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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It has become increasingly clear during the past three or four years to college graduates throughout the country that it is difficult and sometimes impossible to obtain employment in their desired occupational fields. The daily employment rhetoric that fills the headlines of newspapers detailing the grim realities of the job market faces college graduates as well as laymen. The future outlook for certain professions indicates continuing problems for those graduating in that occupational field. One such profession in which there appears to be a surplus of professionals, at least on paper, is in the area of education.

The 1972 Manpower Report of the President cites a concatenation of shifts in supply and demand factors -- economic, demographic, and political as reasons for the decline of college graduates in the job market. Except for the field of education, the oversupply of college graduates in most professions is projected to be a temporary situation. The discrepancies between the number of applicants and job demand is to minimize as federal domestic spending increases and as the economy improves. (Stewart, 1972, p. 103).

Stewart (1972, p. 103) contends that by 1980 professionals in the field of education can expect to have competitors of at least two to one for a job. This present and future situation is quite
a reversal from that of the late 1960's. At this time vigorous efforts were being made to increase the enrollment in colleges and universities to help meet the needs of national manpower. The surplus of educational professionals has been aided by the leveling off of the school age population and also the increase in number of college graduates seeking teaching positions.

The review of literature clearly states that college students in the field of education are being overly produced. These graduates may be forced to obtain jobs in which their knowledge and skills will not be utilized according to their academic preparation. Thus, universities and colleges departments of education need to expand their present curriculum. They should begin to accept the employment situation of their college graduates as a challenge to find new employment outlets. New programs were developed in the past decades in response to perceived national manpower needs. Again, this problem has arisen where new employment outlets are being needed.

One employment outlet that the department of education should utilize is in the field of corrections. Many opportunities are available in this field, for crime is here to stay. Employment problems along with crime can be read in the daily newspaper. Statistics are showing that skilled educators are needed in the area of corrections. Correctional institutions are inhabited by people who have demonstrated a need for assistance but yet society for so long had been successful in maintaining the "out of sight, out of mind"
attitude. As society slowly begins to open its eyes to the fact that the punishment syndrome is destroying rather than salvaging those individuals placed in correctional institutions, it is also becoming aware that education can play a major role in the criminal justice process.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement reported in its Task Force Report: Corrections that in the year 1975 in the field of corrections, there would be a need for 28,000 specialists. This list included teachers, vocational instructors, guidance counselors, and student personnel workers. (Federal Probation, 1973, p. 55). The Task Force Report indicates that there is a dire need for professionals in the field of education to be employed in the field of corrections. The various education departments have a responsibility to their college graduates and to the field of corrections to produce such individuals with marketable skills.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals supports the multi-institutional approach to the training of corrections personnel. In Standard 1110, of the Criminal Justice Standards, the following was stated:

Correctional agencies should immediately begin to plan, support and implement internships and work study programs to attract students to corrections as a career and improve the relationship between educational institutions and the field of practice. (Criminal Justice Standards, 1973, p. 170).
Myron addresses himself to viable and innovative approaches to meeting correctional manpower needs in the Task Force Report: Corrections. He discusses what he calls the required parallel educational system which is necessary to make a criminal justice career possible. (Criminal Justice System, 1973, p. 170). With the major criminal justice institutions and the Presidential Advisory Commission supporting Myron's position, this should have special implications for colleges and universities in the role they should be playing in providing skilled personnel in the area of education to help meet the manpower needs of the criminal justice system.

Statement of the Problem

National concern is stimulated daily on two major aspects of American life: crime and employment. Crime has become a way of life for some individuals. The rhetoric of the news media brings awareness that the rate of crime rises daily. Employment is able to be classified as having the same characteristics. Instead of being such a burden to the American life, crime and employment can begin to complement each other in a favorable manner. This can be accomplished by institutions of higher learning producing graduates with the marketable skills that are needed in the field of corrections. The institutions of higher learning need to begin to have a collaborative relationship to attempt to alleviate the pressures of two major concerns of the American society.
The Task Force Report: Corrections of 1967 stated that there was a great shortage of professionally trained personnel in the area of corrections. The Task Force Report: Corrections of 1973 stated the same concern. This shortage has become increasingly crucial in attempting to bring about change in the area of corrections. Corrections is constantly under attack in trying to answer the serious question about the effectiveness of its treatment.

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training stated the following:

The university must loom large in any scheme to deal with the challenges to corrections. Shortages of personnel raise obvious questions about the past education and training efforts of higher education. The university will be a potential source of support and innovation as the cry for "law and order" places increased pressure on corrections. Both as a center for experimentation and as a source of manpower and ideas for service and experimentation, the university must play the role of ally as corrections comes to gripe with its challenges. (Polk, 1969, p. 2).

David McAfee (1972, p. 1) also supports the position of corrections and institutions of higher learning collaborating. McAfee feels since the field of education has changed, from one of shortage to surplus, that an attempt should be made to change the production goal from a quantity to a quality basis. He proposes that this can happen by institutions recognizing the change needed, from a general training program with a standardized curriculum which is applicable to every individual regardless of his needs, to one of a more individualized curriculum depending on the needs of the academic goals.
The purpose of this study is to assess the present scope of correctional educators' education programs in the institutions of higher learning. The purpose is to also get some perceptions as to what should compose a correctional educators' education program. The study is concerned with what educational curriculum is being utilized in the preparation of individuals in the department of education for employment in correctional institutions. The methodology of collecting data will be achieved in four aspects. One, a survey will be sent to the Deans of Department of Education and Directors of Teacher Programs of various institutions of higher learning to assess the status of correctional educators' education programs. The sample will be from those institutions which have an enrollment of more than ten thousand students. The number ten thousand was chosen in belief that the larger institutions of higher learning would have a more general education curriculum than smaller institutions. This could be a false assumption due to the smaller institutions receiving federal money for specialized programs. There are one hundred and seventy-eight colleges and universities which meet this criteria. Two, a survey will be given to randomly selected inmates from the adult correctional institutions in Ohio. The survey will be collecting data on the inmates perceptions as to what should be included in the training of correctional educators. Four of the seven Ohio adult correctional institutions will be utilized in the study. Ohio was selected due to proximity for the researcher. Of the 11,800 inmates in Ohio institutions about 3,500 inmates or
nearly 30% of the inmates confined in the state's seven correctional institutions are enrolled in education programs. The third aspect will be to collect information from educators presently involved in correctional institutions. These individuals will be surveyed as to what methods of preparation was useful to them; what methods would have been useful to them; and what types of in-service training programs will presently benefit them. All of the educators from four correctional institutions of Ohio will be used in the sample population. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections presently employs one hundred and fifty educators. The fourth group to be surveyed will be the Educational Administrators from forty-eight of the states. Perceptions as to the training of correctional educators will be the focus of the survey. The end result to the combined input from the Deans of the Department of Education from the various institutions of higher learning, the inmates from Ohio correctional institutions, the educators of Ohio correctional institutions, and the Educational Administrators from the forty-eight states, will be vital information that can be utilized as the basis for designing a corrections' educator program.

The 1976 Manual of Correctional Standards states the following:

Correctional education will suffer when in the hands of personnel who are non-professional in their approach and so regarded by the teaching profession. The most important element in education is the teacher. In the correctional setting, particularly, the influence of a strong sound teacher upon his students may be of more lasting importance than the skills or knowledge
which he imparts. Likewise, the educational program will suffer unless directed by individuals experienced in penal practice as well as education. Teaching within the confines of an institution requires a staff of unusual ability. To effect professional growth, planned programs of in-service training must be provided. College and university help is necessary to provide courses essential for appropriate teacher development. Since institutions for the training of teachers are not geared to the training of correctional institution employees, it is desirable to arrange with the training authorities to provide courses designed to improve the performance of the educational staff. (Manual of Correctional Standards, 1976, p. 486).

Importance of the Study

There are several important facets of this study. Hopefully, the findings of this study may be used as a basis for colleges and universities Departments of Education in the planning of a correctional educators' education program. The program would be preparing individuals to effectively work in the educational setting of a correctional institution with a unique population.

Another important facet of this study is that it should present one method of an innovative approach to meeting correctional manpower needs. Simultaneously, it will assist in curbing the unemployment rate of many college graduates in the field of education who are unable to obtain jobs. Although the main emphasis of this study will be on training for students presently in an institution of higher learning, it should be a step forward in the direction of developing in-service training programs for personnel presently in the field of corrections.
By including a correctional educators' education program, a three-fold purpose will have been created: One, training individuals to work with a unique population; Two, broadening the students' intellectual horizons; and Three, providing marketable skills.

The present and anticipated surplus of educated professionals should be a concern to the institutions of higher learning. The education system is beginning to create a myth in our society which is very educational oriented. The cry has always been the higher one climbs in the educational realm, the greater the certainty of rewards. John Gardner's quotation sums up the cry of today's reality for many education professionals. "Talented young people should not ... be led to assume that there is always a market for talent ..." (Stewart, 1972, p. 105).

From the research of the literature, it can be seen that not all universities and colleges want to cooperate effectively with the correctional system. Polk (1969) cited eight elements of a university that generate resistance to working with corrections. Karacki and Galvin (1968) were able to identify sixty-three colleges and universities as having programs related to the correctional fields. (Neil and Hecker, 1974, p. 150). The literature research also shows that very few programs are presently in existence in education departments. It should also be noted that education is not the only discipline in which few training programs exist in the field of corrections. Brodsky and Heisler (1971) reviewed the catalogues of American universities and were only able to identify fourteen courses that
were offered by the psychology department at eleven different universities relating to corrections. (Brodsky, 1973, p. 120).

