-going education-staff development should be initiated. It is recommended that this plan grow out of the data gained from a comprehensive needs assessment. The needs of corrections

school administrators, corrections teachers, and teacher aides should be included in the staff-development plan.

5. The staff-development plan should contain a decentralization component. This would allow a total institution staff, or a single staff member, to participate in staff-development activities tailored to their individual needs.

6. The staff-development needs assessment and the ensuing staff-development plan should be contracted to an outside agency, the Department of Education, a college or university, or consultants who specialize in education staff training. This important project should not be left to an already overburdened Central Office education staff.

7. The Michigan Department of Corrections should view the funding of the needs assessments and the staff-development programs as a necessary cost. They should budget for the training and seek a fixed line-item appropriation in the school budget for this purpose.

8. To develop a more enlightened inmate-tutor cadre in institutions in which inmate tutors are used in the school program, it is recommended that a training program for tutors be developed and used.

9. A procedure should be developed to ensure compliance with the fourth evaluative criterion from the education literature, "assessment of corrections school programs by the school principal." The procedure should include the recommended vehicle or instrument to be used in conducting the needs assessment, the number of times assessments should be conducted each year, the follow-up activities expected

as a result of the evaluation, and the training that must be mastered by the principal before conducting the teacher assessment.

10. The American Correctional Association should include standards for the minimal qualification of a corrections school administrator.

11. The American Correctional Association should also include provisions in the standards for the continuous training of the prison school principal.

Suggestions for Further Study

Several suggestions are offered for further study:

1. Long-range changes in the corrections education program, as a result of continued compliance with the standards and evaluative criteria, should be studied.

2. The effectiveness of current staff-development programs as a means of inducing change in educational institutions should be compared with other methods of bringing about change.

3. A study comparing the short- and long-range results of in-service education should be conducted.

4. A study would be useful to determine whether staff members' attitudes toward the institution and students change as a result of in-service education.

Reflections

Corrections is a difficult arena in which to work. Bell wrote:

Correctional educators labor under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. Not only do they work in a grim environment, often with poor equipment and few resources, but they also deal with people who have poor motivation and a record of failure. However, with the tools for survival--basic reading, writing, arithmetic and a marketable job skill--a released inmate's chances of not returning to crime are considerably increased. We must make sure that incarceration is a sentence to temporary loss of freedom; not a sentence to lifelong ignorance, unemployment, poverty, and crime. Correctional education can be the way out; we must give it our support.¹

The review of the literature on corrections education revealed that little or no evaluation of corrections education programs has been done. The probable reason is that corrections education has not developed a sound educational philosophy of education or comprehensive goals and objectives. In addition, corrections school administrators and teachers have not been well prepared for their task and do not appear to be receiving the necessary in-service training. In considering the Michigan Department of Corrections in particular, the following ideas are offered in an attempt to improve corrections education in Michigan:

1. The Michigan Department of Corrections should employ additional staff members in the Central Office education section. The multiplicity of required tasks is too overwhelming for the current number of Central Office education staff to complete correctly and promptly.

2. When employing teachers and other professional staff, the Department of Corrections should employ individuals who possess

¹T. H. Bell, "Education: A Weapon Against Crime," a forum on education sponsored by the Corrections Program, U.S. Department of Education, March 1981, pp. 5-6.

well-rounded experience as well as a knowledge of adult learning theory and experience in teaching adults.

3. The Corrections Department's chief administrators should understand that there are no education programs like the one that is currently in operation in Michigan. Therefore, it is in the Department's best interest to train all of the teachers and administrators concerning what is expected and how they can function in a prison setting.

4. The Corrections Department should stop using the academic/vocational budget as a trust fund to "bail out" the institutions when they are in financial trouble. Recently, this practice has been a detriment to and has discouraged the long-range planning for Michigan corrections education that should be taking place.

5. Evaluators should continually evaluate the education programs with a goal of improving educational programming when needed. Such research should not be conducted to justify education for prisons, nor should it be conducted for the sole purpose of determining if the "act" of getting an education reduces recidivism.

6. The Corrections Department should study the feasibility of placing additional computer-assisted instruction as a major resource in all of the corrections schools. Computer terminals should be placed on institution work assignments as well as in the school to allow students who are working to go to the computer at their assigned times.

7. A Director's Office memo should be issued, directing the Michigan corrections schools to seek North Central Association

accreditation. This step should be taken before seeking the American Correctional Association accreditation.

8. The Michigan Department of Corrections should place the educational program on a level with corrections work assignments and as a first priority for those individuals who cannot read or who have not completed the equivalent of high school.

Concluding Statement

Although this study dealt with a single state's corrections department, the principles and criteria discussed in Chapter II and the recommendations offered in Chapter V could be applicable to the majority of corrections education programs in the United States. The problems confronting educational programs in a correctional setting are not peculiar to the Michigan Department of Corrections.

