

The Inviting Convicts to College Program

Authors: Chris Rose^a; Kristin Reschenberg^b; Stephen Richards^a

Affiliations: ^a University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, USA

^b Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

DOI: 10.1080/10509671003716092

Article Requests: [Order Reprints](#) : [Request Permissions](#)

Published in: [Journal of Offender Rehabilitation](#), Volume 49, Issue 4 May 2010 , pages 293 - 308

Publication Frequency: 8 issues per year

Also incorporating: [Journal of Offender Counseling Services Rehabilitation](#)

[Download PDF](#) (~151 KB) [View Related Articles](#)

To cite this Article: Rose, Chris , Reschenberg, Kristin and Richards, Stephen 'The Inviting Convicts to College Program' [Journal of Offender Rehabilitation](#), 49:4, 293 - 308

Abstract

While we know formal education is an important variable for reducing recidivism, there are few prison systems that offer college courses. We introduce the Inviting Convicts to College Program that deploys undergraduate student instructors of college level courses inside prisons. The student-teachers are supervised by professors. The program is based on the theory of Convict Criminology. This article describes the program, and uses quantitative and qualitative methods to evaluate the program over two semesters taught at a medium-security state prison. The methodology uses both a survey and focused interviews with student teachers. Findings indicate the program goals were met, and the courses taught served as valuable experiences for convicts and student-teachers.

Keywords: college prison programs; convict criminology; recidivism

INTRODUCTION

In this article, we describe and assess a new prisoner college preparatory program developed through a partnership between a medium-security state prison and the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh. The Inviting Convicts to College Program has been designed to be a relatively inexpensive way to help address the lack of college programs available in prisons. Through their involvement with the ICCP, prisoners learn about college enrollment and traditional college expectations. In addition, the ICCP program has been designed to provide educational opportunities for the more "traditional" university college students by including their involvement as an active and vital part of the program. Under the direction of coordinating professors, these students enroll as teaching interns and become directly responsible for course instruction.

PRISON EDUCATION AND CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHIES

The main goal of prison education programs is to increase the educational level of prisoners and improve their success upon release. As correctional populations continue to increase (Austin, Bruce, Carroll, McCall, & R

providing postsecondary education programs become even more important, because the vast majority of ex-prisoners exit prison and return to our local communities. College education programs, in particular, represent one in which prisoners can become better equipped for the challenges that they will face when they return to society (Richards, 2009). Research prior to and during the 1990s confirms this suggestion by showing a reduced likelihood of recidivism among those convicts who completed college education programs during incarceration (Blackburn, Thorpe, & MacDonald, 1984; O'Neil, 1990; Wreford, 1990).

Despite these findings, when public outrage about criminals getting a “free ride” while law-abiding students receive education¹ combined with the political rhetoric associated with getting tough on crime, the U.S. Congress passed legislation that eliminated Pell Grant eligibility for prisoners (Rose, 2004). As part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1993 and the Higher Education Reauthorization Act of 1994, inmates are legally ineligible for federal student loans. With the passage of these two acts, college education programs began to disappear from the offerings of many prison education departments, and by the end of the 1990s most states were reporting that the elimination of Pell Grants resulted in the drastic reduction or elimination of the college programs in their prisons (Parenti, 1999; Pollock, Tewksbury, Erickson, & Taylor, 2000; Tregea, 2003; Welsh, 2002).

This negative view of education in prison has not always been held by the U.S. Congress, however. The role of prison education programs in prison has changed as public and political ideas about punishment have changed over the past several decades. In the 1970s, prison education departments focused not only on academic basics, such as reading and writing, but also on social skills that are essential to succeeding outside of prison (Hobler, 1999; Ryan, 1995). A full range of academic programs (ABE), secondary, postsecondary, vocational, and social programs were available to inmates. This was a period when the federal government recognized the importance of a “holistic” approach to rehabilitation and reintegration and these programs were backed by federal funds (Hobler, 1999).

In contrast, the 1980s were characterized by a much more punitive and retributive approach to corrections. The widespread claim that “nothing works” when it comes to rehabilitation helped fuel the desire for harsher punishments, and this view clarified his stance to be that rehabilitation programs can work when they are done correctly (Martinson, 1973). Federal funding for prison education programs contributed to the functional illiteracy of a large number of prisoners (Hobler, 1999). Today, over half of all convicts are functionally illiterate, meaning that their reading skills are at or below the 5th grade level (Kerle, 2004).