The results of this study will aid in the in-service training of all correctional personnel who are presently involved in the field of corrections. With their present knowledge and skills, present correctional personnel must be trained to use it effectively.

Zimbardo (1973, p. 202) cites training as being important for one group of correctional personnel. He believes that the guards must be given better training than they now receive for the difficult job society imposes upon them. Zimbardo feels that social scientists and business administrators should be called upon to design and to help carry out this training process.

Neil and Hecker (1974, p. 152) also agree that training is essential. They state that the field of corrections has too long suffered from organizations that are ineffective and personnel who lack the skills and abilities necessary to assist the offender. It is time for effective people who can deliver what they sell to become a part of the correctional system.

Further, the study could lead to new areas of interest and thereby inspire others to do further research.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study include, but are not limited to the following:

1) The correctional education survey is sent only to Deans of the Department of Education and Directors
of Teachers Programs. In the university setting, the Deans and Directors may not be the most knowledgeable individual of the criminal justice system.

2) The inmates and correctional educators surveyed are those limited to Ohio.

3) Institutions of higher learning with an enrollment of ten thousand or more students were used in the sample population. The smaller institutions may be the ones having a correctional educators' education program in their education curriculum.

4) In assessing the scope of correctional educators' education programs, the qualitative aspects of the program is not being measured.

Operational Definitions of Terms Used in This Study

Some terms will be used throughout this study that are subject to different interpretations. In order to establish a line of communication, the following words have been defined.

a) criminal justice system — three phase process which is 1) arrest procedure - police 2) court process 3) sentencing and or corrections;

b) correctional education — an established education program that is available for incarcerated offenders.

c) correctional educators' education program — a learning/training procedure designed to prepare an individual to teach in a correctional institution
through a specialized curriculum in the department of education.

d) correctional institution — a confined habitation which is used as a form of punishment for committing a crime;

e) crime — an act committed in violation of the law;

f) offender — a person who has been found guilty by the court of committing a crime;

g) inmate — an individual who has been found guilty by the court of committing a crime and is sentenced to a correctional institution.

Organization of the Study

An introduction of the study will be presented in Chapter I. This study will include a statement of the problem, a discussion of the importance of the problem, limitations of the study, and a definition of terms used.

A survey of related studies and literature will be presented in Chapter II.

Chapter III will contain a description of procedures, methodology and instruments used in this study along with the questions researched.

Chapter IV will contain an analysis of the findings of the study.
A summary of the study, a discussion of the research findings and a statement of conclusion based on the findings will be contained in Chapter V. A discussion of the implications of this study and recommendations for future studies will also be presented in this chapter along with a perceptual model of a correctional educators' education program.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED STUDIES AND LITERATURE

In this chapter, two categories of literature will be reviewed and an overview of public education will be given. The two categories that will be surveyed are the following:

1) Historical perspectives of correctional education
2) Supportive research related to correctional educators

It is important to have an overview of public education since most of the individuals that are incarcerated have been turned off by public education. These may have been the individuals whose intellectual and creative ability was stifled. Thus, since these individuals were turned off by public education, it is important to examine the educational system in which they are presently involved. It is equally important to examine the educators.

Overview of Public Education

This section will deal with the history of public education, the goals of the educational system, benefits of education, and opposition to our present educational system.

Education has become one of the loudest cries of the American society. To put it simply, it has become the way of life for many Americans. Joel Spring (1973, p. 231) states that society
has attempted to reproduce itself through the vehicle of education. The basic concerns and values of modern society are reflected through education. Education is that process which bridges the generations; it passes on old values and creates new ones.

High priority to education was given by the first settlers in the United States. This priority was given for religious reasons and also because of its clear role in aiding the establishing of a new society. Volunteer groups, that supported education at the public expense, set up schools by private societies with supplementary funds supplied by local authorities. At the public expense, every state was providing free secular primary education by the end of the nineteenth century. (Phillips, 1975, p. 23).

Clarence Karier (1973, p. 7) contends that in the history of American education, schools have been used as instruments to teach the necessary norms for the young people to be able to adjust to the changing patterns of the economic system as well as to society's more permanent values. He further contends that a fundamental shift in the economic system will result in a major change in the basic core values.

Karier (1973, pp. 15-16) supports his shift and change idea. He writes that the American educational history demonstrates the Marxian thesis which states that changes in the means of production results in significant changes in social institutions and life styles. After the Civil War, large urban centers began to develop; the development of the American high school; the academy declined;
growth was seen in the development of industrial education; manual training, and vocational guidance and training, as the apprenticeship began its decline; and the enactment of child labor and compulsory education legislation - all are developments of history which can be traced directly to the newer forms of production that this society adopted. After the creation of mass production was developed, a system of mass education began taking growth.

This system of mass education which took growth in the 1900's has changed very little according to Allen and Hawkes (1970, p. 6). The following is what they have to say about the American education system: "The amount of change in American education since 1900 has been minimal. We have a monolithic school system which proceeds from a standard set of assumptions and we have no alternative perceptions on these assumptions."

The set of assumptions that Allen and Hawkes mention about the traditional American public educational system are summed up by Hitt (1973, p. 5). These assumptions or goals are:

1) Transmitting knowledge in an effective and efficient manner is the primary purpose of education.

2) Serving as a storehouse of knowledge is the essential function of the teacher.

3) Evaluation of students is based on their ability of accuracy to reproduce the knowledge learned from the teacher.

4) An emphasis is placed upon the control and
discipline of the students by teachers.

5) Students in the same age group will progress from one grade level to another in lock step fashion according to the recommendation of the teacher.

6) There exists no overlapping of work and play.

7) The task of the professional educator is to educate young people.

From the set of goals or assumptions that our educational system have established, there exists an outcome or result. Educational institutions have become the manpower holding institution for the economic community. Educational requirements have almost become a mandate in order to survive in the society of today.

Not everyone agrees to the set of assumptions of the American educational system. During the past few years, there has been quite an opposition to our present American school system from the elementary to the advanced levels. The critics are suggesting that the present knowledge being taught to children is sterile, lifeless, coercive, and ignorant to the happenings of today. In the literature, it can be seen that these critics often times compare our present day schools to correctional institutions. The comparison is not so much in the physical condition but more in the manner, spirit, and methods of instruction. One such critic is John Holt. Holt's ideas are similar to the other critics such as Herbert Kohl, Jonathan Kozel, and George Dennison.
Holt (1974, p. 19) feels that adults destroy the disinterested love of learning in children by always encouraging them to strive for competitive rewards. He strongly feels that schools should be that place where children are able to learn what they must want to know instead of what someone else feels is best for them. If this was true, most of the child's intellectual and creative capacity would not be destroyed by adults. Holt contends that most of the knowledge learned in school is quickly forgotten. The child who learns something because it is of interest to him, will remember the material. The child who learns something, because someone feels that it is important to know, will quickly forget because it is of no use or interest to him. A child must be that individual who chooses the particular bit of knowledge that will most strengthen and best fit his model of reality. Since Holt feels that education is misnamed at the moment, and that children's intellectual capacity is being stymied by adults, he has an alternative plan. Schools should be similar to a smorgasbord. In this manner a child can satisfy his own curiosity, develop his own abilities and talents, pursue his interests, and at the same time can have an abundance of a variety and richness of life.

The concept of education being an imprisonment upon the lives of people is stated well in the following passage by Kornbluth (1960, p. 38):

Don't talk, children, sit there and listen to me for the next six hours, for the next five days, for the next forty weeks. If you successfully pass through the first eight years imprisonment,
you can do four more years in high school. Then, if you are intelligent, fortunate, and have money enough, you can do four more years in a university. Then you can graduate and proudly be imprisoned in offices, factories, and institutions throughout the world until, at long last, you are sixty-five. Then you are free to take off more than two weeks in a row. ("Don't ask stupid questions") ("I'm busy right now") ("Amen brother").

Since this study is concentrating on adult incarcerated individuals, it is imperative in the overview of public education to include adult education. The concept of adult education is not a new one. Since the beginning of recorded history, evidence shows that man has learned throughout his individual lifetime. Although the concept of adult education is not a new one, what is new is the concept of formalized institutionalized adult education.

Adult education and primary education have a common bond. Both movements were given high priority because of religious movements. The first adult school was established in Wales in 1740. Since religion played a major role in the adult education movement, the Bible, of course, was the textbook. (Hudson, 1969, p. 3).

Seeing the success of the adult education movement in England, the United States opened two adult schools. One of the adult schools was established in Philadelphia for individuals of the black race. The other one in New York for individuals of the white race. The majority of the individuals admitted to the adult schools were between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four. One of the immediate results that surfaced from the adult schools was the decrease in crime. (Hudson, 1969, p. 8).
The purpose of the establishment of adult education in the United States creates quite a spectrum. Since the society in which we live is pluralistic in its system of values, the spectrum for the purpose of adult education is quite numerous and varied. The spectrum begins with the purpose being for improvement of self and continuing to improvement of society. Some of the purposes listed were generated from a group of adult educators. (Axford, 1969, p. 4).

