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Abstract

Recently the Statewide education program of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) was substantially reduced as a result of several severe rounds of budget cuts. Additional waves of cuts are projected. Now is the best time to plan the attributes of a system that can follow these cuts.

The current, much reduced CDCR education capability is a departure from how correctional education was previously implemented; it represents a massive discontinuity in service delivery. The cuts opened the door to a “new” pattern of educational service delivery—but it was actually the same pattern that was perceived as innovative in the local schools throughout the United States during the 1797-1805 period. Parts of that pattern remained operational in prisons until 1965. Perhaps, therefore, it is most charitable to report that California’s current correctional education approach was common throughout the nation’s prisons until 1965.

Nevertheless, this discontinuity can be an opportunity to take stock of how CDCR formerly operated its Statewide education system, and how that system might be improved. There is a short list of elements of the current, reduced system that might be seen as advantages, even though most of the effects of the cuts were especially difficult for inmate students and the “outside” communities they represent, correctional educators, and institutional managers. Two of the most salient elements on that short list are that steps have been taken by CDCR to foster greater inmate responsibility for aspects their own education and, simultaneously, greater emphasis has been put on volunteer enrollments as opposed to mandatory enrollments.

In addition to the terrible budgetary problems there is another, perhaps more ominous problem. For a variety of reasons correctional educators have not had access to their own literature, the literature of correctional education and of its history. This problem is especially difficult because most correctional educators are not aware that there is indeed a literature which could help them sort out the current discontinuity, the problem of a much reduced program. The purpose of this report is to make a concise summary of the parts of the literature that can be most salient to the current, reduced program situation, and to the structure that might be implemented when the budget situation eases.

The report consists of 11 recommendations and supportive narrative and charts. Ten of the recommendations directly respond to four questions advanced by the California Senate Office of Research. The centerpiece recommendation proposes that the key initiative in the effort to improve and refine CDCR education should be to make program parameters and evaluations consistent with both traditional practice and the problems that those practices have been unable to overcome. Alternatively stated, California correctional educators need access to the literature of their own field. Their lack of access has exacerbated all the current problems and led to a situation in which correctional educators have to “reinvent the wheel” every time they encounter a problem they perceive as “new.” This lack of access is an issue of life and death proportion in the lives of inmates and in the communities they represent. The report identifies no “magic bullet” that can immediately transform CDCR education, but taken together it introduces high visibility/low resource solutions to some of the most pressing problems.
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Introduction

Unfortunately, the problems that plague CDCR education are neither new nor unique to California. The first nationwide survey of correctional education, Austin MacCormick’s *The Education of Adult Prisoners*, was published 80 years ago, in 1931. His observations would have applied as well in 1876 as in 1931, and most of them are applicable in California today. Under the “Causes of Failure” heading, MacCormick wrote the following:

The ineffectiveness of the educational programs of our penal institutions is chiefly due to one, many, or all of the following things: The inherent difficulties of the situation; low aim; narrowness of scope; . . . failure to apply modern psychology and educational technique; . . . failure to relate education to life and to relate the various types of education to each other; failure to make use of the cooperation of state and private educational agencies or inability to secure aid from them; the indifference, ignorance or hostility of institutional officials; inadequate financial support; inexpert supervision and teaching; poor physical facilities; poor textual and supplementary material; and poor libraries. *The Chief Weaknesses.* The most important weakness, after one considers the low aim which characterizes educational work in penal institutions, is inadequate finances. . . . The crux of the matter is the lack of financial support. . . . The resolving factor in the improvement of educational work will always be personnel, but this is only another way of saying that without adequate funds no substantial progress will be made. Today not a single prison in the country has adequate funds for educational and library work; few have funds that are anywhere near adequate. . . . many of the shortcomings of educational programs cannot fairly be charged to institution officials. Even if they knew how their work could be effectively expanded, they could not pay the bill with present appropriations. (pp. 43-44; emphasis in original).

MacCormick’s conclusion for his chapter on “The Present Situation” follows:

. . . educational work in our American penal institutions is still at a comparatively low ebb, chiefly because of its low aim and its lack of financial support. Not only is there need for a more forward-looking and more generous attitude on the part of legislators, but there is also need for a sharper focusing of aims, a redefinition and restatement of the very vague educational and social philosophy which underlies the limited educational programs to be found today in American prisons and reformatories for adults. Hope for the future rests on expert staffs, adequate appropriations, and complete recognition of the validity of the claim of education to a place in the penal program. Today we have too often in their place inexpert direction, starvation-ration appropriations, and a view of education which allows grade school teaching of little more than the three R’s to pass as an educational program. So long as this is true we shall have only the slow and piecemeal progress represented by . . . sporadic and often insignificant accomplishments . . . . When the concept of liberal education, liberally supported, enters the thought of
penal authorities, the first step will have been taken toward meeting the educational needs of the...adults in our prisons and reformatories. (pp. 48-49).

With a few minor adjustments, MacCormick’s findings would be as accurate today as they were in 1931. In broad form, they represent the context in which the current report was prepared.

There have been many useful reports since 1931 on how to implement and evaluate correctional education programs in the United States. In many ways, the following passages from Searcy’s 2008 dissertation, An Assessment of Correctional Education, Programs, and Services on Inmate Recidivism, are typical. “[T]he needs of inmate learners are often overlooked by lawmakers and administrators because of budgetary issues, and furthermore, the learning needs of inmates are not the main priority of most correctional institutions” (p. 67). “In spite of continued success, correctional education...programs...and services in correctional facilities are often limited, archaic, under staffed, periodic, endangered, and lack essential resources” (p. 71).

The current report was written in response to a request for proposals (RFP) by the Faculty Research Fellows Program, at the Center for California Studies, which is located at California State University, Sacramento. The RFP explained that the California Senate Office of Research (SOR) “requested assistance...to evaluate alternative approaches to literacy education in California state prisons” (Leach, 2011, first page). The current report comes at a time when debilitating budget constraints have been experienced throughout the Statewide education program of the California Department of Corrections and Research (CDCR). These conditions have resulted in a Statewide program discontinuity—a crisis or time of maximum flux in the system.

The discontinuity is exacerbated by the lack of access that correctional educators have to their own literature, the literature of correctional education. Most other teachers (for example, secondary math or English teachers, elementary, or special education teachers) have opportunities to study their respective literatures—the “canon,” the pantheon of heroes and heroines who were its greatest contributors, and in most cases the statutory, regulatory, and policy parameters that “drive” classroom practice in their field of education. But no state has a credential or qualification for correctional educators, so correctional educators are condemned to “reinvent the wheel” every time they confront a problem that seems new. They are not generally aware of what works in the prisons of another state, or sometimes even at the prison down the road, and are certainly not aware of what has worked at other times or in different nations. As if this was not enough of a challenge, most of the best books on correctional education are long out of print and very difficult to access without help from people who have been able to direct time to studying the literature of correctional education. Kistler (1995) reported that only 8% of sampled educators from adult prisons in California knew the names of the best books on the field, or of their authors (the standard error of measurement was plus or minus 4%); only 60% knew of the Correctional Education Association, and only 10% were members. These problems are sometimes compounded because when they are able to get an important work on correctional education, they are not usually able to discern what might be its advantages and disadvantages. In short, even in the face of the recent budget cuts, one of the most terrible constraints facing correctional education in California’s prisons is a lack of awareness of the literature of correctional education.
A result of this lack of awareness has been that several California programs in what is now called the CDCR were successful by almost any standard, and they were all phased out. This list includes six exemplary programs, at the following sites:

- The Preston School of Industry, which was managed in a largely democratic manner under Superintendent Calvin Derrick, from 1912 to 1917 (Lafferty, 1994; Scudder, 1972).

- The Whittier State Reform School, which was later renamed the Fred C. Nelles School. Procedures at Whittier included treatment plans, and the entire institution was converted from the congregate system of penitentiaries to the cottage plan, which provided more homelike and humane environments (Morris and Rothman, 1995; Scudder, 1972).


- C-Unit at the Deuel Vocational Institution (Studt, Messinger, and Wilson, 1968), which was managed as a research study, according to principles that required inmates must be treated as people, with dignity.

- The University of Santa Cruz postsecondary education program for women at the California Institution for Women (CIW), which was written up as exemplary according to the standards advocated in this report (Duguid, 2000, pp. 105-113).

- The Our House substance abuse program at California Institution for Men (Gehring, 2008). This program met all the standards set forth in Figure 2 below, and it carried on in the tradition of CIM, the UC Santa Cruz program at CIW, and the C-Unit at Deuel Vocational Institution—inmates were deliberately treated as people, with dignity and respect.

There may of course have been other exemplary programs in California correctional education that were subsequently phased out. The list above merely introduces this author’s current understanding of the issue. Nevertheless, the list suggests standards that can be applied to the issue of what might be described as program integrity. The stakes are high. When offenders are ready to become good community members, prisons have to be ready to direct that newfound interest effectively—and “outside” communities need for CDCR’s education programs to be effective.