The 1990s continued massive increases in the prison population, further complicating matters for prison education departments. Overcrowding led to education classes filling up quickly, but budget constraints did not allow for the expansion of the programs (Hobler, 1999). Essentially, there was a greater demand to participate in the programs than supply. The result was long waiting lists for enrollment in the most basic of educational programs.

Currently, every federal prison and most state facilities have education programs in some form. Adult basic

secondary education are the most commonly found types of courses due to the large number of prisoners with low academic skills as well as a high school education. College programs, however, are rare (Lahm, 2000; Stepick, 2000). Even if some prisons have received funding to offer a few college level courses, the money usually runs out in short order. It appears to be very few prison systems able to sustain college prison programs over time, as most prisoners lack the resources to pay tuition. The fundamental goal of the ICCP is to help address this problem by bringing college level education to prisons through inexpensive and collaborative partnerships between prisons and universities. As we will see, the program offers one inexpensive method to help address these limitations.

The Effectiveness of Education Programs in a Prison Setting

Whereas research on the effectiveness of prison education programs tends to show that such programs can reduce recidivism, they leave many important issues and questions unanswered. While many of these studies use recidivism to determine if an education program was successful (e.g., Fabelo, 2002; Duguid, 1997; Duguid & Pawson, 1998; Wilson, 1994), researchers disagree on how best to measure recidivism. Fabelo (2002), for instance, chooses to include parole violation as part of his operationalization of recidivism, but this is by no means a universally agreed upon definition. In fact, some studies that use the likelihood of recidivism to measure success do not specify a definition for recidivism. Instead, they simply use it as a marker (Duguid, 1997; Duguid & Pawson, 1998; Wilson, 1994).

Another question that arises in regard to recidivism is how long should a person be crime-free in order to be considered successful? Fabelo (2002) suggests that a time frame of two years is sufficient to determine success, while Wilson (1994) argues that five years may be a more appropriate time frame. Others have argued that recidivism is an indirect measure of success and more of a measure of police activity (Vacca, 2004), implying that an alternative measure of success should be used.

One such possibility could be the use of employability after release (Jenkins, Steurer, & Pendry, 1995). Being able to find a job after release is crucial to an offender "making it" on the outside. If an exconvict can't earn a living legitimately, they are more likely to return to illegal work. Since the ultimate goal of these programs is to keep parolees from returning to prison, a measure of success should not necessarily be eliminated completely, but instead enhanced. Fabelo's (2002) study provides an example of this method of enhanced measurement since he does consider both employment and recidivism. Wilson (1995) measured success after release by determining the ability of an exconvict to obtain employment after release. They found that the higher the level of education completed during incarceration, the more likely they were to find employment. The small number of offenders in the study that completed a college education had a 100% success rate in employment. However, these researchers did not look at whether the released prisoners were underemployed or overeducated, which can be a problem for someone on the job market with a criminal record.

A methodological issue that consistently arises in most studies of prison education programs is a self-selection bias. If participants of the programs have chosen to participate rather than having been randomly selected, they may be different from those that chose not to participate. The inmates that participate in education programs are more likely to succeed than those that do not and this may make them less inclined to recidivate (Rose, 2004). To help correct for this bias, researchers should use random assignment to the programs.

selection bias, some efforts have been made to make the sample at least demographically similar to the res population (Wilson, 1994), but simply matching participants with demographically similar nonparticipants is sufficient solution to this problem. Duiguid (1997) and Duiguid and Pawson's (1998) method of using the C Information on Recidivism Scale (SIR)² represents an innovative way of alleviating some of the self-selectio the offenders are not compared to those that did not participate. Instead, they are only compared to the SIF well they would do after release. Yet, this method has an inherent limitation since it relies heavily on the ac prediction tool to determine the success of the education programs.

In order to truly assess the effectiveness of any prison education program, one must also look at the quality being taught. Programs are greatly affected by inadequate funding and lack of supplies, attitudes of the cor teachers, and prisoners regarding education and rehabilitation (Vacca, 2004; Lin, 2000). If the setting is not education, learning may not actually take place, which makes evaluation of the program difficult and even r (2004). As such, in our assessment of the ICCP we focused on two underlying assessment factors: program ability to enroll exconvicts into university and/or technical colleges. We first provide a detailed description of before turning to the assessment and the implications of the results.