1) Self-understanding
2) Remedial or literacy education
3) Cultural education
4) Training and retraining
5) Development of recreational or leisure time skills
6) Development of human relations skills
7) Discovery of new knowledge and integration of this knowledge with life's needs
8) Creation of change
9) Citizenship education
10) Idea exchange

Since there is quite a spectrum of purposes for having adult education, it is noteworthy to focus on those individuals who have these needs. Adults are entering into the educational world with different feelings and experiences from children. The educational needs of adults grow out of personal aspirations and responsibilities of individuals. Adults are attending school because they have the desire to learn, unlike children who are not voluntary participants.

Awareness of three related points is necessary to understanding adult learners according to Roby Kidd (Axford, 1969, p. 77):

1) Adults have more experiences
2) Adults have different kinds of experiences
3) Adults are organized differently
Since adult learners possess different characteristics than youths in the educational world, those individuals that are teaching the adult learners need to be attuned to this.

Axford (1969, p. 57) refers to the adult educator as being one of the greatest professions in the world. His reasoning for this is that the educator is teaching a mature adult who is a part of the working world and who is constantly making decisions and policies that are shaping numerous lives each and every day.

Believing that the adult educator is one of the greatest professions, Axford (1969, pp. 58-70) elaborates on the following qualities that an adult educator should possess:

1) humane human being
2) a person with a nose for needs
3) an organizer
4) a person with flexibility
5) a sharer of ideas
6) a person with a sound philosophy of adult education
7) a promoter of adult education
8) a person with training
9) a person involved in the problems of society
10) an educational leader
11) a program planner
12) a person who practices what he preaches
13) a person with a thick skin
14) a person with commitment to the value of learning throughout life

Since adult education is a relatively modern concept in the fact of a formalized institutional adult education program, more research needs to exist on the adult learner, the evaluation method of adult education, learning theory of adults, and the effectiveness of adult education. Research needs to exist in quantity as well as quality.
Historical Perspectives of Correctional Education

This section will deal with the history of correctional education, the educational level of inmates, the objectives and goals of correctional education, and recommendations for improvement of correctional education. Prison education and correctional education will be used interchangeably in this section. Both phrases mean the education that is available for inmates within the correctional facilities.

Education for inmates within the correctional institutions have long been regarded as one of the primary rehabilitative vehicles. Knowing that Americans view education as the cure-all to many of our societal problems, the relationship between rehabilitating the inmate and education is easily understood. Since education should place some emphasis on developing personal growth and human behavior, it is a necessity within the correctional institutions.

Even though the first prison opened in 1798 at the Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia, it was not until 1870 at the Detroit House of Corrections that an educational program was established. The earliest form of education between 1798 and 1870 were of mostly two types. First, there were some educated inmates who would teach the other inmates some elementary schooling. Second, there were some religious leaders who taught moral and religious instruction. These leaders established Sabbath Schools where the chaplins would teach the inmates how to read passages of scripture. These Sabbath Schools did become the forerunner for established prison education.
In 1870, a school system with the objective of aiding in the reformation of inmates was established at the Detroit House of Corrections. The superintendent announced the following (Roberts, 1971, p. 7): "Education was not introduced to relieve the monotony of imprisonment, but to decline the mind and fit it to receive and to involve in the life, the thoughts, and principles that constitute their possessors good citizens."

Although the Detroit House of Corrections established the first school system for inmates, the establishment of the first reformatory in Elmira, New York, in 1876, opened the gate to prison education. Since the reformatory was located in a college neighborhood, professionals were brought into the educational system. College professors, from the Elmira's Women's College, lawyers, and school principals were secured as instructors. In 1886, one of the first pioneer trade schools in a correctional setting was established at Elmira Reformatory for those inmates who were not interested in the education classes.

Most of the other correctional institutions could not be comparable to Elmira's Reformatory. At the beginning of the twentieth century, most of the institutions had little more than a few literacy courses for inmates.

Specialists in the field of criminology feel that the year 1929 is when the modern trend for prison education began. Austin H. MacCormack is the forerunner in sparking interest in prison education. MacCormack did a survey of prison education and discovered that there
were no schools in thirteen out of sixty correctional institutions surveyed. He also discovered that none of the institutions had a vocational education program. Some of the reasons that MacCormack's study listed for the failure of the prison education programs were (Roberts, 1971, p. 10): 1) lack of clear goals, 2) a tendency to adhere too rigidly to public school methods, 3) failure to individualize programs, 4) poor teaching, 5) lack of funds. From this list of reasons for failure, MacCormack outlined a comprehensive program for correctional institutions which included academic, vocational, social, and cultural education. MacCormack's study was the take off point for many correctional facilities.

Elmer Johnson (1965, p. 17) summarizes the trend of prison education:

"American prisons have made real progress since 1950 toward becoming treatment oriented agencies worthy of the twentieth century. But the task is far from complete. In fact, in most states, the people have not committed themselves to the philosophy of rehabilitation with sufficient clarity to provide the funds essential to a truly modern correctional system.

Since education deals with the development and change of human behavior, faith in education as a treatment is well placed. However, faith is not enough. The educator must operate within the structure and culture of the correctional institutions which employ him. Too often education is advanced as a cure-all for problems when the hub of the problem is in a sphere outside the control of the educator. He needs the support of the prison administrator, but educational reform awaits a more broad base of public support than any governmental agency can provide. The ultimate support must come from the citizens themselves."
The necessity for public support for correctional education becomes apparent when the educational level of inmates is brought to light. If education and success are integrally related, it becomes apparent why so many individuals who have been adjudicated have failed in today's society.

Richmond (1965, p. 30) writes that through his research, studies seem to indicate that roughly ten percent of the inmates are functionally illiterate. The percentage is generally higher in those institutions where there is a large Black and non-English speaking population.

Roberts' literature also shows that there is a need to improve prison education if education is to play a vital part in the resocialization of inmates. Individuals that are confined in correctional institutions have a lower average educational attainment than is found in the total American society. The following chart shows the statistics: (Roberts, 1971, p. 29)
### COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF PRISON INMATES WITH TOTAL U.S. POPULATION, BY SEX, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of School Completed</th>
<th>Males, 25 Years and Over</th>
<th>Females, 25 Years and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates of State Prisons,</td>
<td>Total Reformatories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.*</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates of State Prisons,</td>
<td>Total Reformatories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.*</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Years</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males, 25 Years and Over</th>
<th>Females, 25 Years and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 11</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 1 to 3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 4 - more</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roberts (1971, p. 30) also writes that inmates, based on standard achievement tests, have been often diagnosed as having a median educational retardation of between three and five grades. He further writes that 85 percent of the inmates are school dropouts. Thus, most of the inmates are educationally retarded, a fact which creates a negative attitude toward education, a lack of self-motivation, and a low self-esteem.

To put the educational level of inmates more into perspective, Harrison Morris, the Educational Administrator for the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections, gives the following statistics of the educational level of Ohio adult inmates. (Morris, 1976, p. 3). In the seven Ohio adult institutions, 70 percent are high school dropouts, the average inmate educational achievement is the sixth grade level with large percentages functioning at the first, second, and third grade levels; 85 percent of the inmates have no saleable job skills; and over 60 percent are under the age of 30.

With the educational level of the majority of the inmates being at such a substandard level, it should be taken for granted that every correctional institution has an effective correctional program. Richmond (1965, pp. 36-38) dwells on the realities of correctional education as it appears in many of the correctional institutions. Some realities are:

1) Some correctional education programs have no apparent purpose.
2) Many educational programs and courses only exist on paper.

3) Quite often, the educational courses are substandard and inappropriate.

4) Many educational curricula are replicas of the standard elementary course taken from a public school system.

Although the realities of correctional education paint a bleak picture, the brighter side can be found in some goals and accomplishments that certain correctional education programs have established.

There is not a universal blueprint of correctional education for all correctional institutions. Richmond (1965, p. 29) cites some accomplishments that the educational program in the more progressive institutions strive to accomplish: 1) improved academic education to help resocialize the inmate, 2) vocational training to help provide the inmate with job opportunities once placed back into society, 3) social education will be provided to help the inmate become a more constructive participant in community life.

The objective of correctional education as stated by Morris (1976, p. 2) is the following:

"Although the objectives of correctional education are the same as the objectives of all forms of education, a remedial program literally involves a repair job, a careful return to the earlier stages of cognitive growth and emotional development where the individual has become stymied. Liberating the potential of those who are stunned requires that the shaky foundations
be made firm before the student can progress to a more complex level. Education must help the individual to develop not only the skills and intellectual tools needed to lead a productive life, but also the motivation to learn, a healthy effective life, and the ability to make value judgments."

Since there is not a blueprint for correctional education in all institutions, and with objectives and accomplishments being different, Roberts (1971, pp. 184-185) has proposed some recommendations for the usage of improving correctional education:

1) Better diagnostic and testing programs using special instruments appropriate for determining native intellectual ability.

2) Regardless of the intellectual ability, all inmates should be accommodated in the levels of instruction.

3) It is a necessity that academic learning experiences be made relevant and meaningful to each inmate.

4) Teachers should have a definite academic curriculum.

5) Individual needs and abilities should be accounted for.

6) Up-to-date materials and equipment are needed.

7) Extensive recruitment, more benefits and higher salaries, and intensive in-service training programs for staff members.