National statistics reveal that the educational levels of men and women entering prisons across the nation are not dissimilar. The attitudes of the public in general are well stated in the following quotation:

The public's ambivalence about the dual purposes of incarceration, security, and rehabilitation has been a major obstacle to the development of good educational programs in correctional institutions. Americans usually hold one of the following attitudes toward the education and training of offenders: (1) offenders have by the commission of crime forfeited their right to education/training; (2) offenders have the right to education and training, and are thus more likely to be successfully rehabilitated; and (3) offenders and their needs are of little interest and concern to society at large.¹

¹The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Vocational Education in Corrections Institutions, Report to the President and Congress of the United States, March 1981, p. 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Bar Association, Clearinghouse for Offender Literacy Programs. Reading Program Resource Manual for Adult Basic Education. Washington, D.C.: American Bar Association, 1974.
- American Correctional Association. Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions. 2nd ed. College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, January 1981.
- Angle, Terry. "The Development of Educational Programs in American Adult Prisons and Juvenile Reformatories During the Nineteenth Century." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (September 1982): 4-7.
- APL Project Staff, University of Texas. "Adult Performance Level Competency Based High School Diploma Program Offers Alternative." Journal of Correctional Education 28,3 (1976): 2-7.
- Auer, Michael. "Inmate Education at the State Prison of Southern Michigan: The Little Brick School House, 1949-1966." Term paper, July 1966.
- Bates, Gerald K. "Prison TV for Education." American Journal of Corrections 21,1 (1967).
- Belcastro, Frank P.; Cocha, Walter A.; and Valois, John A. "The Use of Programmed Instruction in United States Correctional Institutions." Journal of Correctional Education 22 (Winter 1970).
- Bell, Raymond and associates. A Model for the Evaluation of Correctional Education Programs. National Correctional Education Evaluation Project, School of Education, Lehigh University, August 1977.
- Bell, Raymond, et al. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. Correctional Education Programs for Inmates, National Evaluation Programs, Phase I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1979.
- Bell, T. H. "Education: A Weapon Against Crime." A forum on education sponsored by the Corrections Program, U.S. Department of Education, March 1981.

- Beto, George. The Houston Post, December 29, 1979, p. 27C. Quoted by Conrad, John P. Adult Offender Education Programs. Monograph prepared for the National Institution of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, March 1981.
- Black, Hartzel. "Innovation Key to Success." Region III Newsletter (Vienna, Ill., Correctional Education Association) 6 (Winter 1982).
- Broudy, Harry S. "Uses of Cognitive Form." In Curriculum Development: Issues and Insights. Edited by Donald E. Orlosky and Othanel B. Smith. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co., 1978.
- Brown, Mack. "Preparing Correction Educators to Teach Delinquents With Learning and Reading Disabilities." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (March 1981).
- California Department of Education, Adult Education Field Service Unit. Competency Based Adult Education: A Process Model. Sacramento: Adult Education Field Services Unit, February 1979.
- Carsetti, Janet K. Literacy: Problems and Solutions. A Resource Handbook for Correctional Educators. Washington, D.C.: American Bar Association, Clearinghouse for Offender Literacy Programs, 1975.
- _____. Motivational Activities for Reluctant Readers. Silver Springs, Md.: READ, Inc., 1979.
- Caswell, Hollis L., and Campbell, Doak S. Curriculum Development. New York: American Book Company, 1935.
- Clark, Wayne W., and Clark, Nan E. Recent and Potential Developments in Adult Education. An Annotated Bibliography. San Diego, Calif.: Information Collection, Evaluation and Dissemination System, n.d.
- Conrad, John P. Adult Offender Education Programs. Monograph prepared for the National Institution of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, March 1981.
- Cram, David. "Preparation and Use of Instructional Modules in Driver and Safety Education." Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility, n.d.
- Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. "Education of Handicapped Children." Federal Register, Tuesday, August 23, 1977, Part II, pp. 42477-42478.
- Gaither, Carl C. "Education Behind Bars: An Overview." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (June 1982): 19-22.