THE ICCP

The ICCP is designed to be a low cost college preparatory program conducted on site at a local area prison inmates enroll in a noncredit college course. The course is taught by senior undergraduate students who ar by faculty. These student interns teach the two-hour classes for 14 consecutive weeks. The pilot program b the past six years the ICCP has grown and evolved. The program is now offered at two prisons during the f semesters. Two student instructors per course now co-teach the classes at each prison. The program has i reviews in newspaper stories, from correctional administrators, and has been featured on public radio and t

Curriculum and Student Expectations: Prisoners and Undergraduates

The primary mission of the ICCP is to enable prisoners to make an informed decision about enrolling in a u community, or technical college upon their release. Is it possible and feasible for them to go to college? Do could successfully complete and earn an accredited degree? For those who believe they can, the ultimate g for prisoners to attend college or university upon release from prison. As such, prisoner-students work with teachers to complete the admissions financial aid applications and mail the forms to colleges and universiti

Undergraduate student-teachers design and deliver course curriculum to their prisoner-students. They are basis by the professors responsible for coordinating the ICCP. During these meetings, they receive instruct presentation and organization, course development, and baccalaureate degree requirements. Essentially, t instructors learn how to put together course materials to teach a college-level course, which may help prep appointments as a graduate teaching assistant. For instance, they develop a teaching portfolio containing s lectures, exams and/or quizzes, in-class assignments, and homework assignments. After teaching the cour

they might also write research papers pertaining to their experiences with the ICCP, which are presented at and/or submitted for publication (i.e., Richards, Faggiani, Roffers, Hendricksen, & Kruger, 2008a, 2008b).

Like all traditional university courses, successful progress through the course depends upon successful completion of objectives and requirements illustrated on the course syllabus (i.e., class participation, course assignments, satisfactory research papers, and so on). The ICCP course content that we describe and assess centered on *criminology*, a developing field in critical criminology that:

...consists primarily of essays and empirical research conducted and written by convicts or ex-convicts, on completing or already in possession of a Ph.D., or by enlightened academics who critique existing literature and practices, thus contributing to a new perspective on criminology, criminal justice, corrections, and community (Ross & Richards, 2003, p. 6)

Finally, student-teachers must also meet with the prison education director on-site at the prison for orientation and class meeting. Here, they are introduced to the security protocols of the prison that they will need to adhere to and measures that can be taken to help ensure their safety in the event of an emergency.

Requirements and Procedures for Enrollment in the ICCP

The prison education directors that we have worked with to coordinate the ICCP have been primarily responsible for recruiting and enrolling prisoner-students. Based upon our suggestions, these directors have sought to recruit prisoners under a number of relevant conditions. First, prisoners that have not previously earned a high school diploma, GED, or college credit be accommodated. Second, based upon the educational director's discretion, convicts that have a history of major prison rule infractions during their current incarceration have, typically, been disqualified from enrollment. We have given preference to those prisoners approaching their parole or mandatory release date.

METHODS: ASSESSING THE ICCP

The evaluation presented here represents an assessment of four separate ICCP courses that followed the described curriculum for both prisoners and students. Each of these programs were offered consecutively from the Fall semester of 2006 to the Spring semester of 2008, and offered at the same Midwestern medium-security maximum security prison. The assessment focused on determining whether or not the underlying goals of the ICCP were accomplished. Variables measured included (a) successful at enrolling prisoner-students in an accredited university and/or technical colleges upon their release from the educational program that helped prisoner-students become familiar with the expectations of college course enrollment and financial aid processing; and (c) an applicable, as well as, rigorous educational experience for the student-teachers and interns.

Data Collection

Prisoner assessments of the ICCP were established via prisoner opinion surveys consisting of questions on a Likert scale, and focus group discussions with enrolled prisoners. The survey included questions that allowed prisoners to express their opinions and assessments of the instructors, and the usefulness, difficulty, and quality of the program. Four focus groups were held with the prisoner-students related to their experiences in the ICCP (one focus group for each of the four separate programs). On average, these focus groups lasted about 60 minutes; course instructors were not present at the focus group sessions. Topics of discussion also included prisoner experiences and involvement in alternative programs, their educational goals, their initial expectations of the ICCP, their opinions concerning the value of the program, the degree of depth in the curriculum, and whether or not the program and the curriculum was

Also, separate interviews were conducted with the eight undergraduate student-teachers that taught the four courses at the prison. The interview format was the same for each student, and focused on such topics as their opinions on the program and the educational benefits they may have received from teaching the courses.