8) Team teaching should exist.

9) Teachers should be aware of behavior patterns.

10) A reward system for inmates should exist.
11) The academic school should be accredited by a recognized local or state department of education. Recommendations to help improve correctional education have also been proposed by the Education Commission of the States. The Education Commission of the States through a Correctional Education Project, which began in 1975, made some of the following recommendations its first year: (1976, p. 3)

1) Inmate involvement should be in the development of educational curricula.

2) All education departments should have learning laboratories for basic skill development.

3) Programmed instruction should be emphasized in educational and vocational programs.

4) Selected offenders should participate in instructional roles in both educational and vocational programs.

5) Correspondence courses should be made available.

"Correctional educators must use educational concepts to pioneer in the correction of corrections" are the words of Dr. John Marsh (1971, p. 101). He has offered the following considerations in the developing of correctional education:

1) Establish correctional education as an undergraduate major and a graduate degree in schools of education. These programs must be interdisciplinary with corrections programs.
2) Develop methods by which programs in correctional education can be granted recognition and standing in terms of accreditation and the correctional educators must be certified.

3) Examine means by which correctional education became an integral but independent part of every correctional and confinement facility.

Although recommendations are proposed to help improve correctional education, there are some individuals, as in public education, who feel that there needs to be a more significant change. Two of these individuals are Sylvia McCollum and Albert Roberts.

McCollum (1973, pp. 7-8) feels that educators have the challenge of creating an educational delivery system which takes into account the individual difference in various age groups, prior experiences, interests, aptitudes, and learning styles. McCollum proposes alternative approaches to correctional education. One of her approaches is to take correctional education out of the correctional institution and separate it sequentially from the confinement period. Another approach, if the education program is to be kept within the walls is to use educational vouchers. In this approach, the inmate would be involved in specified standards of conduct within a portion of his sentence. After this was fulfilled, he would be granted full-time involvement in a prescribed education and training program either at a nearby manpower skill center, a vocational-technical school, junior college, a community based approved apprenticeship program, or
other appropriate educational experiences.

Albert Roberts (1976, p. 1) also feels that there can be a more innovative approach in correctional education. He did a study to explore issues through which a more efficient and effective relationship between the educational needs of inmates and technological tools and media could be achieved.

Supportive Research Related to Correctional Educators

This section will deal with the needs for professional educators, a need for the collaborating of universities and corrections, and a need for an established correctional educators program. There seems to be little progress in the area of preparing professional educators to work in the correctional setting.

The Manual of Correctional Standards (1976, p. 485) states that an educational program in a correctional institution must rely on qualified civilian teachers operating under civil service regulations and meeting the standards of the state education department. A professional staff needs to be involved in correctional education in helping to eliminate illiteracy, developing occupational skills, motivating individuals to pursue and discover creative abilities. For correctional education programs to develop, the teachers' caliber plays a major role. Inmates need that daily contact with professional staff members. The teacher is the most important element in education. A teacher becomes that role model that inmates attempt to emulate.
On the topic of the need for professional educators, David McAfee (1972, p. 2) writes the following:

"A rehabilitation program in a correctional institution which includes education as a part of its program is in trouble from the beginning if it attempts to use teachers who are trained as the great mass of teachers are trained for the simple reason that the conditions in those institutions, the backgrounds of the inmates, and the previous experiences of the inmates with the educational process create a situation entirely different from that which the ordinarily trained teacher has been prepared to cope."

McAfee (1972, p. 6) continues on the need for professional trained educators:

"Correctional institutions must have more success in educating inmates than the public schools had in dealing with them before they became inmates. To achieve this success, they must have specially selected and specially trained personnel who will succeed in an educational process that will replace the educational process to which the inmates were exposed prior to incarceration and which has a 95 percent record of failure."

These qualified professional educators that The Manual of Correctional Standards and McAfee refer to are, in reality, scarce. The following charts found in the Perspectives on Correctional Manpower and Training (1970, pp. 91-93) as reported by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, show the need for more professional correctional educators.
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL,
1968, BY OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation of Respondents</th>
<th>Adminis-</th>
<th>Super-</th>
<th>Special-</th>
<th>Line Worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trator</td>
<td>visor</td>
<td>ist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(percentage distribution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years of college</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate study</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERCENTAGE OF SELECTED SPECIALIST OCCUPATIONS WITH ANY MASTER'S DEGREE AND WITH MASTER'S DEGREES IN THE PROFESSIONAL SPECIALTY FIELD, 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialist Occupation</th>
<th>Percentage with any Master's Degree</th>
<th>Percentage with relevant Master's Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Teacher</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification Officer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation or Parole Officer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. Includes degrees in education, educational administration, and guidance and counseling.
2. Includes degrees in guidance and counseling, psychology, and social work.
3. Includes degrees in social work.
4. Includes degrees in psychology.

### BACHELOR'S DEGREE FIELDS OF CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL, 1968

BY OCCUPATION. (PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THOSE WHO HAVE BACHELOR'S DEGREES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Field</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Occupation of Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology/Corrections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ibid., p. 29
Anderson (1976, p. 7) agrees with the *Manual of Correctional Standards* and McAfee that there is a need for qualified professional teachers to help with the educational aspects of the rehabilitative process. Anderson contends that the need for specialized teacher training is on the increase and this increasing need will exist into the foreseeable future. Anderson states, "In the academic area, present correctional teachers were trained in a traditional public school orientation. Such training does not lend itself to the specific needs and situations existent in a correctional facility. Such teachers were not originally selected especially for a career in corrections, and many who are presently teaching are marginally effective and not necessarily interested in remaining in their present position."

The literature and statistics reveal that there is a shortage of trained professional correctional educators. The literature also reveals that these trained educators need to have developed special skills. These skills can be obtained and the shortage of professionals eliminated by institutions of higher learning and corrections collaborating.

Kenneth Polk (1969, pp. 1-2) in his consultant paper for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, entitled "The University and Corrections" states that the university must begin to collaborate with corrections to help with the many challenges that corrections is facing. One challenge is a shortage of professionally trained personnel. This challenge reflects the past education and
training efforts of higher education. The university needs to begin to reshape its curriculum to meet the needs of corrections. Polk feels that the School of Education is one curriculum that needs to begin to train individuals in the area of corrections.

On the need for the collaboration of universities and corrections, the *Manual of Correctional Standards* (1976, p. 486) agrees with the ideas of Polk. Highly professional individuals are needed in correctional education programs due to the fact that it requires individuals with unusual ability. In-service training programs are needed for all educational staff members to effect professional growth. To facilitate this growth there needs to be a relationship with a university or college. This relationship is strongly recommended in providing improvement in the performance of the educational staff, since most institutions that train teachers are not geared to the training of correctional institution employees. Affiliation also needs to be developed with public agencies, industries, professional organizations, trade unions, to help prevent that walled-in living experience that so often develops from working in correctional institutions.

Grim (1974, p. 36) also agrees that universities should play a role in the training of correctional educators. Universities are the institutions which occupy strategic positions in today's contemporary society. Universities have available resources and frequently best test experiences for developing and being able to provide effective training models.
The ideas of Charles Newman (1970, p. 88) on the relationship of corrections and universities coincides with the others. He feels that the training for correctional educators is a joint responsibility shared by the university and the field of corrections. This co-operation from both sources would create an educational experience which will have both utilitarian and broad social value. Newman further contends that the university should be an essential vehicle in the development and operation of staff development programs.

Roberts (1971, p. XIII) reiterates the same ideas that many other criminologists have on the topic of training correctional educators. The field of education and corrections have not begun to collaborate to any extensive degree. The education and training for correctional educators for the most part does not expose these individuals to the internal parts of the correctional institutions. It is a rarity when higher education programs have involvement in the educational treatment, staff training, and research needs of the field of corrections.

The review of the literature clearly agrees on the fact that education and corrections need to develop a more intimate type relationship. Within the facet of the university, there is discussion as to which academic areas should train professional correctional educators.
Newman (1970, pp. 83-86) is unable to view any academic area that has a patent on the best method for preparing individuals for the correctional field. Newman does feel that an established correctional program in the field of education, with a science base, needs to be established rather than having it as a sector of sociology, law, social work or any other academic curriculum. Although some critics feel that a specialized correctional educators program should not be developed since the correctional field has not created for itself a definite philosophy, Newman feels such a position is indefensible.

As stated earlier, Polk agrees with Newman that the academic area of education needs to develop a correctional educators program.

Roberts (1974, pp. 84-85) states the need for the development of a specific college curriculum to prepare educators for the field of corrections. In his research, Roberts discovered that very few of the correctional educators who were involved in preparing inmates to effectively re-enter society had been properly prepared themselves for their position.

There is minimal literature on which universities are preparing individuals to become correctional educators, let alone which academic area should prepare them.

Eckenrode's article (1971, p. 224) refers to his knowledge of two institutions of higher learning that are preparing individuals to become correctional educators. One of the programs is at Coppin College in Baltimore, which offers a degree in correctional education.
The other program is at the University of Georgia, which has a Teacher Corps Program.

Within the correctional educators program, there needs to exist certain content to make the program an effective one.

McAfee (1972, p. 2) states that the content of a correctional educators training program needs to be quite flexible in nature. Such factors as the following should be included: the backgrounds of the inmates, individual differences and needs of the inmates, the range of educational level from the illiterate to the occasional college graduate, and the structure of the correctional institutions.