This report’s structure was generated by specific events. The California Senate Office of Research (SOR) posed four broad questions for consideration. They appear in their original language in the Table of Contents, but they can be summarized as follows: (a) What are the parameters of an effective correctional education program and how it can be evaluated? (b) What are the attributes of an effective and cost-effective approach to correctional education curriculum and instruction? (c) How can correctional education programs successfully enhance inmate post-release success? and (d) To what extent can the present, CDCR Statewide education program be judged effective? The responses to these questions are framed in the narrative of the report, with 11 discrete recommendations that allude to the correctional education paradigm (how things have been done) and its anomalies (obstacles, or problems that the paradigm has not solved). These
recommendations refer to “the hidden heritage”—the literature that most correctional educators have not been able to access. All these terms, and the issues they represent, are developed in the report narrative and in supportive charts.

The central task for the current report, as the author perceived it, was to concisely summarize and interpret relevant lessons from that literature, and from the experiences of California correctional educators. I am hopeful that the report will be successful in that regard, and that the Senate may take appropriate action as a result.

The first recommendation prioritizes a direction that must be pursued soon to improve California correctional education. It identifies a central need that must be addressed before any other efforts to improve and refine the current program.

**Recommendation 1:** CDCR Statewide education personnel should immediately take stock of resources and aspirations, to plan program attributes that can be implemented when the budget crisis eases.

CDCR education staffs, curricula, and program capabilities shrank rapidly. Academic, vocational, and social education programs are extremely reduced; student waiting lists are getting longer; staff are demoralized from cutbacks, institutional closures and threats of closures. The very assumptions on which CDCR education was based—for example, that programs, curricula, policies, and practices should be evidence-based—seem no longer to be applicable. None of these problems were caused by CDCR correctional educators. The problems are being experienced directly, though in different ways, by students and correctional educators alike. In the face of this discontinuity, no attempt to replicate the logistics of past practice need be pursued. Rather, with open minds about the potential of education to help people who want to transform their lives, correctional educators have an excellent opportunity to reflect on their work and to plan.

In one of the two definitive books on correctional education MacCormick (1931) wrote “In all fields of education, theory is in advance of practice” (p. xii). In this case theory is allied with “big picture” thinking about the purpose of correctional education and the best ways it should be pursued. This planning time should begin with the identification of big picture concerns, followed later by thinking about the practical issues of implementation.

**SOR Question:** Is there a way to evaluate and compare the performance of the 33 adult inmate facilities in California? For example, which programs produce the most high school graduates or GED recipients? Can different literacy programs be linked to rates of recidivism and/or return to custody?

The gist of this first question addresses the parameters of an effective correctional education program, and how that system can be evaluated. This is the most salient and complex of the questions posed by the SOR, the one that deserves the most attention. It is the subject of six recommendations, on the following: (a) understanding that there is a relevant literature to consult on these issues, (b) pursuing refinements in how correctional officers are trained, (c) applying an especially useful report just released by the California Department of Education regarding the structure of adult education, (d) transforming CDCR’s education programs into a real school system, (e) stopping the overemphasis on recidivism as a measure of correctional education
program success, and (f) adopting a program evaluation model that is adequate to the task and tailored for the needs of correctional education. Taken together, these recommendations introduce fundamental and highly visible improvements that can be implemented without great expense.

**Recommendation 2:** The key SOR initiative should be to make CDCR program parameters and evaluations consistent with both the correctional education paradigm (how things have been done) and anomalies (problems that the paradigm has not solved).

One way to summarize all the problems of CDCR education is that the nationwide correctional education paradigm has been overemphasized, and the anomalies have been ignored. It is unlikely that CDCR education can begin planning a better approach until this central problem is addressed. The best “paradigm plus anomalies” materials include the following: (a) the Correctional Education Association’s (CEA’s) Resolution on the capabilities of exemplary delivery systems (in Gehring, 1984), (b) Ross and Fabiano’s summary of cognitive skills for social competence (1985), (c) Gehring’s summary on “What Works in Correctional Education” (2011, p. 183), and (d) the “European Prison Rules” for educational programming (in Nordic Council, 2005). The first on this list is the CEA’s 1984 Resolution #2 on the characteristics of exemplary correctional education delivery systems. Resolution #2 is relevant to the organizational capabilities that should be developed as a minimum level of CDCR education service.

II. Issue #2: Characteristics of exemplary correctional education delivery systems.

A. The CEA seeks to apply the equal educational opportunity principle to persons in contact with the criminal justice system.

1. Educational opportunities for the incarcerated should be comparable to those available in the free community.

2. Congress and many state legislatures established educational programs to which each citizen is entitled—basic educational opportunities for everyone, including the disadvantaged, neglected/delinquent, illiterate, adult, disabled, and unskilled.

B. The CEA will encourage state and local jurisdictions to decide which agency is responsible for delivering educational services to persons in contact with the criminal justice system (i.e., which state agency. . .).

C. The CEA will advocate the establishment or continuation of jurisdiction-wide correctional education delivery systems capable of:

1. Assessing the educational needs of offenders at intake, as part of the classification process.

2. Providing vocational, academic, and social education programs relevant to the identified needs of incarcerated individuals.

3. Providing jurisdiction-wide supervisory support in the areas of correctional education curriculum, staff development, and program implementation/
evaluation.

4. Accessing state, Federal, and local education funds and support services.
5. Hiring instructors who are certified by the state department of education.

6. Working with the state department of education to establish formal correctional education certification standards, and with the higher education community to establish correctional education teacher preparation programs.

7. Acquiring program accreditation from a recognized accrediting agency.

8. Credentialing program graduates with certificates, diplomas, or licenses.

9. Transferring student credit to non-correctional education programs in the free community.

10. Ensuring that correctional education administrative decisions (in curricular, personnel, fiscal, and internal policy matters) are made by professional correctional educators assigned to correctional education decision-making positions.

11. Maintaining formal links and informal liaisons with related service delivery and funding agencies.

12. Developing public visibility through relevant programming, community involvement, and accessible information.

13. Utilizing the services of an independent advisory or policy board.

14. Maximizing educational opportunities at correctional institutions, court schools, pretrial detention centers, etc., within the jurisdiction. (in Gehring, 1984, pp. 138-139).

The next relevant selection addresses priority areas that should be covered in correctional education curricula. It is Table 3 (p. 179) from Ross and Fabiano’s groundbreaking 1985 book Time to Think: A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation. That book refuted Martinson’s premature 1974 assertion that “nothing works” in rehabilitation. Not only were Ross and Fabiano thoughtful and effective in showing the flaws in Martinson’s methodology, their own findings were also informed by a method of literature review that was new at the time, meta-analysis. Time to Think (1985) and The Education of Adult Prisoners (introduced above, 1931) are the two definitive books on correctional education, yet most correctional educators have never heard of them.

Nevertheless, a problem was that Ross and Fabiano framed their findings in negatives or learner deficits. Most teachers today prefer to be positive, to “work on students’ strengths to overcome weaknesses.” Despite this problem, Figure 1 below is included in this report because its
content is directly pertinent to CDCR’s education program. Then Figure 2 will provide another useful summary of correctional education aspirations, Gehring’s 2011 summary of program components that have proven successful in the four most documented, exemplary approaches.

**Figure 1: Cognitive Skills for Social Competence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Problem Solving</th>
<th>Cognitive Style</th>
<th>Social Perspective-Taking</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Meta-Cognition</th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>problem recognition,</td>
<td>concrete,</td>
<td>egocentric,</td>
<td>thinking errors.</td>
<td>egocentric,</td>
<td>limited awareness of their thinking.</td>
<td>impulsive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consequential thinking,</td>
<td>external,</td>
<td>non-empathetic,</td>
<td></td>
<td>non-empathetic.</td>
<td></td>
<td>non-reflec-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative thinking,</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>role-taking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means-end thinking.</td>
<td>oriented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: “What Works in Correctional Education?”—One Program, Four Versions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy/Andragogy</td>
<td>Adult education</td>
<td>Adult, postsecondary education</td>
<td>Adult education Methods</td>
<td>Peda/Andragogy continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>Degrees enhance career options</td>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>Marketable skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>Social education</td>
<td>Learning in the social sciences</td>
<td>Social and economic context</td>
<td>Social education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Education</td>
<td>Cultural education</td>
<td>Learning in the humanities</td>
<td>Cultural context; creative activities</td>
<td>Dance, drama, humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Principle of Just community</td>
<td>Prisoners participation</td>
<td>Reciprocity,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>community organization</td>
<td>(democracy)</td>
<td>pate in education outside prison</td>
<td>democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2: What Works... cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Education for the handicapped</td>
<td>Native American courses; ESL; pre-college/tutors</td>
<td>All prisoners have access</td>
<td>Special, bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Film strips; 35 mm films</td>
<td>Computers; word processing</td>
<td>Eur. Prison Rules 2, 7, 9, and 17 imply and support technologies</td>
<td>Various equipment; no high technology to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Configuration</td>
<td>Ready for bureau</td>
<td>Ready for correctional school district</td>
<td>Ready for integral education</td>
<td>(Not relevant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four Figure 2 programs are the best documented and most exemplary in the literature that takes into account both the paradigm and the anomalies—or, stated alternatively, the hidden heritage. The first of these was implemented by Brockway and improved by MacCormick (it was an innovation in the United States); the second was implemented by Ayers and Duguid, and articulated additionally by Ross and Fabiano (it had many roots, but was implemented in the Canadian Federal Penitentiary Service); the third is by the Council of Europe (see the discussion on the EPR below), and implemented in its most complete form by the Nordic nations. The fourth, identified here as integral education, was enacted in a number of nations at different times, and with different emphases, but was entirely implemented in adult prisons and juvenile institutions that were officially and actually managed according to democratic principles.