RESULTS

Enrollment, Completion, and Success Figures: 2006-2008

The prisoner-students enrolled in the ICCP clearly understood the importance of a college education and, consequently, that their involvement in crime resulted from their lack of education. This lack of experience with higher education led to a number of prisoner-students to be surprised by the level of difficulty and amount of academic work required to complete the program. Less than half of the inmates who enrolled in the ICCP successfully completed it (about 44%).

Although they came to class and participated in discussions, worked on the assigned readings, and attempted to complete written assignments and exams, some did not have the language skills to effectively comprehend the readings or the writing skills to successfully complete the exams, and the writing skills to produce a coherent paper. Simply put, the majority of the students who enrolled in the ICCP were simply not ready for college.

While some prisoner-students were ill-prepared to comprehend the reading assignments and/or to complete homework assignments, exams, and papers, others clearly had the aptitudes to meet university expectations. In fact, about 14% of the prisoner-students who successfully completed the ICCP were enrolled in a university or technical college by the end of the program. It should be noted, however, that the ability of student-prisoners to successfully enroll in university or technical college was limited by their mandatory release dates. The majority of these inmates did not send off their application materials, because it would not be possible for them to attend during the following semester. The average length of time left to serve for those prisoners who successfully completed the ICCP was 5.8 years (the average length of time left to serve for those prisoners who were teaching interns successfully completed the program, with half of those students presenting related papers at the annual conferences).

TABLE 1 ICCP Enrollment, Completion, and Success Figures: Prisoner-Student

Justice Students (Fall 2006 to Spring 2008)

	Fall 06	Spring 07	Fall 07	Spring 08	Totals
Prisoner-students enrolled	12	11	15		12N = 50
Prisoner-students who successfully completed ICCP	7	5	7		3N = 22
Prisoner-students admitted to a college by end of ICCP	1	1	0		1 N = 3
Criminal Justice students enrolled in ICCP	2	2	2		2 N = 8
Criminal Justice students who successfully completed ICCP	2	2	2		2 N = 8
Criminal Justice students presenting related paper at conference	1	1	0		2 N = 4

Prisoner-Student Assessments of the ICCP: Quantitative Results

Table 2 shows the averaged responses of the prisoner-students who met two conditions: (a) they successfully completed ICCP between the Fall semester of 2006 and the Spring semester of 2008 (each received a university certificate of their accomplishment), and (b) they completed the prisoner-student assessment survey.

TABLE 2 Averaged Prisoner-Student Assessment Survey Responses: ICCP (N = 22) Scale (Higher Values Represent More Positive/Supportive Responses)
Average response

Instructor Evaluation:

1. How would you rate the instructor's knowledge and command over the subject matter?
2. How well did the instructor explain the course content?
3. How well did the quiz and examination questions relate to the course content?
4. How well did the instructor stimulate your interest in learning the subject matter?
5. Would you recommend this instructor to fellow students?

Evaluation of Course Content:

6. How would you rate the quality of the syllabus?
7. How would you rate the degree to which the syllabus was followed?
8. Do you feel that the substantive course content (i.e., convict criminology) is relevant to your future studies?
9. How well did the course book and supplementary reading materials serve as useful aids in understanding the course material?
10. Could this course benefit from more effective use of learning technology (computers, video, etc.)?
11. How would you rate the difficulty of subject matter as compared to other courses/programs you have taken?

These data suggest that prisoner-students were satisfied with their learning experiences in the ICCP. The responses were consistently positive. They were confident in their teachers' command of the material. They indicated that their teachers had the ability to explain and stimulate their interest in the course material (ranging from an average of 4.1 to 4.7). Prisoner-students also viewed the tests, syllabi, and organization of the course favorably (an average of 4.1 to 4.7), as did the course text (i.e., Ross & Richards' [2003] text *Convict Criminology*).

The lowest averaged response (3.21) related to the relevance of convict criminology to their future careers. This suggests that while the convict criminology approach was intriguing to the prisoner-students, few prisoner-students would actually become convict criminologists, professors in a criminology department, or (due to their employment) employed in the criminal justice field. As such, this substantive material was not viewed as relevant to their careers.