Neil and Hecker (1974, p. 150) piggy back on Roberts' idea of the need for internal exposure to be included into a correctional educators training program. Both realize that educators are being removed from the mainstream of life and placed into an isolated institutional setting. There is an adjustment stage, of sometimes between six months to a year, before an educator is able to transform his ivory tower theory into practical applied knowledge.

The Education Commission of the States, through surveying administrators of the correctional institutions, has recommended some specific courses that should be included in a training program (1976, p. 5). Teachers should meet state certification as well as having additional course work in social education, reading instruction and abnormal psychology.
Anderson (1976, p. 7) also feels that correctional educators should have specific training at least in the following areas: 1) history, infrastructure and milieu of correctional settings; 2) knowledge of the kinds of individuals within correctional institutions; 3) familiarity with other staff personnel; 4) dynamics of crime causation; 5) individual instruction; 6) principles of learning and behavioral and motivational techniques.

In addition, Anderson (1976, p. 7) agrees with Neil and Hecker, and Roberts that individuals need to do an internship, as well as student teaching, in a correctional setting.

McAfee elaborates on the need for the individuals to have certain characteristics to become correctional educators that training is unable to provide for them. He feels that individuals must: 1) be able to interact with individuals of different ethnic backgrounds and socio-economic status, 2) be able to differentiate between the need for honest concern for inmates and perhaps damaging sympathy for the inmate, and 3) have a stable personality coupled with a high degree of emotional maturity.

The need for professional correctional educators and a specialized curriculum is well summed up by Eckenrode. Charles Eckenrode delivered a speech at the 1971 American Correctional Association meeting entitled "Future Trends in Correctional Education." (1971, pp. 222-227). The following are some excerpts from his speech.

"Except for a few sporadic and widely scattered instances there has been little change in our source of teacher supply, except that ministers rarely serve in this capacity any longer."
The curriculum that has been provided pretty largely has been borrowed from the public school. It has consisted of literacy instruction, remedial classes, classes in preparation for the G.E.D., formal high school courses, and some college-level study. Now, there is not anything wrong with this and I do not mean to be critical of it, except what we have done is establish a program and then endeavor to fit our students into it. It ought to work the other way around - we ought to fit the program to the needs of our individual inmate students.

If we were better prepared to assume our role of correctional educators, perhaps we would possess the built-in security that would enable us to keep the inmate student and his behavior in the proper perspective. Rather than becoming correctional educators by accident, we should become prepared for and then enter the profession on purpose.
SUMMARY

The American society believes that education is the remedy for the many societal ills that exist. Public education has become mandatory by law but also mandatory in the eyes of the occupational world. Public education, which began because of religious reasons by the first settlers, has changed very little. The goals and objectives are still quite similar. For this very reason, there are many critics who are opposed to our present educational system. These critics such as Holt, Dennison, and Kozol, feel that our present system is destroying the disinterested love of reading in children.

This disinterest of learning can be found in the majority of those individuals who are incarcerated. A large percentage of the intellectual capacity of the inmates range between the third and sixth grade level. For this reason, it is a necessity to have a correctional education program established with the correctional institutions. The history of correctional education shows that the first major keystone in this area began at the Elmira Reformatory in 1876. Not many of the other correctional institutions educational programs could be compared to that of Elmira's. There has been a call by criminologists to upgrade the present correctional education programs. There is not a universal blueprint of correctional education for all correctional institutions and thus many, if not all, institutions need to begin to make amends within their program.
One major concern in amending the corrections program is to focus on the professional staff. The review of literature clearly states that there is a shortage of professional correctional educators. This shortage reflects upon the various universities in which there are minimal training models that exist to prepare individuals for working in the correctional setting. These concerns have brought a call from many criminologists on the collaboration of universities and corrections.

From the limited review of literature, it can be seen that correctional education has progressed, but it also is obvious that much more extensive research needs to occur.
INTRODUCTION

The research method of this study is a descriptive one. According to Best (1970, p. 116), the descriptive research method is concerned with the existing conditions, practices that prevail, beliefs and attitudes that exist, and effects that are being felt from the conditions, practices, and beliefs that are existing. The descriptive research techniques will be discussed in this chapter. The design of the chapter will be in five major sections: 1) Populations to be Studied; 2) Data Collection Instruments; 3) Administration of Data Collection Instruments; 4) Research Questions; and 5) Data Processing and Analysis.

POPULATIONS TO BE STUDIED

The population investigated in this study consisted of four groups. The groups were as follows: 1) Deans of the Department of Education and Directors of Teacher Education Programs at institutions which have an enrollment of ten thousand or more students; 2) Educational Administrators of the correctional system in forty-eight states; 3) Inmates from four Ohio adult correctional institutions; and 4) Correctional Educators from four Ohio adult correctional institutions.
The Deans of the Department of Education and the Directors of Teacher Education Programs were chosen for the purpose of assessing the present scope of correctional educators programs. The sample population of these individuals was chosen from one hundred and seventy-six institutions of higher learning that had an enrollment of more than ten thousand students. The number ten thousand was chosen in belief that generally the larger institutions of higher learning would have a more comprehensive education curricula than smaller institutions. It is recognized, however, that some smaller institutions do have very comprehensive education curricula, but they will not be a part of this study. According to the 1976 World Almanac, there are one hundred and seventy-six colleges and universities which meet this criterion. All one hundred and seventy-six colleges and universities were used in the sample population. (Appendix D).

The second sample population is the Educational Administrators of each correctional system. The population size is forty-eight since information was unavailable in the National Directory of Chief Educational Officers in Adult and Juvenile State Correctional Systems on Alaska and New Hampshire (Appendix G). The majority of the states have one educational administrator for their adult correctional system and another one for their juvenile system. Arizona, Idaho, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, are states which combine the adult and juvenile correctional education programs under one administrator. The educational administrators were selected
because of their position in the education correctional system. They are able to have an overview of the perceptions and needs of the correctional educators as well as the inmates.

The inmates are a vital group to include in the sample population since they are the consumers of corrections education programs. The inmates used in the sample population were drawn from four of the seven Ohio adult correctional institutions. Ohio was selected due to proximity to the researcher. Of the 11,800 Ohio inmates, about 3,500 inmates or nearly thirty percent of the inmates confined in the state's seven correctional institutions are enrolled in education programs (Appendix H). Four of the seven institutions were selected to obtain a cross section of inmates for the study. The four institutions which were utilized are: 1) The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (Lucasville) which is the newest adult correctional institution and the only one which is maximum security; 2) The Ohio Reformatory for Women (Marysville), which is the state's first and only correctional institution for adult female offenders; 3) Lebanon Correctional Institution which is a medium security institution for first offenders under the age of thirty; and 4) Chillicothe Correctional Institution, which is a medium security institution for offenders over the age of thirty and those under thirty with prior felony convictions. Ten percent of the inmates involved in an education program from each of the four institutions comprised the sample population. Of the three thousand five hundred inmates involved in education classes in the seven adult institutions,
one thousand forty-seven attend classes in the four chosen correc-
tional institutions. Thus, one hundred and forty-seven is the sample size for the inmates. The education classes were randomly selected.

The fourth group from which information was solicited was the educators who are presently involved in the correctional institutions. These educators came from the same four adult correctional institutions of Ohio that were used with the inmate sample population. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections presently employs one hundred and fifty educators in the seven adult institutions. All of the educators from the four correctional institutions, which comprise a total of eighty-five, were used in the sample population.

Data Collection Instruments

The data collection instruments were four surveys. (Appendixes A, B, C, and D). The surveys were devised by the researcher with the help of research consultants and the researcher's committee members. Information for the surveys also utilized Kelsey and Thomas' unpublished Teachers' Corps Proposal (1976, Appendix B1), Hagerty's unpublished thesis (1976, p. 49), Reckless (1973, pp. 596-602), and Hitt (1973, pp. 157-162).

The survey for the Deans of the Departments of Education and the Directors of Teacher Education Programs consisted of three parts. The first part was answered only by those universities and colleges that had an existing correctional educators program. This part was
concerned with the highest attainable degree, length of the program, organization of the classes, where and how many students have received jobs as correctional educators. The second part was to be answered by those institutions which did not have such a program in their education curriculum. It was concerned with the need for a correctional educators program, knowledge of how many education students were receiving minors in the criminal justice related disciplines, and knowledge of those individuals receiving positions as correctional educators. The third section was for all respondents. It dealt with what competencies and curriculum areas Deans and Directors felt that a correctional educator would need before entering a correctional institution. Responses ranged from very important to not important. The survey was pretested on individuals from the community of The Ohio State University (Police Department, Residence Hall System, Professors) and individuals in the criminal justice system. They were given a rating sheet which was devised by the researcher (Appendix E). The questions were to be rated on relevancy and acceptability.

The survey designed for the educational administrators consisted of three sections: 1) personal data; 2) data on their education program and correctional educators; and 3) opinion of what competencies and curriculum areas educational administrators feel correctional educators should have before entering a correctional institution. The third section of the survey is the same section which was sent to the Deans and Directors of Education Programs in institutions of
higher learning. The survey was pre-tested from the community of The Ohio State University (Residence Hall System, Graduate Students, Professors) and a correctional administrator. The same rating sheet was used as in the pre-testing of the Deans and Directors' survey.