- Gehering, Thom. "Zebulon Brockway of Elmira: 19th Century CE Hero." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (March 1982): 4-7.
- Gwynn, Minor J. Curriculum Principles and Social Trends. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943.
- Hass, Glen. Curriculum Planning: A New Approach. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.
- Hilfiker, Eugene E. "Implementation of an Adult Basic Education Program in a Correctional Setting." In Education for Adults in Correctional Associations: A Book of Readings, pp. 236-51. Edited by T. A. Ryan. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- Horvath, Gerald J. "Issues in Correctional Education: A Conundrum of Conflict." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (September 1982): 8-14.
- Kilty, Ted K. "A Study of the Characteristics of Reading Programs in Federal, State and City-County Penal Institutions." Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, School of Education, 1977.
- Drug, Edward A. Curriculum Planning. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1950.
- Lane, Murray. "The School District Concept." Adult Leadership (June 1975): 358-60.
- Laubach, Wilburt. "Report to the Director of Corrections on the Department of Correction Education Programs."
- Lucas, Geoffrey S. "Hints on Individualization in ABE and GED." Journal of Correctional Education 30,1 (1979): 9.
- MacCormick, Austin H. The Education of Adult Offenders. New York: National Society of Penal Reformation, 1931.
- _____. Survey of Michigan Penal Institutions. New York: The Osborne Association, Inc., 1940.
- Mangano, Joseph, and Bosco, Joseph. "Redesigning Academic Curriculum." Journal of Correctional Education 28,1 (1976): 14-16.
- Maresh, A. L., Education Coordinator, Minnesota Corrections Department. December 1981.
- Marsh, John J. "Academia in Correctional Education: Partner, Patsy of Panacea." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (June 1982): 23-25.

- _____. "Correctional Educators--The Forgotten Professionals?" Journal of Correctional Education 29,1 (1977): 6-9.
- _____. "GED Testing in State Penal Institutions." Journal of Correctional Education 25,1 (1973): 13-23.
- _____, and Adams, Stuart N. "Prison Education Tomorrow." In School Behind Bars, pp. 97-110. Edited by Michael V. Reagan and Donald M. Stoughton. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1976.
- McCollum, Sylvia G. "A Look at Correctional Education From the Federal Level." Journal of Correctional Education 28,3 (1976): 11-12.
- _____. "New Designs for Correctional Education and Training Programs." Federal Probation, June 1973, pp. 6-11. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 109 373, 1973.
- _____. "Say, Have You Got Anything Around Here for a Dummy?" Federal Probation 35,3 (1971): 37-42.
- McKee, John M. "Hardware and Software for Adult Basic Education in Corrections." In Education for Adults in Correctional Institutions, Vol. II, pp. 556-69. Edited by T. R. Ryan. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- _____, and others. Improving the Reading Level of Disadvantaged Adults. Elmore, Alabama: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1967. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 015 117, 1967.
- McNeil, John D. Curriculum: A Comprehensive Introduction. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1981.
- McPherson, Alfred Angus Murray. "An Analysis of Selected Perceptions of Curriculum Development as Expressed by Pupils and Instructional Personnel in Manitoba." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976.
- Michigan. Annual Report of the Inspectors of the State Prison, 1858.
- _____. Annual Report of the Inspectors of the State Prison, 1879.
- _____. Annual Report of the Inspection of the State Prison, 1881.
- _____. Biennial Report of the Board of Control and Officers of the Michigan State Prison, June 30, 1904-1908.
- _____. Biennial Report of the Board of the State Commissioners of Charitable, Penal, Pauper, and Reformatory Institutions for the Two Years Ending June 30, 1874.

- _____. Corrections Education GED Completion Resource List, 1979.
- Michigan Department of Civil Service. "Job Specification Manual: School Teachers." Revised December 1979.
- Michigan Department of Corrections. Education Management Plan, 1975.
- _____. Education Superintendent Memorandum, "Corrections School Assessment Objectives."
- _____. Education Superintendent's Office Memorandum, August 1982.
- _____. "Educational Programs for Prisoners," Policy Directive PD-BCF-41.03, June 1980.
- _____. "Entry-Level Test Scores of Male Felons for Year 1975. Computer Printout, October 1976.
- _____. "Transfer of Education Records," Procedure DP-BCF-23.02, December 1980.
- _____. "CRI Assessment," Procedure DP-BCF-41.01, November 1976.
- _____. "Program Classification Manual," 1982.
- _____. "Programs for Rehabilitation," PD-DWA-40.01, April 1975.
- _____. The Michigan State Prison, 1837-1928.
- Michigan Department of Education. "The Adult Education Act." Public Law 91-230, amended through November 1, 1978. Compilation by the Michigan Department of Education.
- Michigan Revised Statutes of 1846, Chapter 172, Section 50.
- Michigan State Conference of the Charities and Corrections, 1883.
- Murry, Lane. "The Role of Federal Government in Adult Education." Journal of Correctional Education 28,1 (1976): 2-3.
- National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Vocational Education in Corrections Institutions. Report to the President and Congress of the United States, March 1981.
- National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. Correctional Education Programs for Inmates, National Evaluation Program, Phase I. Raymond Bell, Elizabeth Conrad, Thomas Laffey, J. Gary Lutz, Paul Van Reed Miller, Christine Simon, Ann E. Stakelon, Nancy Jean Wilson. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Stock No. 281-3801/1608, June 1979.