Therein lies one of the greatest anomalies, since there is nothing more antithetical to the traditional paradigm than a democratically managed prison. In part that is because in a democratically managed program or prison, or even in a prison like California Institution for Men under its first warden, Kenyon Scudder, inmates feel that if they act out behaviorally they will be letting down their community rather than “screwing the man.” One summary is that in anomalous, democratic prisons, security is more efficient and effective than in a traditional prison.
However, the most stunning aspect of Figure 2 is that all four of these best documented, most exemplary approaches to correctional education learning content included precisely the same nine elements. In the “Elements” column on the left, the term Pedagogy/Andragogy means that there was clarity about to what extent correctional education should be based on the learning needs of children (as in pedagogy) or adults (as in andragogy)—and the emphasis was on andragogy, throughout. The term Vocational Education is probably clear to anyone, but the differences between Social Education and Cultural Education should be explained. Social Education (SE) helps persons survive and cope “inside,” and “outside” the institution after release. SE curricula typically emphasize topics such as how to get and keep a job, basic health and safety, how to use public transportation, loans and credit, and shopping on a budget. Cultural Education can include such topics as readings in one’s racial or ethnic background, music appreciation and/or playing musical instruments, studies of film or novels, or painting. The concept of shared responsibility was introduced above; in the context of Figure 2 it is deliberate encouragement of students who want to take some responsibility for their own learning—when “self-starters” decide what to study or in what sequence to study the topics in which they are ready and interested, all the way through to a continuum in which the school is managed democratically (either as part of a democratically managed institution or as a democratic enclave within an otherwise coercive institution). Inclusion means that the needs of students which were not previously or traditionally addressed, were indeed addressed in these four types of exemplary correctional education approaches. Often this has been in the form of special education services for students with disabilities, or speakers of minority languages, or particular cultural adaptations congruent with the expectations or aspirations of one or more minority group(s). The elements of Technology and Library are non-controversial. The element of Administrative Configuration is a measure to which correctional educators are in charge of decisions regarding education, particularly in the areas of (a) curricula, (b) budgetary decisions that are made about funds allocated to education, and (c) educational personnel, or the hiring and firing of qualified educators, as in Recommendation 5 below.

The next significant report that should be considered for planning purposes is what has become known in North America as the European Prison Rules (EPR) for education. Its official title is the Recommendations of the Council of Europe (R[89]). The EPR are a centerpiece of the European Prison Education Association (EPEA), the professional association that was established in the late 1980s. Although the EPR are actually guidelines rather than rules for the European Union nations, they have been treated as rules, thanks in part to the EPEA’s strong advocacy work. Muth (2007, part one, p. 3) characterized the EPR as “student-centered,” a contrast to the prison-centered approach which is often evident in U.S. correctional education. He reported that the U.S. approach “eschews student-centered learning in favor of top-down criminogenic methods of intervention. . . [which use the] diagnostic-prescriptive [method]. . . with little learner input other than, perhaps, a questionnaire about academic goals and vocational interests.” (p. 4). The EPR’s 17 rules follow:

1. All prisoners shall have access to education, which is envisaged as consisting of classroom subjects, vocational education, creative and cultural activities, physical education and sports, social education and library facilities;

2. Education for prisoners should be like the education provided for similar age groups in the outside world, and the range of learning opportunities for prisoners
should be as wide as possible;

3. Education in prison shall aim to develop the whole person bearing in mind his or her social, economic and cultural context;

4. All those involved in the administration of the prison system and the management of prisons should facilitate and support education as much as possible;

5. Education should have no less a status than work within the prison regime and prisoners should not lose out financially or otherwise by taking part in education;

6. Every effort should be made to encourage the prisoner to participate actively in all aspects of education;

7. Development programmes should be provided to ensure that prison educators adopt appropriate adult education methods;

8. Special education should be given to those prisoners with particular difficulties and especially those with reading or writing problems;

9. Vocational education should aim at the wider development of the individual, as well as being sensitive to trends in the labour market;

10. Prisoners should have direct access to a well-stocked library at least once per week;

11. Physical education and sports for prisoners should be emphasised and encouraged;

12. Creative and cultural activities should be given a significant role because these activities have particular potential to enable prisoners to develop and express themselves;

13. Social education should include practical elements that enable the prisoner to manage daily life within the prison, with a view to facilitating the return to society;

14. Wherever possible, prisoners should be allowed to participate in education outside prison;

15. Where education has to take place within the prison, the outside community should be involved as fully as possible;

16. Measures should be taken to enable prisoners to continue their education after release;

17. The funds, equipment and teaching staff needed to enable prisoners to receive appropriate education should be made available. (Nordic Council of Ministers, 2005, pp. 132-134).
The EPR presents an approach to correctional education that is divergent from the typical way most state systems deliver services in the U.S. For example, EPR #4 acknowledges the moral authority that wardens and other institutional administrators can apply to advocate for the power of education to diminish crime and reoffending. That approach is a high visibility/low resource strategy for program improvement. Most institutional staff members accept the warden’s logic about good practice. Since many of the organizational problems experienced by inmate students and correctional educators accrue from staff who do not support education, the warden’s advice can be especially important. Essentially, every time the warden is speaking publically he or she can be a walking, talking commercial for education. As a result of this no cost strategy, and other dynamics of the EPR, North American correctional educators who are aware of the EPR find them helpful. Another strategy to pursue this objective about increasing staff advocacy for education will be introduced in the next recommendation.

**Recommendation 3:** CDCR correctional officers’ preservice and inservice training programs should include discrete components on the value of education and its alignment with every aspect of the institutional purpose.

The characteristics of correctional officer new hires have been changing recently, especially with regard to the average level of educational attainment. Therefore, part of the organizational culture clash between the goals of security and of education can be corrected now if a strong “top down” message is delivered about how education is consistent with the CDCR purpose. This can be accomplished through two tandem approaches—a “team teaching” session for new officers at the Galt Training Academy, and also as part of the officers’ annual inservice block training. In both approaches a public relations savvy correctional educator should be teamed with either a pro-education administrator or a highly placed, pro-education custody person. Relevant content for the session at the Academy might include the benefits of education in regard to (a) the smooth management of prisons, (b) the rehabilitation of inmates who are ready to turn their lives around, (c) the stability of California communities, and (d) the strong association of education with every effective prison reform that has ever been implemented in California—indeed, around the nation. The annual block training should pursue different topics that build on the content of the Academy’s initial session, to emphasize different aspects of the evolving Statewide education program and to help keep correctional officers up to date about the progress and problems encountered by inmate students and correctional educators.

**Recommendation 4:** The Blueprint for Action advanced in the report *Linking Adults to Opportunity: Transformation of the California Department of Education* [CDE] Adult Education Program should be applied as a model for CDCR education.

This CDE report is current (April, 2011), applicable, and relevant. Although it was not prepared by educators who were experts in both the correctional education paradigm and its anomalies, it is extremely useful. *Linking Adults to Opportunity* begins with a mission statement that can be adapted, rooted in three influences on adult education in our State: (a) demographic shifts, (b) educational challenge, and (c) workforce demand. It presents core principles, and a
“Blueprint for Action” that addresses several strategies: (a) collaborative leadership, (b) academic and career education transition centers, (c) transition services, (d) curriculum and instruction, (e) professional development, (e) data and accountability, and (f) funding.

Planning a better future for CDCR’s Statewide education program, and the specifics of evaluating correctional education, should include all five of the sources introduced above—without negating any of them. Again, the five recommended sources are as follow: (a) the CEA’s Resolution #2, on characteristics of exemplary correctional education delivery systems, (b) Ross and Fabiano’s summary of general cognitive skills areas that should be covered in correctional education curricula because they are needed for inmate social competence, (c) the “What Works in Correctional Education” summary of program elements shared by the most successful and best documented approaches, (d) the EPR, and (e) the CDE’s framework for adult education. In addition, at least three other aspects of program implementation and evaluation should be considered. These are the organizational structure of education services, the overreliance on recidivism as a measure of program success, and the need for a program evaluation model crafted especially to meet the needs of correctional education.

**Recommendation 5:** CDCR should negotiate with the California Department of Education to change its education programs into real schools by adopting the correctional school district (CSD) organizational configuration.

This change will help ensure that inmate students receive appropriate credit for learning they experience while in confinement. It will also increase the credibility of CDCR’s Statewide education program in various audiences.