The inmates' survey was concerned with personal data, such as their educational background and experiences, to become familiar with their learning patterns. The survey also dealt with the attitude of their present and past educational experiences. The survey was pre-tested by individuals at the Ohio Seventh Step Foundation in Columbus, Ohio, who are now former inmates.

The fourth survey was devised for correctional educators. The first section dealt with personal data. The second section dealt with their perception as to the need of a correctional educators program and in-service training. The third section was the same section used for the Deans and Directors and Educational Administrators which dealt with what competencies and curriculum areas a correctional educator would need before entering a correctional institution. The survey was pre-tested by some former correctional educators and an educational administrator from the Training Institute of Central Ohio (TICO). The rating sheet was also used in the pre-testing.
Procedure for Collecting the Data

The 1976 World Almanac served as the basis for deriving the names of the institutions which had an enrollment of over ten thousand students. The Yearbook of Higher Education served as the basis for deriving the names of the Deans of the Department of Education and the Director of Teacher Education Programs (Appendix F).

The National Directory of Chief Education Officers in Adult and Juvenile Institutions served as the basis for the mailing list of the educational administrators. The Directory was compiled by Harrison Morris, Educational Administrator of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections, in January, 1975.

For both groups of individuals, the survey instrument, along with a cover letter, and a return pre-addressed stamped envelope was mailed. Also each set of individuals had a follow-up mailing. This mailing consisted of another survey, a cover letter, and a return pre-addressed stamped envelope.

The surveys for the correctional educators were sent directly to the principals of the institutions' education programs, who were to distribute the surveys to their educators. The names of the four principals were received from Harrison Morris, Educational Administrator of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections. A return pre-addressed stamped folder was mailed along with the survey instrument and cover letter. A follow-up mailing occurred.
The data from the inmates was received by going to the four adult correctional institutions. Classes were randomly selected. An explanation was given to the inmates of the purpose of the study. The surveys were filled out with the researcher in the classroom.

**Research Questions**

The four surveys were structured in order to answer the following research questions.

1) Are there any educational institutions that are presently preparing individuals to become correctional educators?

2) Is there a need for a specific education curriculum to be developed to prepare individuals to become correctional educators?

3) What are the educational qualifications of the present correctional practitioners?

4) Are correctional educators, who have been public school educators, using any different teaching methods?

5) What are some of the competencies and knowledge that a correctional educator should possess to be effective?

6) Is there a need for in-service programs for the present correctional practitioners?

7) What are the educational backgrounds of the inmates?
8) Are correctional education programs meeting the needs of the inmates?

**Data Processing and Analysis**

The completed surveys were processed in the following manner. The researcher hand coded each survey. This information was then transferred to IBM cards by the keypunching method.

Since this is a descriptive study which is concerned with existing correctional educators programs, practices that prevail in the correctional education system, and what type of correctional program could exist, there is no formal statistical design that could be used. This study is a needs assessment research which collected its data from colleges and universities, current practitioners, and inmates to be used as guidelines for a correctional educators program. Tabulation of responses, frequencies, and correlation of responses between the three population groups by using the t and f test of significance are the means of analyzing the collected data. The significance level of .05 was used for the t and f test. The formula for the t test is:

\[
 t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}}
\]

\[
 df = n_1 + n_2 - 2
\]

The IBM cards were sent to The Ohio State University Computer Center for the analysis of the data.
SUMMARY

This chapter dealt with the methodology of the study here reported. The next chapter will deal with the results of the study from using the mentioned methodology.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

The research method of this study is a descriptive one. This descriptive method is concerned with the existing correctional educators' education programs, perceptions as to what should compose a correctional educators' education program, and attitudes as to whether or not a specialized curriculum for correctional educators should exist. The process of descriptive research is a needs assessment in which there are tabulations of responses, percentages, and correlation of responses between the different population groups by using the t and f test of significance. The method of collecting the data was through surveys to universities and colleges, current practitioners, and inmates. The surveys were structured in order to answer the following research questions:

1) Are there any educational institutions that are presently preparing individuals to become correctional educators?

2) Is there a need for a specific education curriculum to be developed to prepare individuals to become correctional educators?

3) What are the educational qualifications of the present correctional practitioners?
4) Are correctional educators, who have been public school educators, using any different teaching methods?

5) What are some of the competencies and knowledge that a correctional educator should possess to be effective?

6) Is there a need for in-service programs for the present correctional practitioners?

7) What are the educational backgrounds of the inmates?

8) Are correctional education programs meeting the needs of the inmates?

The method of reporting the results of the findings from the questions of each of the four surveys will be constructed in the following manner. Each of the above eight research questions will be the major topic. Inclusive in the major topics will be the various questions from each of the four surveys which were constructed to answer the appropriate question.

After a second follow-up method was used for all the surveys, except the inmates, the following response was received:

1) Colleges and Universities with a population of ten thousand or more students - one hundred and fifty-five (155) out of a total of one hundred and seventy-six (176), 88 percent.

2) Correctional Educational Administrators - forty-four (44) out of a total of forty-nine (49), 89 percent.
3) Current Correctional Educators from four Ohio adult correctional institutions – fifty-four (54) out of a total of eighty-five (85), 64 percent.

4) Inmates from four Ohio adult correctional institutions – one hundred and forty-three (143) out of a total of one hundred and forty-seven (147), 97 percent.
I. Are there any educational institutions that are presently preparing individuals to become correctional educators?

### TABLE 1

The Number of Correctional Educators' Education Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the one hundred and fifty-five colleges and universities that responded to the survey that was sent to Deans of the Department of Education and Directors of Teachers Programs that had an enrollment of ten thousand or more students, only sixteen (10.3 percent) universities stated that a correctional educators education program existed in their institution. These institutions are:

1. Virginia Commonwealth University
2. Western Illinois University
3. Texas A. & M. University
4. Fordham University
5. University of Georgia
6. University of Massachusetts (Amherst)
7. Montclair State College
8) Arizona State University
9) Boston University
10) University of Vermont
11) California State University (Long Beach)
12) Mankato State University
13) University of South Florida
14) Georgia State University
15) University of Akron
16) Indiana University

The sixteen institutions that have correctional educators' programs are located in the following areas of the United States by percentage:

1) 35 - Eastern States
2) 28 - Midwestern States
3) 35 - Southern States
4)  2 - Western States

The sixteen institutions of higher learning and the composition of their correctional educators' education program is shown in Table 2. The composition comprises the following items:

1) Highest possible earned degree
2) Number of students enrolled in the program
3) How long the program has been in existence
4) Organization of the classes
5) The instructors of the classes
6) Other disciplines that are teaching criminal justice
related courses

7) Classes are geared toward

8) Where graduates have acquired jobs

9) Number of graduates who have received job positions as correctional educators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Length of Program</th>
<th>Organization/Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervised field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Illinois</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervised field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A. &amp; M.</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>Under a year</td>
<td>Seminar, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervised field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervised field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervised field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervised field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervised field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Seminar/Lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Lecture, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lecture, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lecture, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lecture, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>Lecture, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lecture, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>Under a year</td>
<td>Lecture, flo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience, simul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>Length of Program</td>
<td>Organization of Classes</td>
<td>Instructor of Classes</td>
<td>Other Criminal Justice Disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminars/supervised field experience</td>
<td>Combination of Professions</td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminars/supervised field experience</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Public Administration, Social Work, Education, Sociology, Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>Under a year</td>
<td>Seminars, field experience, simulations</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminars/supervised field experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminars/supervised field experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminars/supervised field experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Lecture/seminars/supervised field experience</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Social Work Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Seminars/lecture/discussion</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Education, Social Work Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Lectures, field experience, seminars</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Education, Social Work Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lectures, field experience, seminars</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lectures, field experience, seminars</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lectures, field experience, seminars</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>Lectures, field experience, seminars</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 126</td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>Lectures, field experience, seminars</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>Under a year</td>
<td>Lectures, field experience, seminars</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Public Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</th>
<th>Instructor of Classes</th>
<th>Other Criminal Justice Disciplines</th>
<th>Classes Geared Toward</th>
<th>Job Positions</th>
<th>Positions as Correctional Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Combination of Professions</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
<td>Juvenile and Adult Institutions</td>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Public Administration, Social Work, Education, Sociology, Psychology</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
<td>Juvenile &amp; Adult, Public Schools, Agencies</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Agencies, School Districts</td>
<td>No Graduates Yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Sociology</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Public Schools, Colleges</td>
<td>60-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Psychology</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>20-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>20-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Psychology</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>10-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Sociology</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Agencies, Schools, Juvenile</td>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Public Administration, Sociology</td>
<td>Youth and Adults</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Administration</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>20-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Youth and Adult</td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/Seinar/Supervised Field Experience</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>Education, Social Work, Public Administration</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>1st 2 year graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that of the sixteen colleges and universities that responded that a correctional educators' education program existed in their institution, a follow-up study existed. Not all of the institutions responded to the letter asking for specific information on their program. Those who did respond and who sent information are: Western Illinois, Texas A. & M., and Arizona State.

It should be noted that several colleges, The University of Virginia and Memphis State, are in the process of developing a correctional educators' education program. Memphis State sent information on its proposed correction counseling program. California State University (Sacramento) had a teachers' corp correctional program.