While the average prisoner-student response to the question pertaining to the relative difficulty of the ICCP compared to other prison programs (3.44) seems low, one must be careful when interpreting this statistic. To explain, one might interpret this to mean that the ICCP may have been relatively easy for the prisoner-students to complete. However, such an interpretation ignores a number of known factors concerning prisoner-student enrollment and completion, which would explain the lower rating. For instance, the prison education directors (who were primarily responsible for prisoner-student enrollment and completion) tended to enroll prisoners whom they often referred to as "the cream of the crop." That is, these were those students that may have had educational and intellectual advantages, which would help them to not only complete a typical prison education program, but the ICCP as well.

Clearly, the educational directors were not always accurate in their predictions. As Table 1 shows, 56% of the students who enrolled in the ICCP failed to successfully complete it. These prisoners either failed a number of times and gave up, caught a trip to the detention cell block (the hole), received a reassignment in housing or work, or were transferred to another institution. As such, we should note that these students did not complete the prisoner

assessment survey, which certainly had the potential to lower the average response to this question.

Focus Groups with Prisoners

During our focus group discussion positive themes consistently emerged to further support the validity of the course. Our focus group data from all four discussions include multiple examples of prisoner-students emphasizing the value and support for the ICCP. The two comments below represent this theme:

The course has really opened my eyes to my full education potential, and what college education is really a course in my eight years so far in prison. I think they should use this course in every prison and maybe other troubled kids and adults might be and don't know that this [college] might be possible for them.

Drugs, alcohol, depression, low self-esteem led me to give up on college. When I started taking this class I would change this. I was just doing it to occupy some time. But these two interns convinced me not to give up. They helped me get into [a local technical college]. I'll be there in Fall 2008.

For these prisoner-students, then, enrolling in the ICCP was fundamentally viewed as a positive experience with a possibility that, initially, they believed to be beyond their reach.

Two additional themes also consistently emerged in the prisoner-students' discussion: (a) the challenges they provided, and (b) the student-teachers performed admirably. On this first point, one prisoner who, by the time of the group discussion, had been accepted at a four-year regional state university commented:

I hope to see others benefit from the continuation of the course. The challenge was there, the content of the course was worthwhile, and it was all packaged in a great learning experience.

Following up on this comment, another prisoner-student emphasized the challenges in the ICCP in comparison to other programs that he had been involved in during his incarceration:

I didn't find the other programs I've done to be as challenging as this one [ICCP]. I found there to be only a few other prison courses] who really cared about their students' education, and only a handful of students that cared about their education. It was as if they constructed the programs with the thought that inmates are lacking in intelligence.

Another prisoner-student, also addressing his classmates' comments on this subject, suggested that in con

ICCP his experiences with other prison education programs were completely different:

In other programs I've taken there was no respect from teachers other than what was required by administrators. If we showed up, we passed.

In this sampling of focus group transcripts, the prisoner-students' comments clearly suggest that ICCP was an endeavor that provided a worthy and applicable educational experience.

Concerning the second theme relating to the student-teacher performance, one prisoner-student suggested that student-teachers became more accustomed to the prison environment and that they grew into their roles as

Both instructors were very well prepared, professional, and related to the material and class well. But, I'm pretty nervous during their first prison experience. So early on I could see the tension in their faces. After a couple of classes they relaxed and were more self-confident and comfortable.

Throughout all of the focus group discussions, prisoner-students consistently provided supportive comments about their teachers. They were frequently described as: "respectful," "competent," "patient," "kind," and "concerned."

Interviews with Undergraduate Student-Teachers

The qualitative data collected to assess student-teacher views and opinions concerning their involvement in the program showed that student-teachers tended to stress a number of themes. Typically, they stressed that the experience was enlightening, and an applicable educational experience. On this first theme, one former student-teacher commented:

By the end of the semester, I felt valued and rewarded. I made a difference in those students' lives and they made a difference in my life as well.

Primarily, student-teachers stressed that these rewards came from the impact that they had when their students were successful at enrolling at a university by the end of the course.