Two elements of effective correctional education programs which are often neglected by practitioners can be introduced here. First, one part of the struggle to improve and consolidate correctional education is not about overwhelming student learning needs, nor is it about the pain of confinement. Instead, it is about the need to improve and consolidate correctional education management. Second, education decisions should be made by educators—not by jailers or administrators who usually cannot emphasize teaching and learning. (Gehring, 2011, p. 250).

(Note: This section is based on Gehring, 2007, pp. 1-4.) In the U.S., K-12 local schooling funded with public resources is organized under school districts. This is not an accident. School districts promote school activities, in part through community scrutiny. The school district pattern of organization helps ensure that school activities are consistent with public expectations. Those schools that are not organized under school districts are notable as exceptions: for example, the preponderance of institutional schools. These do not fit the accepted public school norm. Discussion of democracy in the schools is not mere lip service; sometimes education has been structured to further student alienation and particularistic interests. This occurred in Germany under the Nazis, in South Africa under apartheid, in the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs when it was operated under genocidal policy, and in the Jim Crow period prior to the Brown vs. Board decision. In sum, schooling can be used to help or to hurt student and community interests. The purpose of the school district pattern of organization is to promote helpful education.
School districts provide for local control within state and Federal guidelines. In addition to being traditional and predominant, school districts have school boards which are known especially for their fiscal accountability, organizational flexibility, and transparency to outside observers. These capabilities are necessary because of the importance of schools as agents of socialization. In addition, school funds can be mishandled, and autocratic control of school activities without internal and external checks can obstruct student maturation and community interests.

A continuum can be conceived between participatory and autocratic management, or between democratic and professional organization. Over the decades the same local school board can operate according to democratic (participatory), or professional control (autocratic) principles. The school district concept is sufficiently flexible to accommodate a range of organizational behaviors between these extremes. In sum, the U.S. approach to school management, the school district concept, is an accepted platform of public policy. We expect schools funded with public monies—public schools in the generic sense—to be managed in school districts because school districts are (a) traditional (b) accountable, (c) transparent to outside observers and responsive to various guidelines within a framework of local organization, and known for (d) robust internal fiscal controls, and (e) flexible management. Public education that is not organized in a school district should be questioned.

Most correctional education around the country is not organized under the school district structure. One salient aspect of correctional education organizational structures is that educators are often not in charge of educational decisions. This problem is most keenly felt in three key decision-making areas: curriculum, the education budget, and personnel matters (the hiring and firing of educators). Correctional education organizational history has been an effort by educators to assume some authority over these important educational decisions. Authority over educational matters is different from authoritarian management. For example, as noted above, successful teachers often encourage mature students to assume some responsibility/authority for aspects of their own education.

Historically in the United States, five systems have existed for the delivery of correctional education: Sabbath schools, the traditional or decentralized pattern, correctional education bureaus, correctional school districts (CSDs), and integral education. Of these, the first (Sabbath schools) are officially defunct because they violate the Constitutional aspiration to separate church and state. The last (integral education) is personality based; it cannot be implemented throughout an entire jurisdiction (county, state, etc.). So the next part of this section will focus on the middle three delivery patterns (traditional or decentralized, bureaus, and CSDs). These are the three modern, generic models of jurisdictionwide organizations that deliver correctional education services to confined students. All three are currently operational, often in adjacent states. The theme that unites these three models is that they emerged in historic sequence to increase educator authority over educational decisions—a trend that matches the needs of students, teachers, and communities. (Readers should note: prison systems that contract for local school districts to provide courses or degree programs “inside” are not always correctional school districts. Rather, they are either decentralized, bureau, or CSD organizations that use contracted services).
Authority over educational decisions is an aspect of administration that is a central part of correctional education. It influences all the other parts—instruction, professional development, and each teacher’s personal rationale for being engaged in the work.

On a standard table of organization (or organizational hierarchy chart), staff authority—which is consultative authority to recommend and support—is represented with a broken line (-----), and line authority—which is administrative authority to hire, fire, and direct—with a solid line (——). In a decentralized organization line authority extends from the institutional administration, through the education director or principal, to the teaching staff. In a bureau (the organizational pattern of the CDCR Statewide education program) organization line authority remains as it did in the decentralized pattern; and staff authority extends from the state director of correctional education, in California through a staff of Statewide supervisors, through the principal, to the teaching staff. In a CSD organization, line authority extends from a superintendent of schools who is qualified according to the same state education department (SEA—state education agency, in our case the CDE) as in other school districts (LEAs—local education agencies). The line authority goes from the superintendent of schools, through the principals, to the teaching staffs; parallel staff authority extends through statewide supervisors (optional). These relationships are portrayed in Figure 3, in which the decentralized pattern is the least desirable approach, the Bureau is the current CDCR mode, and the correctional school district is the best approach.

**Figure 3: Line/Staff Relationships in the Three Modern Models**
The historic sequence of these three modern correctional education models (decentralized, bureau, CSD) extends from minimal authority for educators over educational decisions, to maximal authority for educators over educational decisions. Figure 4 summarizes this relationship, and Figure 5 shows typical opinions on correctional education in the three models.

**Figure 4: Direction of Modern Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority over educational decisions</th>
<th>Correctional School District</th>
<th>Authority over educational decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resides with non-educators</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>resides with SEA-credentialed educators. <strong>This is how real school systems should be managed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(institutional administrators who</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may or may not be qualified</td>
<td>Bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according to SEA credential standards)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is not a good way to manage a school system.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decentralized Pattern</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5: Dispositions Toward Correctional Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decentralized Pattern</th>
<th>Within the Site-Based Institutional Community</th>
<th>Within the Agency that Operates Correctional Institutions</th>
<th>Within the Correctional Education Teaching Community</th>
<th>Within the Educational Community (SEA, LEAs, Colleges, . . .)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If there is a correctional education program, it exists to support the institutional mission.</td>
<td>Correctional education programming is a matter of each warden’s discretion.</td>
<td>Teachers often suspect correctional education is not important in the institution.</td>
<td>“Correctional education” is not an education program, and correctional education staff are not educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau</td>
<td>The correctional education program may be a useful part of institutional programming.</td>
<td>Correctional education has a low profile, as one part of the institutional program.</td>
<td>Teachers and students are often confused about the correctional education role.</td>
<td>“Correctional education” does not pass the tests that prove education adequacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional School District</td>
<td>Correctional education is a quality program that complies with institutional rules.</td>
<td>High correctional education visibility and status as a semi-independent program.</td>
<td>Teachers can teach and support the institutional mission and rules at the same time.</td>
<td>Correctional education is important, and must not be overlooked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are several strategies that can be used to pursue the CSD structure. A review of these strategies appears in Gehring’s *Handbook for Correctional Education Leaders* (2007), which will be forwarded to the SOR along with this report. Before moving on to a new topic it is necessary to explain the term “semi-independent,” which appears near the end of Figure 5 above.

There are at least six areas that directly impact correctional education services: (a) curriculum, (b) the budget allocated for institutional education, (c) educational personnel matters, (d) institutional security, (e) inmate traffic within the institution, and (f) the physical plant in which educational activities are provided. The CSD structure is semi-independent from institutional management because it exerts control over only the three of these—curriculum, the educational budget, and educational personal matters. Correctional educators do not seek control over inmate traffic, institutional security, or the physical plant; therefore, CSDs are only semi-independent. This pattern matches institutional management needs. As mentioned, the credibility of the Statewide educational program rests on the ability of qualified educators to make educational decisions. Correctional educators are active participants in the effort to keep institutions safe and healthy environments; they are an important part of the institutional security team.

Of the three modern organizational models (traditional or decentralized, bureau, and CSD), only the CSD pattern can pursue systemwide or Statewide improvements. Nothing can work smoothly in the decentralized or bureau models if even one warden decides to exert direct authority over education. Suppose, for example, that the Statewide supervisors in a bureau discern that an identified professional development activity is central to a systemwide improvement in the education program. However, one warden decides “These teachers work for me and their job is to be in the classroom, not off somewhere for a training.” That obstacle will exacerbate all the problems inherent in the provision of effective services in a confinement setting. This capability for systemwide improvement is salient and should be considered seriously.

One important improvement that can be made is from a system that emphasizes behavioral psychology (which is rooted in corrections’ medical model as well as in education’s diagnostic-prescriptive approach) to one that emphasizes a cognitive psychology. This change would help provide a more extensive repertoire of instructional strategies. The behavioral model tends to treat the mind as a “black box,” focusing on measurable behaviors instead of promoting transformational changes in attitudes. By contrast, the cognitive model tends to tailor lessons to thinking functions, to the way the human brain actually works. The cognitive model—or the cognitive-moral, or cognitive-social, or cognitive-democratic approach—focuses more on actual development/maturation, whereas the behavioral approach tends to be more superficial, more akin to training than to education. This shift, from a behavioral base to one rooted in cognition, is something to which most correctional educators aspire, though they typically use other terms to describe it. Gehring (1988) reported one aspect of the hidden heritage or anomalous correctional education literature—how cognitive or cognitive-moral processes are associated with interpersonal cognitive or cognitive-moral development (the approached by Ross and Fabiano, whose work was introduced above). This is accomplished through what was referred to above as the shared responsibility model (in some cases with participatory management or democracy). Gehring organized these processes under five themes: literacy, “chunking” information into usable parts, transition and reintegration, “seeing the other fellow’s perspective,” and, in general, education and
socialization. Under these themes were several specific cognitive elements that result from participation in a shared responsibility program: generalization, abstraction, deduction, problem solving, self-analysis and self-awareness, analysis, synthesis of chunked information, problem recognition, goal-setting, consequential reasoning and related planning skills, adaptability, tolerance, reciprocity (the inclination to role-take), integration and assimilation of language and culture(s) and education, reflection and introspection, and personal responsibility. (p. 67).