II. Is there a need for a specific education curriculum to be developed to prepare individuals to become correctional educators?

The following five questions were asked on the survey to the colleges and universities to focus on the need for a specific correctional educators' education program. It should be noted that of the missing data category, sixteen colleges and universities already have a correctional educators' education program.
TABLE 3
Would A Correctional Educators' Program Enrich Your Present Education Curriculum?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>31 (15)*</td>
<td>20.0 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual non-respondents is 15, since 16 colleges and universities already have a correctional education program, making the total 139 instead of 155.

Table 3 shows that of the one hundred and thirty-nine universities and colleges, a little less than half (41 percent) feel a program would enrich their present education curriculum. Fifty-two (33 percent) of the institutions are still in the deciding stages, while only eight (5 percent) universities and colleges are definite that such a program would not enrich their curriculum. Of those colleges and universities in the deciding stage, some Deans indicated that they were not clear on the term correctional educators' program.
TABLE 4

Does Another Discipline Have A Program That Deals With The Criminal Justice System?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the above</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above plus others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>31 (15)*</td>
<td>20.0 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual non-respondents is 15, since 16 of the colleges and universities already have a correctional education program, making the total 139 instead of 155.

Table 4 shows that one hundred and four (68 percent) of the one hundred and thirty-nine institutions have various disciplines that deal with the criminal justice system. Twenty (12 percent) of the colleges and universities do not have any disciplines that relate to the criminal justice program. Some of the other disciplines that relate to the criminal justice system throughout the various institutions are the following: Criminology, Administration of Justice, Law Enforcement, Criminal Justice, Rehabilitation, Human Resources, and Forensic Science.
TABLE 5

Are Education Students Receiving Minors In
The Criminal Justice Related Disciplines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 79%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>30 (14)*</td>
<td>19.4 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual non-respondents is 14, since 16 of the colleges and universities already have a correctional education program making the total 139 instead of 155.

Table 5 shows that seventy (45 percent) of the one hundred and thirty-nine colleges and universities have education students receiving minors in the criminal justice related disciplines. Twenty-four (15 percent) of the institutions do not have any students receiving minors in such disciplines.
TABLE 6
Are You Aware of Your Graduating Students in Education Acquiring Positions As Correctional Educators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes answers (Percentage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 39%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 59%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 79%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>33 (17)*</td>
<td>21.3 (11.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual non-respondents is 17, since 16 of the colleges and universities already have a correctional education program making the total 139 instead of 155.

Table 6 shows that fifty-seven (36 percent) of the one hundred and thirty-nine colleges and universities have education students acquiring jobs as correctional educators. Sixty-five (42 percent) of the institutions do have education students acquiring jobs in such a profession.
TABLE 7

If A Specialized Curriculum was Developed, The Highest Obtainable Degree Would Be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>47 (31)*</td>
<td>30.3 (200)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actual non-respondents is 31 since 16 of the colleges and universities already have a correctional education program making the total 139 instead of 155.

Table 7 shows that of the one hundred and thirty-nine colleges and universities, seventy-one (65 percent) feel if a specialized correctional educators' education curriculum was developed students would be able to obtain a Bachelors' or higher degree. The main emphasis seems to be more on the Masters' or higher level degree.

The following question was asked on the Correctional Administrators Survey to focus on their perception as to the need of a correctional educators' education curriculum.
Table 8 shows that thirty-six (81 percent) of the Correctional Administrators feel that correctional educators need to be involved in a specific college curriculum.

The following question was asked on the Correctional Educators' Survey to focus on the perceptions of current correctional educators as to the need of a correctional educators' education curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows that thirty-eight (70 percent) of the current practitioners feel that there is a need for a specialized college curriculum in corrections.

The following question was asked on the Inmates' Survey to focus on their perceptions as to the need for a specialized curriculum.

Table 10 shows that one hundred and seven (approximately 75 percent) of the inmates feel that correctional educators need training in a specialized correctional college curriculum.
III. What are the educational qualifications of the present correctional practitioners?

The following seven items provided data for this section. These items focused on the educational background of the current correctional educators in four Ohio Adult Correctional Institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post High School up to 2 yrs.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. or B.A. Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree &amp; 30 qtr. hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree &amp; 30 qtr. hours</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that twenty-seven (50 percent) of the current correctional educators have a Master's Degree or higher. The other half of the educators population have a high school diploma to a Bachelor's Degree plus 30 quarter hours. The table shows there is a cluster of educators in the Master's Degree level.
TABLE 12

Do You Have A State Teaching Certificate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes answer type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Certificate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary or Professional Certificate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that approximately 8 percent of the current educators do not have a State Teaching Certificate. The Table indicates that almost 50 percent of the educators have Temporary or Provisional Certificates while the other 50 percent have Standard Certificates.
TABLE 13

Are You Full or Part-time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows that of the fifty-four educators, fifty (93 percent) are employed as full-time employees.

TABLE 14

Have You Had Prior Teaching Experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes answer years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows thirty-eight (70 percent) of the fifty-four educators have had prior teaching experience. Almost 32 percent of them have taught for over 6 years before entering the correctional educators profession.
TABLE 15
Prior Correctional Related Work Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic or Vocational Teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole or Probation Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Professions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows that almost 60 percent of the correctional educators had no prior correctional work related experiences. Those educators that did have such experiences were academic or vocational teachers or a combination of some of the professions, such as teacher/counselor or group leader/counselor.
Table 16 shows that of the fifty-four correctional educators, forty-nine (91 percent) did not have a specialized correctional curriculum.

Table 17 shows that of the fifty-four correctional educators, thirty-six (67 percent) did not have any courses related to corrections prior to entering a correctional institution. The following seven questions were asked of the forty-nine correctional administrators. These questions focused on their educational background.
Table 18 shows that all the correctional administrators have at least a Bachelor's Degree. The degree cluster is at the Master's level (64 percent).
Table 19 shows that 68 percent of the correctional administrators have their degrees in a combination of the listed curriculum areas. One of the most common combinations is Education/Administration.

### TABLE 19

In What Curriculum Area(s) Is Your Degree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 shows that of the forty-four correctional administrators, thirteen (29 percent) have had no prior job experience in corrections, while 68 percent of the administrators have. Emphasis appears to have been on teaching and a combination of professions. A common combination is Teacher/Counselor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole or Probation Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 shows that almost 100 percent of the correctional administrators have had prior education work experience other than corrections. Over 50 percent of the administrators having experience in a combination of education professions. The most common combination being Public School Teacher/School Administration.
### TABLE 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Trade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that of the forty-four correctional administrators twenty-seven (61 percent) have had other prior work experience related to their present position.
### TABLE 23
Have You Had Any Training In Administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 shows 93 percent of the current correctional administrators having had administration training.

### TABLE 24
Have You Been Involved In Any University Coursework Related To Your Position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes answer years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within last 2 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 shows that almost 60 percent of the correctional administrators have been involved in university coursework related to their job position within the last 2 years.
The following four questions were also on the Correctional Administrators Survey. These questions were asked of the administrators in relation to the correctional educators in their particular state correctional system.

TABLE 25

How Would You Rate The Skill Level And Ability of Your Educators To Work With Inmates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 shows that correctional administrators feel that 85 percent of the correctional educators, throughout the various states in skill level and ability, rate between excellent and good.

Table 26 shows the various states with the following information:

1) How many teachers the correctional system employs
2) The various types of teaching certificates the teachers hold
3) The length of time the teachers have been employed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th># of Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>0-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>60-Dir.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-Contact</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>150-Aca.</td>
<td>ALL HAVE CERTIFICATES</td>
<td>ALL ALCER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195-Voc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6-Aca.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14-Voc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>14-4+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-Vacs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>16 Full-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>None (Educational Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>30-Aca.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34-Voc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 shows that the number of teachers that each correctional system employs varies from 1 (Alabama) to 450 (Florida). The majority of the correctional teachers hold a standard teaching certificate. Very few correctional teachers are teaching without any type of teaching certificate. The number of years correctional teachers have been teaching is varied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th># of Teachers</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>0-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Carolina</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Dakota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carolina</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>24+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Virginia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Are Correctional Educators, who have been Public School Educators, using any different teaching methods?

To answer this question, there were two questions constructed, one on the educators survey and the other on the administrators survey. Both questions were focusing on the difference, if any, in those who worked in the public school setting and are now in the correctional setting.

**TABLE 27**

If You Have Worked In A Public Education Setting, Have You Noticed Any Difference In The Correctional Educators As Opposed To The Public Educators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows that thirty-five (79 percent) of the forty-four correctional administrators were involved in the public school setting. Of the thirty-five, thirty-two (73 percent) of the administrators noticed a difference in the public school educators as opposed to the correctional educators.
Table 28 shows that twenty-seven (50 percent of the correctional educators were involved in the public school setting before entering the correctional setting. Of those who have worked in both settings, it is almost unanimous (98 percent) that there is a difference between the work settings.

After the educators and administrators answered the questions in Tables 27 and 28, those who indicated they had worked in the public setting had to do some comparisons on a 4 point scale (1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent), on their experiences in the public school setting as opposed to the correctional setting. Table 29 shows the comparison of both the administrators and educators. The mean will be used to indicate the comparison.