Student-teachers also stressed how their prison teaching experiences cut through their preconceived notions about the prison population, as well as, the public misconceptions of inmates and prisons. A former student-teacher who earned a law degree indicated how her experiences with the program "enlightened" her notion and conception of prisons:

This class taught me not to judge others based on public perceptions. I was able to work with people that seem to live with and see them as people rather than just criminals. I know this will also benefit my legal career. This was a hands-on learning experience that taught lifelong lessons.

Also illustrated in this comment, student-teachers stressed the educational value and professional skills they gained. The student-teacher who is now pursuing a Master of Arts degree in Criminal Justice continued to stress these educational experiences.

Some of the skills I have gained are the ability to organize and lead discussions, the confidence to share my ideas in a group forum, and to develop relevant and clear lectures. These skills have been useful to me as a student.

Clearly, this student-teacher was able to use this experience teaching in prison to further her/his own education.

Apart from these positive themes, student-teachers also stressed a number of difficulties they encountered. Student-teachers emphasized that, at times, the prisoner-students seemed hesitant to write papers and participate in discussions that were critical of the U.S. correctional system. This hesitation among the convicts is not surprising given the “radical power dichotomy” (Carceral, Rose, Richards, & Bernard, 2008) that exists within the social structure of the prison environment. After all, they are prisoners with no rights of self expression.

To resolve these issues, student-teachers worked to foster a classroom culture where prisoners felt safe to share their thoughts and ideas that were relevant to the course material. Through their actions, the student-teachers assured the prisoner-students that they were not replicating the radical power dichotomy that exists in prison life. Student-teachers tried to facilitate class discussion and foster a comfortable learning environment making it clear that they were not required to inform staff on their criticisms of prison policies and/or procedures.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on these results, we argue that the ICCP produced a beneficial learning experience for both undergraduates and inmates, and that both the university and prison should be able to continue offering this educational experience without incurring and prisoners for little, if any, costs to their budgets and current resource allocations. In the ICCP's present format, university staff will not be required to devote significant amounts of their time to facilitating the ICCP. The educational program requires minimal resources: required to recruit prisoners, and assign one classroom once a week for a two-hour period over the course of the semester. Furthermore, the use of criminal justice students as student-teachers will prevent the reallocation of university resources to maintain the program. Professors will not be required to teach the noncredit course;³ rather they are required to supervise the student-teachers' internships.

We do suggest two new possible directions for future programs. First, it may be possible to develop connections between community correction centers and implement ICCP's at these agencies. As shown in our data, a number of convicts could not take full advantage of the program due to the fact that their mandatory release dates were far off from the end of the program. For these convicts, the program may have been an effective academic exercise, but it could not possibly help prepare them for university setting in the immediate future and, as such, its impact on these prisoners may fade over time. By implementing versions of the program at community correction centers, we could reach a population that could almost immediately benefit from the effect of the program. Since convicts who serve time in a community correction center may have access to day passes, a number of class sessions might actually be held at the university. Additionally, those who successfully complete the program could immediately enroll in a technical college or university prior to their mandatory release date.

Second, we might want to expand beyond the substantive material of convict criminology. As our data show, many students felt that the topic may not be relevant to their future career choices. As such, we suggest more diverse substantive material covered. For instance, introductory topics in sociology, psychology, political science, and history could be included. The inclusion of varying topics would not only help address the concerns of the prisoner-student about the relevance of the topic, but it would also open up the program to the involvement of other liberal arts student organizations and topics that overlap with crime, corrections, and crime policy.

In light of the restrictions placed by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1993 and the Higher Education Reauthorization Act of 1994 on prisoners' ability to receive a college education and, ultimately, a reduced likelihood of recidivism (Messner, 2003; Welsh, 2002), an expansion of the ICCP to other universities, prisons, and community correction centers may help to alleviate some of the negative results of these legislative restrictions. The benefits that the program potentially provide to convicts, prisons, university students, and surrounding communities may outweigh the costs that it places on university and correctional budgets.

The ICCP was found to be one inexpensive and effective way to build a bridge from the prison to the university and address the lack of college education opportunities in correctional facilities. We found prison administrators to be receptive to the idea. The warden and prison education director offered a great deal of support in the development and implementation of the ICCP. In part, such support may be due to the fact that these administrators are operating under a Department of Corrections mission statement that clearly promotes service to and a desire to maintain collaborative relationships with State universities operate under similar mission statements, and are located in close proximity. Thus, collaborating these two institutions to enhance prisoner's rehabilitation and education can be perceived by both institutions as being in their mission.