Canadian correctional educators discuss the problem of overemphasizing the behavioral approach when they speak of criminals with job skills. Criminologist Vernon Fox wrote "If one teaches a criminal to be a plumber, then the result must be a criminal plumber" (in Roberts, 1971, p. 129). MacCormick used different words to describe the same dilemma:

The mere tools of education are no guaranty of character. A man may carry a kit of burglar's tools and a doctor's degree at the same time. . . .If a man is to remain a criminal, it is perhaps better for society that he remain as ignorant . . . as possible. (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 1-3).

Correctional educators want to shift to a cognitive psychology base because it is more closely aligned to the real learning needs that they encounter in inmate students. But this shift, and other important changes, simply cannot be negotiated systemwide in the decentralized/traditional or bureau models; only the CSD can deliver on such systemwide improvements.

There are other problems with statewide education programs that cannot be solved systemwide. For example, if improvements are made at one or a few “showcase” institutions, the rest of the institutions are often ignored (De Tocqueville, 2001/1835 and 1840, p. 244). Also, legal problems can emerge when the conditions at one site diverge from those at other sites. In short, the best approach to educational improvements is systemwide, and the only modern organizational model that can implement systemwide improvements is the CSD.

**Recommendation 6:** The reductionist reliance on recidivism as an important measure of correctional education program success should be avoided whenever possible.

Multiple measures are preferable to measures that reduce inputs to a single variable. Some correctional education systems applied a reductionist approach, for example measuring program success by the numbers of Bible verses memorized and recited, the frequency of inebriates proclaiming that they would never drink alcohol again (BPDS, 1972); releasees placed in domestic service (Kneebone, et al., 1998); or revenues taken in through prison industries (McKelvey, 1977). The modern version of reductionism is the special emphasis placed on recidivism.

The Three State Recidivism Study (Steurer, Smith, and Tracy, 2001) is indicative of how prison education programs are perceived with regard to their capacity to diminish recidivism. That team reported aggregate recidivism rates for offenders who participated in correctional education were nine percent less than non-participants with regard to re-arrests, eight percent less with regard to re-conviction, and 10 percent less with regard to re-incarceration. This is all very good until close scrutiny is directed to exactly what recidivism findings mean. For example, at New York State’s Elmira Reformatory, releasees who died were counted as successes since they did not recidivate (Eggleston, 1989).
Correctional educators are often forced to define program effects in terms of recidivism, dollars saved, and other measures that miss the mark with regard to the profound, community-oriented...results...of teaching and learning for confined students. To focus only on [superficial and easily measured variables, such as reduction in recidivism is] gross reductionism...a very precise prescription for failure, even if that result is not realized immediately. [The]...recommendation to avoid reductionism is relevant to the everyday condition of correctional educators. (Gehring, 2011, p. 248).

Figures 6 and 7 below present problems and questions relevant to these issues about recidivism.

**Figure 6: Nine Problems with Recidivism as a Program Evaluation Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one knows what the term “recidivism” means.</td>
<td>Jurisdictions apply different definitions, yet persons from one jurisdiction often recidivate in another.</td>
<td>Popular differences relate to criteria (re-arrest/re-sentence) and duration (usually anywhere from 12-60 months).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No accepted method exists for data collection and treatment; no data repository exists.</td>
<td>The Federal government has not initiated standards for collection/treatment/reporting data, and no state can unilaterally implement nationwide procedures.</td>
<td>One state applied five designs: by (a) offense type, (b) geographical region, (c) type of inmate, (d) level of institutional security, and (e) for each institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism can be used for “disinformation.”</td>
<td>Many observers are convinced recidivism reports are used to conceal information about system effectiveness.</td>
<td>Some states adjust data treatment procedures without notice; many use different definitions for different results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links between crime, arrest, and incarceration vary.</td>
<td>Minority confinement rates exceed those of the dominant culture; vast socio-economic differences are evident.</td>
<td>Often states are criticized because confinement appears based, in part, on differences that are culturally defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one knows what recidivism measures.</td>
<td>Recidivism is a non-specific measure—yet it is generally applied only to education.</td>
<td>Are improved recidivism rates from institutional education, health care, security, etc.?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism is unsophisticated/dichotomous, a terminal measure. Recidivism studies mostly measure yes/no data—not useful to improve programs. If an armed robber recidivates for forgery, are we prepared to say he failed?

**Figure 6: Nine Problems. . .cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment fosters criminality and alienation.</td>
<td>Basic academic/marketable/social skills area not all that is learned “inside;” confinement tends to interrupt growth.</td>
<td>Disincentives for non-enrollment are more powerful than incentives; follow-up/placement services are underfunded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confinement reduces post-release life opportunities.</td>
<td>Despite effects of correctional schools, the overall impact of imprisonment is overwhelmingly negative.</td>
<td>Legislators have allowed punitive measures to predominate; equality of educational access has not been applied “inside.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracies often seek reconfinement.</td>
<td>Ex-felons are usually supervised closely by police and others, as “prime suspects.”</td>
<td>All jurisdictions selectively apply law enforcement sanctions to ex-felons. (Gehring, 2000, p. 199).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7: Four Questions About Recidivism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Should released individuals be able to live decent lives in the free community (responsibly, without committing crimes)?</th>
<th>Question: Can recidivism be researched rigorously (is the term adequately defined—are there accepted standards for data collection/treatment/reporting)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer: <strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>Answer: <strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: In general, do North American criminal and juvenile justice systems treat all people equally and fairly, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or socio-economic class?</td>
<td>Question: Has recidivism data been used to identify the adequacy or inadequacy of specific correctional program elements, and to facilitate program improvement?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California’s Petersilia (in McShane and Williams, 1996) discussed concerns about recidivism as a measure of program success, and Pennsylvania criminologist Dennis Giever is working to discern what recidivism statistics actually reveal (personal communication to Gehring, 2010). Correctional educators and criminologists are not the only ones who are perplexed by recidivism-oriented measures, even when they are rooted in the desire for accountability. Similar problems have been raised about dropout rates for the local schools (Zachry, 2010). As with recidivism in the institutional schools, drop out rates in the local schools can be used or abused to result in whatever point might be made to avoid budget cuts. It seems organizations sometimes manipulate data on their perceived success to match public expectations, or the expectations of specific audiences. In sum, recidivism is not a good measure of correctional education program success. No one knows what the term means; there are no commonly accepted methods for collecting, treating, and reporting recidivism data; recidivism has often been used to misinform interested audiences; and recidivism data is infrequently used for program improvement purposes.

**Recommendation 7:** CDCR should adopt or develop a program evaluation model capable of addressing both the correctional education paradigm and its anomalies.

If CDCR is interested in a program evaluation model designed for correctional education, the most applicable source is the Gehring, 2007 entry in the References of this report, pp. 376-386. In all things connected with the report, including the selection and use of any program evaluation model, if the faculty and staff of the Center for the Study of Correctional Education (CSCE) can be of help to the Statewide CDCR education program, we would like nothing better. The CSCE is a function of the College of Education at California State University, San Bernardino, so we are partial toward this type of cooperative work. Also, since the CSCE faculty have plenty of work to do in other jurisdictions, we would not be offended if CDCR should decide to pursue collegial assistance from some other quarter. In its next question, the SOR asked about the attributes of an effective and cost-effective approach to correctional education curriculum and instruction.

**SOR Question:** What does the existing scientific literature on prison literacy programs suggest as the best approach to providing effective and cost-effective literacy education for inmates? For example, are there different learning styles between men and women that need to be considered in basic prison literacy?

This second question from the SOR focuses on the attributes of an effective and cost-effective approach to correctional education curriculum and instruction. This topic is addressed in Recommendation 8, which suggests that CDCR educational decisions should be anchored to the literature of correctional education, and to the experiences of field-based teaching staff.
Recommendation 8: CDCR educational decisions should be informed by the literature of correctional education, and by field-based experiences of teaching and learning in the confinement setting.