- Norde, Gerald. "Certain Sociological Characteristic Differences in the Correctional Education Learners and the Public School Learners." Journal of Offender Counseling and Rehabilitation 5,2 (1980-81): 85-93.
- _____. "Correctional Education Performance Competency Standards." Journal of Correctional Education 30,1 (1979): 13-15.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. "Policies and Standards for the Approval of Optional Schools and Special Function Schools," n.d.
- Orlosky, Donald E., and Smith, Othanel B. Curriculum Development: Issues and Insights. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1978.
- PLATO Correctional Project Staff. "Computer Based Education Has Been Introduced in Three Illinois Prisons." American Journal of Corrections 40,1 (1978): 6-7, 34-37.
- PLATO CMI Author's Guide. Minneapolis, Minn.: Control Data Corporation, 1978.
- Platt, John S.; Tunisk, Roy H.; and Wienke, Wilfred D. "Developing the Work and Life Skills of Handicapped Inmates." Corrections Today 44 (February 1982): 66-73.
- The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Corrections. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.
- "Purpose of Title I Grants for Local Education." Federal Register 46, no. 12, 19 January 1982.
- Purves, John H. The Nightkeeper's Report. Jackson: The State Prison of Southern Michigan, 1975.
- Reagen, Michael V., and Stoughton, Donald M., eds. School Behind Bars. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1976.
- Reid, William A. Thinking About Curriculum. Boston: Rutledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Reynolds, Jean. "Incarcerated Students: Change and Conflict." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (September 1982).
- Roberts, Albert E., ed. Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.
- _____. Sourcebook on Prison Education. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

- _____, and Coffey, Osa D. A State of the Art Survey for a Correctional Education Network, Part I. College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1976.
- _____. A State of the Art Survey for a Correctional Education Network, Part II. College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1976.
- Roberts, Kathy. "The Professional Development of Correctional Educators." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (March 1982): 20-21.
- Rocco, James. "Pluto Terminals Available in Corrections Education." Southfield, Mich.: Control Data Corporation, March 1982.
- Romine, Stephen A. Building the High School Curriculum. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1954.
- Ryan, T. A., ed. Correctional Education: A Projection for the Future. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1977.
- _____. Education for Adults in Correctional Institutions: A Book of Readings, Volume I. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- _____. Education for Adults in Correctional Institutions: A Book of Readings, Volume II. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- _____. "The Individualized Adult Life Skills System." Journal of Correctional Education 33 (September 1982): 27-32.
- _____. Paper presented at a workshop for Michigan corrections teachers, 1974.
- _____. "Strategies for Evaluating Adult Basic Education in Corrections." Prepared for Regional Training Seminar on Adult Basic Education in Corrections, St. Paul, Minnesota, March 1971.
- _____; Clark, Dale W.; Hatrak, Robert S.; Hinders, Dean; Keeney, J. C. Verl; Oresic, Joseph; Orrell, James B.; Sessions, Arnold R.; Streed, James L.; and Wells, H. Gary. Model of Adult Basic Education in Corrections. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- Ryan, T. A.; Hartrak, Robert S.; Hinder, Dean; Keeney, J. C.; Oresic, Joseph; Orrell, James B.; and Wells, H. Gary. Model of Adult Career Education in Corrections. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- Saylor, Galen J.; Alexander, William M.; and Marconnit, George D. Contemporary Thought on Public School Curriculum: Readings. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown and Co., Publishers, 1968.

- Short, Edmund C., and Marconnit, George D. Contemporary Thought on Public School Curriculum: Readings. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown and Co., Publishers, 1968.
- Stratemeyer, Florence B.; Forkner, Hamden L.; and Mekin, Margaret G. Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947.
- Taylor, Ann, Assistant Director of the California Department of Corrections. Interview, December 1981.
- Texas Department of Corrections. The Basics of Individualized Instruction in Correctional Education. Huntsville: Windham School District, 1975.
- Udvari, Stephen S. "Hardware and Software for Adult Basic Education." In Education for Adults in Correctional Institutions, Vol. II, pp. 530-47. Edited by T. A. Ryan. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1975.
- University of Southern California, College of Continuing Education in Corrections. "The Assessment of Inmate Learning Needs: Research Methodology and Survey Results." Los Angeles: University of Southern California, College of Continuing Education in Corrections, 1978. (Mimeographed.)
- University of Texas at Austin. The Adult Performance Level Competency-Based High School Diploma Program. 4th ed. Austin: University of Texas, May 1978.
- _____. Final Report: The Adult Performance Level Study. Austin: University of Texas, 1977.
- U.S. Office of Education. Education Programs That Work. 5th ed. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.
- Watson, M. R., and Stump, E. S. "Predicting the General Education Development Test Score." Journal of Correctional Education 26,1 (1974): 8-10.
- Williams, David C. "Rethinking Correctional Staff Development." Journal of Correctional Education 29,1 (1977): 14-16.