Such similarities can certainly provide a basis for the development of the partnerships that will be necessary to implement ICCP's in other states. Another source of support can likely be found in the established connections that may already exist between different institutions. Criminology, criminal justice, social work, and other academic departments are likely to have existing relationships with area prisons (i.e., working in the front office, assisting volunteer services, paralegal services,

services, and so on). If university professors have already established good working relationship with prison may be relatively easy for them to arrange a meeting to explore the possibility of implementing an ICCP. The partnerships between a local university and a local prison an innovative and inexpensive program can be maintained, which will introduce, invite, and help place prisoners in a university upon their release. At the same time, the program can enhance the educational experiences of the more traditional criminal justice student by providing a unique educational opportunity.

Notes

This concern about prisoners getting a “free ride” may not be warranted since prisoners received less than \$1000 in grants offered each year (Taylor, 2005).

The SIR is a scale used by Canadian Federal Parole Boards to predict a potential parolee's likelihood of reoffending relevant to the offender's risk level, such as offense type, number of offenses, family situation, and so on. It has been in use since 1982 in Canada and has been found to be a valid predictor of recidivism for a variety of types of offenders. The SIR is used in federal parole decisions and has also been used by the Correctional Service of Canada to evaluate various programs.

The coordinating professors, however, have typically involved themselves in course delivery via guest lecture presentations. We anticipate that this will continue.

REFERENCES

1. Austin, J. , Bruce, M. A. , Carroll, L. , McCall, P. L. and Richards, S. C. (2001) The use of incarceration in the United States: National policy paper. *Critical Criminology* **10**:1 , pp. 17-41. [[crossref](#)]
 2. Bala, G. , Thorpe, T. and MacDonald, D. (1984) Follow-up offenders who earn college degrees while incarcerated in New York state. *Journal of Correctional Education* **35** , pp. 86-88.
 3. Blackburn, F. S. (1979) Blacksburg, VA — *The relationship between recidivism and participation in a college associate of arts degree program for incarcerated offenders* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) Blacksburg: Polytechnic Institute and State University
 4. Carceral, K. C. , Rose, C. , Richards, S. C. and Bernard, T. J. Ruddell, R. K. and Fearn, N. E. (eds) Beyond the officer-prisoner model of control. *Correctional violence* pp. 231-248. Newgate Press , Richmond, VA
 5. Duguid, S. (1997) Confronting worst case scenarios: Education and high risk offenders. *Journal of Correctional Education* **48**:4 , pp. 153-159.
 6. Duguid, S. and Pawson, R. (1998) Education, change, and transformation. *Evaluation Review* **22**:1 , pp. 1-12. [[crossref](#)]
 7. Fabelo, T. (2002) The impact of prison education on community reintegration of inmates: The Texas experience. *Journal of Correctional Education* **53**:3 , pp. 106-110.
 8. Hobbler, B. (1999) Correctional education: Now and in the future. *Journal of Correctional Education* **50**:1 , pp. 1-12.
 9. Jenkins, H. D. , Steurer, S. J. and Pendry, J. (1995) A post release follow-up of correctional education completers released in 1990-1991. *Journal of Correctional Education* **46**:1 , pp. 20-24.
-