It is necessary to briefly introduce some of the finest historical and international examples of effective programs that operated with minimal material resources. The best documented examples were (a) in schools on ships that transported convicts from England to the Australian penal colonies (Carpenter, 1969/1864); (b) at Pestalozzi’s institutions in Switzerland after the invasion associated with the French Revolution (Quick, 1916; Gehring and Rennie, 2008); (c) the French Mettray facility 1840-1937 (Eriksson, 1976); (d) the Junior Republic in upstate New York around the turn of the 20th century (George, 1911); (e) the Barrett facility in Jim Crow Virginia (Kneebone, et al., 1998; Muth, et al., 2009); and (f) in Makarenko’s prisons in the U.S.S.R. after World War I, the Bolshevik Revolution, the Russian Civil War, and the famines of the 1920s (Makarenko, 1973). These exemplars suggest, as MacCormick recommended, that correctional education must have a higher aim than the acquisition of mere knowledge and skills; its aim should be both practical and transformational, and transformation should not involve direct moral instruction. Indeed, many California correctional educators have found that—for these students, in these institutions—the traditional formula ranking of public school priorities should be reversed. Rather than emphasizing knowledge, skills, and attitudes, in that priority ranking, correctional schools should emphasize the same, in reverse order: attitudes, skills, and knowledge.

Reder (2009) reported that “proficiency may not be the most appropriate measure of program impact but rather other dimensions such as modified levels of engagement in everyday literacy and numeracy practices” (in Stromquist, 2009, p. 7). With regard to adult education program completions, Reder and Strawn (2001) found 34% of adults engaged in self-directed learning without participating in formal programs, 46% of participants had been formerly enrolled in another adult education program, and 58% of current adult education enrollees had participated previously with the same goal in mind. Stromquist (2009) found that engagement in adult education frequently results in learner desire for greater empowerment and confidence. These findings tend to support “attitudes, skills, and knowledge” as the best priority outcomes ranking for students seeking transformation. When the priority is to turn one’s life around, knowledge is important and useful, but a better attitude with regard to one’s social relationships is central.

Trends have been noted in recent decades regarding differences in the ways men and women learn. There are documented differences between the sexes with regard to cognitive-moral development (Kohlberg, 1981; Gilligan 1982)—men tend to focus most on personal rights, women on issues of care and nurture. However, men and women move through the same levels and stages of cognitive-moral development which are required for community membership. One accepted summary is that, to mature, persons must progress sequentially through distinct phases, which Kohlberg (1981) categorized as pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional. This system is supported not only by Kohlberg’s work (which focused on cognitive-moral development in males), but also in Gilligan’s (which focused on the same in females). In this system, the pre-conventional level is associated with ego-centrism and, by extension, criminality; the conventional level with accepted ideas that regulate social interactions, usually accompanied with ethnocentricity; the post-conventional level, often called universal citizenship, which includes the
aspiration for unity of all persons and peoples. Men and women face the same three developmental levels—men tend to frame them in terms of rights and women in terms of caring.

Laird (2007) wrote on gender gaps and different teaching styles for men and women: differences between men’s and women’s learning styles, suggesting that women “have a greater affinity for active practices” (p. 17) such as hands-on learning, and men for lecturing. However, that difference does not seem to match teachers’ experiences in correctional settings. Sax (2011) found differences in male and female vision and hearing. Israeli correctional educator Feuerstein (1980) wrote on mediated learning experience (MLE), a cognitive-moral teaching and learning strategy appropriate for both men and women. MLE depends on a caregiver (such as a teacher) sequencing and explaining new information for a learner. The next SOR question asks how correctional education programs can successfully enhance inmate post-release success.

**SOR Question:** What states are considered to have the best prison education, as measured by indicators such as the proportion of inmates who attain a GED or high school diploma? What are the key elements of successful programs, including but not limited to inmate incentives? What lessons could California learn from these programs?

The current author’s response is that it is insufficient for CDCR to continue making decisions about the Statewide education program merely on the basis of past practice. The ways in which things have been done (the paradigm) is one way to guide the system, but greater success will be realized if attention is also directed to the problems that those ways could not address (the anomalies). If we want to refine the program, a change in our way of thinking is now required.

**Recommendation 9:** Planning to improve CDCR’s education program should be based, in part, on what has been learned about correctional education anomalies and its rich “hidden heritage” literature.

A lack of standard criteria and divergent data bases make measures across states difficult (see Tolbert, 2006). The U.S. Education Department’s Office of Correctional Education/Correctional Education Association *Three State Study* (Steurer, et al., 2001), introduced above, used Maryland, Minnesota, and Ohio programs as exemplars, and noted substantial GED attainments in those states. In the early 1980s all attention was riveted on Texas’ approach, which was subsequently found to be relatively flawed; today Oklahoma claims great success (see Holley and Brewster, 1997-1998). Tolbert (2002-2003) used Maryland, Ohio, and Texas as exemplars.

The California Legislative Analyst’s Office report (LAO, 2008) stated that, proportionally, fewer California inmates access correctional education than do inmates in many other states, that the rate of GED attainment in CDCR is a fraction of the rate in many other states, and that inmate access to education differs greatly from prison to prison within the State. Those observations were made before the last two rounds of budget cuts to the CDCR Statewide education program. Observers report that inmate students who transfer from one CDCR prison to another often experience learning discontinuity because of varied program offerings at the sites.

Whitehurst and Chingos (2011) reported for the Brookings Institution on education in all settings (focusing on K-12 local schooling). They found that class size is not as important a
regulator of quality instruction as most educators expect. However, Schanzenbach and Mathis (2011) identified severe problems with the Brookings data set and methodology. So the issue of class size has not yet been definitively addressed. For the present, it is probably important to keep class sizes as small as possible within identified constraints of the budget and the physical plant. However, other predictors of GED completion are being researched. Mentor (2005) found that high school or GED completion typically requires at least 240 student class hours, or until the GED is attained. A focus on maximizing opportunities for time on task in the Adult Basic Education and GED programs might help inmate students maintain interest and be engaged in the program—help them meet the “persistence” requirement for program completion discussed by Comings (2001 and 2003) in adult education. Comings and his associates found learner persistence to be a much more reliable and robust predictor of program completion than class size. “If they [adult students] drop out of the program prematurely, or if they spend only a few hours a month working on their literacy skills, they are unlikely to achieve their goals” (2001, p. 65).

Reagen and Stoughton explained how education can be used to neutralize some of the debilitation that results from incarceration. In their report to the Ford Foundation they offered a perspective on the meaning of education in confinement, and a definition of a correctional school:

A small number of persons are doing yeoman work in an alien environment. Corrections is designed for custody and control. Education’s purpose is freedom, growth, and self-actualization. The correctional educator must, at minimum, maintain an island of sanity in a storm of psychosis. (1976, p. 28).

What psychosis? Reagen and Stoughton were building on work by Barnes and Teeters (1959).

[T]he ever present jailing psychosis with the frenzied preoccupation of counting and double-checking inmates. No rehabilitative program, however excellent in theory, can ever be a success so long as . . . administrators are judged to be efficient or incompetent almost exclusively by their success in preventing escapes. (p. 428).

Barnes and Teeters were commenting on what has been called the U.S. reformatory movement, the 1870-1900 effort to transform prisons into schools. That movement began with a declaration of principles, of which Principle X introduced an aspiration relevant to the current report:

Education is a vital force in the reformation of fallen men and women. Its tendency is to quicken the intellect, inspire self-respect, excite to higher aims, and afford a healthful substitute for low and vicious amusements. Education is, therefore, a matter of primary importance in prisons, and should be carried to the utmost extent consistent with the other purposes of such institutions. (Wines, 1871, p. 542).

In recent years the work of Wright, and of Muth, best express some central themes that are relevant to these points.

It is safe to say that prisons are low-trust environments; prison officers are an unreceptive ‘audience,’ stingy with its applause for just about everyone who sets foot in prison. The scripts of keeper and kept have been well rehearsed over the years, so
performances are stale and brittle. Prisoners are typecast, their identities spoiled in advance, the course of the interaction limited in advance by stigma. The disciplinary matrix of surveillance and control circumscribes the prisoners’ performative spaces [or tolerated roles]. Like the roles one finds in funeral homes, job interviews, or in corporate boardrooms, prescriptions on behavior abound. Prisons do not prepare prisoners for the street because prisoners have few opportunities to consider, let alone perform, mainstream roles or identities. (Wright, 2011, p. 7).

Institutional schools can provide such opportunities, however.
Not all schools are the same. Schools operate at variable distances from the central functions of the prison allowing for different degrees of autonomy. Some schools are tailored by prison operations with little space afforded to novelty. The school’s center of gravity is more or less authoritarian. Some teachers work hard to put some distance between school and prison. They carve out a cultural space of being, acting[,] interacting with prisoners that counterpoints prison culture and enable[s] performative spaces to flourish. Not all teachers are the same. Some manage, with relative ease, the structural or organizational tensions created by schools within prisons—the dialects of freedom and control, structure and novelty, alienation and agency, merit and guilt. These teachers turn schools into prison niches... Other teachers are not so adept handling the complexities and anxieties of prison life. They reduce anxiety, uncertainty and risk (perceived or real) by adopting the official culture. (Wright, 2011, p. 42).

A brief overview of the [correctional] education literature suggests there is face validity to the school-as-niche theory, in one case the reference is explicit (Behan, 2008). Teacher imagery (which guides and reflects practice), describes schools as special or different places within prison (Meussling, 1984), enclaves (Gehring), spheres of civility (Wright & Gehring, 2008), public spheres (Wright & Gehring, 2008), isles of civility (Kraft, 1998), just communities (Kohlberg), democratic communities (Duguid, 2000), third spaces (Muth, 2008; Wilson, 2000), borderlands (Wright, 2008), cracks in the system (Behan, 2008), places where cultures of respect (Muth, 2004) are proposed and lived. An ethic of care infuses these special places (Wright, 2004). Wright (2001) notes how prisoners learn to dwell and nourish themselves in the safe spaces provided by literacy programs. Vacca (2004) reports education programs give prisoners a break from the routines of prison life.
Tewksbury and Stengel (2006) state that schools are places where students feel good about themselves: enhance self-esteem and self-efficacy, which prepares them to succeed in other endeavors. Schools-as-niches may offer students more comfort than other places in the prison: they are a good place ‘to escape the cockroaches’ (Wilson, 2007). Prisoner-students allude to the niche-like qualities of schools, stating that good teachers help them recover their self-esteem as well as provide support and meaningful work for them (MagheeHon, 2006). Prisoners allude to the school as a meaningful activity when they talk about time serving them by going to school, rather than them serving time. (Wright, 2011, pp. 28-29).

Both prisoners and officers are trapped in a cynical interactional game with roles
encumbered by the institutional dynamic of power, surveillance and control; trust is very scarce. When prisoners attempt to break out of stereotyped roles officers respond with wariness and skepticism, believing their efforts as further evidence that prisoners are manipulative, strategic game-players. Both keepers and kept must keep their distance or be suspected of being a con lover or snitch, respectively. A teacher’s positive description of a student’s efforts in school convinces officers that the teacher has been duped by the devious prisoner, whose ‘real’ (despicable) behavior occurs in the cell blocks. (Wright, 2011, p. 11).

Muth (2007) explored many of the same themes, and explained how they translate into correctional education classroom behaviors.

For the past 40 years adult learning theory has stressed the need for adults to share in the planning of their own learning and socially construct new knowledge by building on their background knowledge and life experiences. Despite growing acceptance of social constructivist [approaches], . . .in community-based literacy programs and even corporate settings, much literacy instruction in U.S. prisons remains individualized, and prison classrooms are not perceived as safe places for conversations about life experiences and personal literacy needs. (Muth, 2007, part one, p. 2).

Muth found that

. . .U.S. prison classrooms remain spaces characterized by individualized instruction, decontextualized content, and silenced learners[ where]. . .print literacy [is] . . .often associate[d] with discrete skills, test taking and grades. . .Excluded . . are everyday literacy practices, critical reflection, and the social construction of meaning. Unfortunately these narrow associations are often associated with school failure. (pp. 6-7).

Muth went on to describe “the safe routine of workbooks” (p. 8), in which literacy learning [is reduced to the]. . .mastery of skills” (p. 10).

When. . .deeply personal thoughts are devalued—either by the student or the teacher—and deemed unwelcome in the ABE [Adult Basic Education] class, they remain detriments, distractions from the official curriculum, and, perhaps most tragically, unresolved life problems: further proof of the prisoner’s impotence. (p. 20).

He found that some correctional educators expressed concerns about using literacy instruction to help inmate students develop social attitudes, as in the “attitudes, skills, and knowledge” approach introduced above, especially with regard to “(a) prisoner fears and embarrassment, (b) teacher fear of losing control [of the classroom], (c) narrow curriculum, and (d) lack of support from the [institutional] administration” (p. 21). The summary in part one of Muth’s report was that there are perceived barriers in correctional education “that make learner-centered approaches appear radical and dangerous” (p. 24). These findings were concisely stated in part two of his report: “In many U.S. prisons an overuse of individualized instruction silences literacy learners and reinforces oppressive notions about what knowledge is and whose knowledge counts. . . .top-down prison culture and output-based programs [become places] where quantity
(completions) trumps quality ([learning] process).” (p. 3). He found that many of correctional education’s requirements “create[s] tedious classes for both students and teachers” (p. 25).

But Muth noted that “Learning is a collaborative process,” and that a better approach would require teachers and students to develop “social skills such as active listening, tolerance for diversity. . . respect for personal boundaries” (p. 4). He found some correctional educators “were emphatic . . . they were not trained (or hired) to do this” (p. 11). One teacher in Muth’s sample was concerned that shifting from the “student as object,” to the “student as subject . . . involve[s] risks and tricky negotiations across cultural borders” (p. 18). Another said “It would be nice if education could be the number one priority in prison, but this is not going to happen. . . you just have to work around security. . . Our students are regularly taken out of class for urines [drug tests]. We were told by the warden that we and the school took second place to security.” (p. 19).

Other correctional education researchers have expressed parallel, though different findings. For example, the Urban Institute published several excellent studies recommending that the link between prison education and reentry programs should be strengthened: Gaes and Kendig (2002), Gaes (2008), and Brazzell, et al. (2009). Peterson and Taylor (2009) recommended cognitive-moral and citizenship development to bridge the gap between the currently narrow definition of literacy and a more balanced approach.

**SOR Question: Are there data that support the CDCR approach to education—especially the increasing reliance on inmate tutors and self-study to compensate for reductions in professional literacy staff? What does the data show about whether limited class time is an effective teaching method for incarcerated men and women, including those who have failed in regular classes?**

The salient dynamic of this last question by the SOR might be stated as follows: To what extent can the present, CDCR Statewide education program be judged effective? The response has two elements. First, despite the cutbacks, now is the time to study and learn about what is happening and what can be done to maximize results despite the budget shortfall. Second, it is imperative that the CDCR education organizational culture be improved. Together, these two recommendations outline part of the way out of “the current mess.”

**Recommendation 10:** The current CDCR mode of offering limited educational opportunities, which is actually a return to the nationwide pre-1965 correctional education pattern, should be studied comprehensively to maximize its potential benefits.

That pre-1965 system, during its final years, was implemented by (a) one or a few “head teachers” at each facility whose work was mostly to develop, supervise, and monitor educational activities offered by inmate teachers, (b) site-based principal’s offices, when they existed, with limited, often intermittent staffing and capabilities, and in some states (c) a statewide cadre of supervisors operating out of the department of corrections office in the state capital. Gehring and Rennie (2008) summarized how that system actually began in local schools throughout the U.S.:

In 1797 Dr. Andrew Bell introduced into England the system of using . . . older boys for the instruction of the younger (Monroe, 1912, p. 382). Bell’s system was refined by Joseph Lancaster. By applying detailed curricula and the services of conduct monitors,
Lancaster... made it ‘possible for one teacher to direct a large number of pupils.’... He... proved that one teacher could control a school of a thousand students. Thus in the absence of any willingness on the part of the people adequately to support schools, the government opposed... to contributing for such purposes, and... the religious bodies wholly unable to cope with the needs of the times, the monitorial system made possible some general attention to public education. In addition to economy, the great advantage... was its rigid method of grading in arithmetic, spelling, and reading. Students could be promoted in a specific subject, for example arithmetic, even if they were not ready to move into the next general grade. This was also a disadvantage: learning tended to be through rote memory—formal, superficial, and mechanical (p. 383).

In 1805 the Lancasterian system was introduced in New York City. Within a few years it was thriving from Boston south to Charleston, South Carolina and west to Cincinnati. Lancaster assisted in New York City, Brooklyn (then a separate jurisdiction), and Philadelphia (pp. 383-384). His system was popular throughout the U.S. before the Civil War, and had lasting effects. In corrections, principles from this Bell, Lancasterian, or monitorial system were applied from the late 19th to mid 20th century. Early prison Sabbath schools (from approximately 1825 to 1876) had theological students and other community tutors for moral and religious education. Until the 1960s most correctional education programs were managed by one or two head teachers who provided inservice and supervision for inmate tutors who did most of the actual instruction.

In the current CDCR education structure, continuity of staff expectations would be inconsistent with this “new” or reduced organizational structure. Indeed, greater responsibilities are being shifted to CDCR inmates, so now might be the right moment to explore the shared responsibility model, in which inmate students are encouraged to take as much responsibility for their own education as they are currently able to take. One respondent in a Virginia correctional education study stated “In the spirit of andragogy [adult education] and nondirective teaching, I’d love to shift more of the responsibility for learning onto my students themselves” (Muth, 2007, part two, p. 24). In California, now is the right time to consider having inmates participate in many of the functions that were previously relegated to civilian teachers, such as the establishment of cooperative school and classroom rules, teamed tutorial and small group learning, and perhaps curriculum development consistent with general parameters established by credentialed teachers.