10. Kerle, K. (2004) Inmates as victims of crime. *American Jails* **18** , pp. 35-37.
 11. Lahm, K. F. (2000) Equal or equitable: An exploration of educational and vocational program availability for male and female offenders. *Federal Probation* **64:2** , pp. 39-46.
 12. Lin, A. (2000) *Reform in the making: The implementation of social policy in prison* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ
 13. Martinson, R. (1974) What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest* **10** , pp. 17-32.
 14. Martinson, R. (1979) New findings, new views: A note of caution regarding sentencing reform. *Journal of Correctional Education* **10:4** , pp. 243-258.
 15. Messner, J. (2003) College programs for inmates: The post-Pell Grant era. *Journal of Correctional Education* **34:1** , pp. 32-39.
 16. O'Neil, M. (1990) Correctional higher education: Reduced recidivism?. *Journal of Correctional Education* **21:1** , pp. 31-36.
 17. Parenti, C. (1999) *Lockdown America: Police and prisons in the age of crisis* Verso New Left Books, New York, NY
 18. Pollock, J. (2004) *Prisons and prison life: Costs and consequences* Roxbury Press, Los Angeles, CA
 19. Richards, S. C. , Faggiani, D. , Roffers, J. , Hendricksen, R. and Kruger, J. A. (2008a) Convict Crime and recidivism: A comparison of inmates who graduate from prison. *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Context* **2:1** , pp. 121-136.
 20. Richards, S. C. , Faggiani, D. , Roffers, J. , Hendricksen, R. and Kruger, J. A. (2008b) Convict Crime and recidivism: A comparison of inmates who graduate from prison. *The Journal of Prisoners on Prisons* **17:1** , pp. 43-60.
 21. Rose, C. (2004) Women's participation in prison education: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Correctional Education* **55** , pp. 78-100.
 22. Ross, J. I. and Richards, S. C. (2003) *Convict criminology* Wadsworth , Belmont, CA
 23. Ross, J. I. and Richards, S. C. (2009) *Beyond bars: Rejoining society after prison* Alpha/Penguin, New York, NY
 24. Ryan, T. A. (1995) Correctional education: Past is prologue to the future. *Journal of Correctional Education* **26:1** , pp. 60-66.
 25. Stephan, J. J. (2008) *Census of state and federal correctional facilities, 2005* Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice , Washington, DC
 26. Tewksbury, R. , Erickson, D. J. and Taylor, J. M. (2000) [Opportunities lost: The consequences of Pell Grant eligibility for correctional education students.](#) *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* **31:1/2** , pp. 43-54.
 27. Tregoe, W. Ross, J. I. and Richards, S. C. (eds) (2003) *Twenty years teaching college in prison.* Wadsworth , Belmont, CA
 28. Vacca, J. S. (2004) Educated prisoners are less likely to return to prison. *Journal of Correctional Education* **35:3** , pp. 297-305.
 29. Welsh, M. (2002) The effects of the elimination of Pell Grant eligibility for state prison inmates. *Journal of Correctional Education* **53** , pp. 154-158.
-

30. Wilson, P. R. (1994) Recidivism and vocational education. *Journal of Correctional Education* **45**:
 31. Wreford, P. (1990) *Community college prison program graduation and recidivism* University of M
 MI — (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)

List of Tables

TABLE 1 ICCP Enrollment, Completion, and Success Figures: Prisoner-Student Justice Students (Fall 2006 to Spring 2008)

	Fall 06	Spring 07	Fall 07	Spring 08	Totals
Prisoner-students enrolled	12	11	15		12N = 50
Prisoner-students who successfully completed ICCP	7	5	7		3N = 22
Prisoner-students admitted to a college by end of ICCP	1	1	0		1 N = 3
Criminal Justice students enrolled in ICCP	2	2	2		2 N = 8
Criminal Justice students who successfully completed ICCP	2	2	2		2 N = 8
Criminal Justice students presenting related paper at conference	1	1	0		2 N = 4

TABLE 2 Averaged Prisoner-Student Assessment Survey Responses: ICCP (N Scale (Higher Values Represent More Positive/Supportive Responses))
 Average response

Instructor Evaluation:

1. How would you rate the instructor's knowledge and command over the subject matter?
2. How well did the instructor explain the course content?
3. How well did the quiz and examination questions relate to the course content?
4. How well did the instructor stimulate your interest in learning the subject matter?
5. Would you recommend this instructor to fellow students?

Evaluation of Course Content:

6. How would you rate the quality of the syllabus?
7. How would you rate the degree to which the syllabus was followed?
8. Do you feel that the substantive course content (i.e., convict criminology) is relevant to your future studies?
9. How well did the course book and supplementary reading materials serve as useful aids in understanding the course?
10. Could this course benefit from more effective use of learning technology (computers, video, etc.)?
11. How would you rate the difficulty of subject matter as compared to other courses/programs you have taken?

Bookmark with: [CiteULike](#) [Del.icio.us](#) [BibSonomy](#) [Connotea](#) [More bookmarks](#)

Librarians	Authors & Editors	Societies
»Pricing	»Book Authors	»Current par
»Account Information	»Journal Authors	»Publish with
»Subscriptions	»Reference Work Authors	
»Usage Reports	»Editors	
»Manage Authentication		
»Co-branding		
»Link Resolver		
Privacy Policy Terms & Conditions Accessibility Feedback		
© 2011 Informa plc		