It is also time to reconsider professional development themes for qualified teachers and for inmates employed as instructors. In addition to the nuts and bolts of preservice and inservice relevant to the institutional setting, the new focus of professional development should not only address paradigm issues (how things have been done) but also issues related to the anomalies (obstacles or problems the paradigm has not solved). CDCR has not yet identified or thoroughly considered the anomalies. The previous CDCR approach, though it was called evidence-based, ignored evidence that was inconsistent with the paradigm. It is interesting that Kuhn (1970), whose work shaped the paradigm change model of how communities solve problems, predicted that persistent anomalies can set an agenda for crisis. During a crisis, like the one now faced by CDCR’s education program, attention shifts from the work that went on under the paradigm, to a realization that the anomalies, which were previously ignored, now occupy center stage. There is a vast and helpful literature about the anomalies that was neglected under the previous CDCR education paradigm. It is known as the “hidden heritage” because it was inaccessible to most field-
based correctional educators. The current lull in program capabilities may provide an excellent opportunity to explore that literature and ascertain the degree to which its principles might now be applicable. Some salient aspects of the hidden heritage have been summarized in this report.

**Recommendation 11: Special steps should be taken to improve the organizational culture of CDCR’s Statewide education program.**

> [S]everal researchers and authors support the idea that the primary focus of all correctional services should be educational. (Searcy, 2008, p. 75).

The preceding section addressed some issues that can be summarized as part of the organizational culture of most correctional systems. One important point is that it is relatively easy to establish an organizational culture but very difficult to improve it. In many ways the prison culture of the United States began with the first model penitentiaries in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. By the beginning decades of the 19th century prison culture was established and consolidated. McKelvey’s book title, *American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions* (1977) expressed one dimension of that culture. Another dimension was expressed in Beaumont and de Toqueville’s report on the American penitentiary systems (1964/1833), in which they summarized the organizational culture of prisons by coining the term “bureaucracy.” The main dimension, however, was the top-down or authoritarian mode of organization, typically with militaristic elements, with the added dimension that—from the beginning—prison staff were counseled not to care about prisoners. California’s entry into the prison milieu, decades later, was a continuation of the organizational culture had already been experienced in older, East Coast prisons.

In 1849 San Francisco converted the ship Euphemia into a prison known as the Waban (alternatively spelled “Wabau”). It was a “hulk,” divided into cells and chained up to a dock. In 1851 several county prisons were reorganized by the legislature into State prisons. In 1852 San Quentin was established. (Brown, 1991, pp. 4-7). The CDCR website explains that in 1912 our first Statewide agency made up of prisons was established, the California State Detention Bureau. By 1951 that agency became known as the California Department of Corrections, and in 2005 the “R” was added, changing the name to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The details of the organization had changed, but there are questions about whether, or to what extent, the organizational climate ever really changed.

This issue is especially relevant to CDCR’s Statewide education program. Like other statewide corrections systems, CDCR has been known to focus on details rather than meanings or purposes, despite the fact that inmates are very concerned about meanings. Reciprocity, an attribute of good adult education in general and of correctional education in particular, cannot be implemented through a sea of details and regulations (written and/or unwritten). Muth’s criticism about “individualized instruction, decontextualized content, and silenced learners[, where] . . .print literacy [is] . . .often associate[d] with discrete skills, test taking and grades” (2007, part one, pp. 6-7) concretized this issue. As we saw, Wright expressed another part of the same issue:

> When prisoners attempt to break out of stereotyped roles officers respond with wariness and skepticism, believing their efforts as further evidence that prisoners are manipulative, strategic game-players. Both keepers and kept must keep their
distance or be suspected of being a con lover or snitch, respectively. A teacher’s positive description of a student’s efforts in school convinces officers that the teacher has been duped by the devious prisoner, whose ‘real’ (despicable) behavior occurs in the cell blocks. (Wright, 2011, p. 11).

None of these comments were made about California correctional education; they were instead descriptions of the prison setting in general, from a nationwide perspective. Nevertheless, if the idea of shared responsibility—which has surely been placed in the forefront with the recent rounds of budget cuts—is to be taken seriously, mere details will not make correctional education truly correctional or transformational. If we are not concerned about criminals with job skills, or with “the criminal plumber” problem cited above, the details of class schedules, text selection, or which vendor can provide the most useful type of classroom furniture will not be helpful. The issue is much larger than the details, and cannot be addressed through quick add-ons or simple prescriptions. For example, most observers agree that education is always a good thing, but that idea does not hold up to close inspection, as indicated in Figure 8 below.

**Figure 8: Three Types of Educational Service Delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th><strong>Obstructionist</strong></th>
<th><strong>Conventional</strong></th>
<th><strong>Transformative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplary System(s)</strong></td>
<td>Traditional Bureau of Indian Affairs programs, some prison education programs.</td>
<td>Most local school programs, most post-secondary degree programs.</td>
<td>Some local school and post-secondary programs; some private, specialized schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Orientation</strong></td>
<td>“The most we can give these students is basic education—they can’t handle more than that.”</td>
<td>“It’s up to the student to take advantage of program opportunities.”</td>
<td>“Our expectation is that all participants—teachers and students—will give their best effort.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining Attributes</strong></td>
<td>Abiding resource inadequacy; schooling based on conventional prejudices; classes may be large or small.</td>
<td>Intermittent resource adequacy, and schooling based on fads and politics; tends toward large classes.</td>
<td>Fixed resource adequacy (because people care), and schooling based on the best research; small classes when possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although some teachers may be devoted to student learning, most have some other agenda. Teachers meet minimal job expectations; ‘may make some promises but do not necessarily deliver on them. Teachers are enthusiastic about teaching and learning, often acquiring skills that are not required to keep their jobs.

From a nationwide perspective of corrections Boonyanate and Prayoonwet (2010) summarized major trends that have made the pursuit of exemplary programming difficult: prison overcrowding, budget cutbacks, interrupted courses, lack of standardization (an inmate enrolled in the school at one prison might be transferred to another prison where that program is not offered), an absence of libraries, a prevalence of waiting lists to enroll, and limited access generally. Still, as noted above, the current CDCR education program discontinuity, which resulted from budget constraints, provides a good opportunity to plan the program that will follow those constraints.

The current discontinuity is characterized by several rather abrupt changes, chief among which are a smaller civilian teaching staff and a larger inmate teaching staff. At approximately the same time another organizational shift was also implemented—a reduced reliance on mandatory enrollments and a greater reliance on voluntary enrollments. These simultaneous changes can be seen as opportunities to experiment with greater inmate responsibility for their own education, aligned with the approaches discussed in the first parts of this report. That change, toward shared responsibility, is consistent with the way community adult education diverges from the education of children, and with the Figure 2 consideration of “what works in correctional education?” CDCR teachers report vast improvements: the classroom organizational culture under the volunteer enrollment approach is perceived as being more pro-education. This shift also provides one example of how an incentive might work to attract enrollment (an element in one of the questions advanced by the SOR). In short, the voluntary enrollment approach enables students and potential students to make choices regarding their own education, it is consistent with some of the best advice from experts who are familiar with both the paradigm and the anomalies in the field, and it improves the classroom organizational culture. With this fact in mind, planning for a better Statewide education program can proceed according to the recommended focus on shared responsibility as a useful program improvement strategy. Stated alternatively, this important element of a good program can become part of the new paradigm instead of merely an anomaly.

Summary

- The current CDCR Statewide education program relies on an organizational model—formerly known as the Bell, Lancasterian, or monitorial system—which was on the cusp of education during the 1797-1805 period. In corrections, nationwide throughout the U.S., elements of that model lasted until about 1965, justified by resource inadequacy. The system was generally phased out as soon as Federal funds for education became available. In short, the California correctional education system has applied an organizational approach that is antiquated and inadequate, one that has been abandoned by most other states.

- Over the decades, California correctional education has seen at least a half dozen exemplary programs that were phased out. California correctional education has been subject to most of
the same constraints as correctional education in other states. One summary is that CDCR education has been generally characterized by an overemphasis on details and a lack of emphasis on the meaning of why education services should be provided.

- CDCR education is afflicted by educational decisions that are made by non-educators, a flawed and reductionist perspective suggesting that recidivism is a good measure of correctional education program effectiveness, a focus on student knowledge and skills when student attitudes should be prioritized and, in general, program attributes and an organizational culture that decontextualizes and potentially obstructs teaching and learning content.

- These compound problems were, until recently, exacerbated by the mandatory enrollment policy. However, there is now some evidence that mandatory enrollment may be phased out.

- CDCR education problems began with the acceptance of the nationwide corrections and correctional education paradigms, and their current and most obvious manifestations are directly linked to terrible budget constraints.

- The simultaneity of all these problems suggest that the most productive use of the current time of budget and program discontinuity can be to plan the attributes of an improved CDCR Statewide education program, to be implemented when budgets are not so constrained.

Addressing this constellation of issues is not a simple matter and there is no single, panacea-like add-on or mechanical solution sufficient to turn around CDCR’s education program. However, tools to begin the process do exist, and many of the preconditions for success are already operational within the system. Dedicated personnel are on the payroll, unintended though promising improvements have been realized toward student responsibility for aspects of their own education, progress toward voluntary enrollments has been experienced, and so forth. California leaders may decide that it is in the program’s overall interest to work with others who have also been considering potential program improvements. If that is the case, the faculty and staff of the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at CSU, San Bernardino would be happy to cooperate with our CDCR colleagues toward that end, either to share in the work or to refer CDCR to others who might be willing and able to assist.
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