ED = Correctional Educators   AD = Correctional Administrators
### Table 29
Public Educators vs. Correctional Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Public Educator</th>
<th>Correctional Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative teaching methods</td>
<td>ED 2.536</td>
<td>ED 2.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD 2.286</td>
<td>AD 3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College training beneficial</td>
<td>ED 3.000</td>
<td>ED 2.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD 3.147</td>
<td>AD 2.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendlier attitude toward students</td>
<td>ED 3.111</td>
<td>ED 3.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD 2.676</td>
<td>AD 3.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job duties more clearly defined</td>
<td>ED 2.828</td>
<td>ED 2.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD 2.713</td>
<td>AD 2.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted individual differences</td>
<td>ED 2.483</td>
<td>ED 3.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD 2.471</td>
<td>AD 3.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated more on student's level</td>
<td>ED 2.724</td>
<td>ED 3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD 2.324</td>
<td>AD 3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult and gave extra help</td>
<td>ED 2.586</td>
<td>ED 2.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AD 2.545</td>
<td>AD 3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided student to develop ability to function in</td>
<td>ED 2.538</td>
<td>ED 2.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>society</td>
<td>AD 2.194</td>
<td>AD 3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of students</td>
<td>ED 2.667</td>
<td>ED 2.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual instruction</td>
<td>ED 2.370</td>
<td>ED 3.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed specific learning objectives for the</td>
<td>ED 2.444</td>
<td>ED 3.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used reward system</td>
<td>ED 2.208</td>
<td>ED 2.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to relate with students</td>
<td>AD 2.618</td>
<td>AD 3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 shows that in the administrators' comparison the means for the correctional educator tend to be somewhat higher, except for the item of beneficial college training, than for the public educator. The means of the current correctional educators tend to be somewhat similar to those of the administrators. The mean is somewhat
higher in most of the items except for beneficial college training, job duties were clearly defined and motivation of students. The means for both the public educator and correctional educator as compared by the current correctional educator and correctional administrators are quite similar.

The t-test of significance was used to analyze the mean scores in Table 29 on the items in relation to the public educator and correctional educator as viewed by the correctional administrators and correctional educators. The t-test was used as the statistical treatment in determining whether or not differences can be found in viewing the public educator and correctional educator.

With infinite degrees (86 and 106) of freedom, a t-score of 1.64 is required to be significant at the .05 level of confidence. When the correctional educator compared the public and correctional educators on the items in Table 29, all the items were significant except for beneficial college training, aided student to develop ability to function in a positive fashion in society, and the use of the reward system. When the correctional administrators compared the two groups, all the items were significant except for friendlier attitude toward students and job duties more clearly defined. In comparing the public educator on the same item by the correctional administrators and correctional educators, there were significant differences on friendlier attitude toward students, communicated more on student's level, and aided student to develop ability to function in a positive fashion in society. There were only two items which had
significant differences in comparing the same item for the correctional educator by the population groups. The items were beneficial college training and aided student to develop ability to function in a positive fashion in society.

V. What are some of the competencies and knowledge that a correctional educator should possess to be effective?

To focus on competencies that an individual may need to learn in a correctional educators' program, Deans of the Department of Education, correctional educators, and correctional administrators were to rate the following competencies on a scale from very important (4) to not important (1). These ratings are shown in Table 30 by using the means for each group (N = number of respondents).
TABLE 30

Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Colleges and Universities N = 118</th>
<th>Administrators N = 42</th>
<th>Educators N = 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>3.602</td>
<td>3.463</td>
<td>3.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>3.681</td>
<td>3.463</td>
<td>3.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values clarification</td>
<td>3.521</td>
<td>3.405</td>
<td>3.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>3.720</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td>3.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td>3.297</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>2.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resources</td>
<td>3.325</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>2.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research procedures</td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>2.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>3.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team techniques</td>
<td>3.084</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>2.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>3.765</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>3.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual instruction</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>2.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>3.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing techniques</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>3.048</td>
<td>2.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Educators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Individual instruction</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication skills</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conflict management</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crisis intervention</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Decision making</td>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>Individual instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Value clarification</td>
<td>Value clarification</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Value clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Problem solving</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Group processes</td>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>Group intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Community resources</td>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Career counseling</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Team techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual instruction</td>
<td>Team techniques</td>
<td>Interviewing techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Interviewing techniques</td>
<td>Interviewing techniques</td>
<td>Community resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Team techniques</td>
<td>Community resources</td>
<td>Research procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Research procedures</td>
<td>Research procedures</td>
<td>Research procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 shows the rank order of importance of the competencies to the three groups of population.
The f-test of significance was used to analyze the mean scores of the colleges and universities, correctional administrators, and correctional educators on the competencies listed in Table 30. With the degrees of freedom being 2 and 211, a f-test of 3.00 is required to be significant at the .05 level of confidence. There was a significant difference on the following competencies - decision making, career counseling, community resources, problem solving, interpersonal relations, individual instruction, group processes, crisis intervention, and interviewing techniques. Table 31 shows the rank order of the competencies between the three groups (<&= interchangeable). There is consistency as to what may be important in a correctional educators' program as opposed to what has less importance. Interpersonal relations, communication skills and decision making appear to be heading the list. While on the bottom of the list are interviewing techniques, team techniques, and research procedures.

Table 32 shows some potential curriculum areas which may be part of a correctional educators' program. These areas were also rated on a scale from very important (4) to not important (1) by Deans of the Department of Education, Correctional Administrators, and Correctional Educators (N = number of respondents).
### TABLE 32

Potential Curriculum Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Colleges and Universities N = 118</th>
<th>Administrators N = 42</th>
<th>Educators N = 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method of teaching in a correctional institution</td>
<td>3.277</td>
<td>3.595</td>
<td>3.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>3.167</td>
<td>2.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational programs in correctional institutions</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>3.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and practice in correctional education</td>
<td>3.440</td>
<td>3.238</td>
<td>3.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>3.524</td>
<td>3.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of public education versus correctional education</td>
<td>2.492</td>
<td>2.262</td>
<td>2.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative organization of correctional education</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>2.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest and police procedures</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>2.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult and Juvenile court procedures</td>
<td>2.966</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>2.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics and organizations of correctional institutions</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>2.810</td>
<td>2.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and culture</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>2.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confinement and the inmate social system</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>3.024</td>
<td>3.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole and probation procedures</td>
<td>3.008</td>
<td>2.548</td>
<td>2.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment modalities</td>
<td>3.178</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>2.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends and volume of crime</td>
<td>2.542</td>
<td>2.268</td>
<td>2.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change strategies</td>
<td>3.376</td>
<td>2.902</td>
<td>2.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare and placement procedures</td>
<td>3.322</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>3.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of the law of criminal correction</td>
<td>2.957</td>
<td>2.341</td>
<td>2.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social institutions and crime causation</td>
<td>3.102</td>
<td>2.585</td>
<td>2.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential justice</td>
<td>2.888</td>
<td>2.463</td>
<td>2.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 32
(con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Colleges and Universities N = 118</th>
<th>Administrators N = 42</th>
<th>Educators N = 53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss and restoration of civil rights</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>2.452</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Development of corrections</td>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>2.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of offenses and offenders</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>2.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in crime</td>
<td>2.756</td>
<td>2.390</td>
<td>2.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstances and problems of release</td>
<td>3.178</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>2.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform and community base corrections</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>2.810</td>
<td>2.889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 shows the means for the Deans of the Department of Education being higher than the means for the administrators and educators. The f-test of significance was used to analyze the mean scores of the three population groups for the items listed in Table 32. With the degrees of freedom being 2 and 211, a f-test of 3.00 is required to be significant at the .05 level of confidence. There was a significant difference on all the potential curriculum areas except for the following ones: Social education, educational programs in correctional institutions, curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting, comparison of public education versus correctional education, administrative organization of correctional education, and historical development of corrections.
Table 33 shows the rank order of the potential curriculum areas by the three population groups.

**TABLE 33**

Rank Order of Potential Curriculum Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Colleges and Universities</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods of teaching in a correctional institution</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational programs in correctional institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and practice in correctional education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative organization of correctional education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest and police procedures</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult and juvenile court procedures</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics and organizations of correctional institutions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and culture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confinement and the inmate social system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole and probation procedures</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment modalities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends and volume of crime</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare and placement procedures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of the law of criminal correction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social institutions and crime causation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ranking in Table 33 shows that the three groups of population agree that methods of teaching in a correctional institution, educational programs in correctional institutions, confinement and the inmate social system, and curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting may be areas to include in a specialized curriculum for correctional educators. Courses that may be of little value are historical development of corrections, comparison of public education versus correctional education, trends and volume in crime, and women in crime.
To also focus on what type of knowledge would be beneficial for a correctional educators' education program, current correctional educators were asked if there are any courses that they feel would be helpful to them now. If their answer was yes, they were to list some courses.

**TABLE 3k**

Are There Any Courses Which You Feel Would Be Helpful To You Now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3k shows that 56 percent of the educators feel that there are courses that were beneficial to them now as current educators.

Some of the common courses listed were the following:

1) Criminal Law Procedures
2) Correctional Psychology
3) Basic Psychology Courses - Behavioral Psychology
4) Courses in Corrections - Criminology
5) How to Teach Adults
6) Learning Disabilities
7) Reading/English
8) Individualized Instruction
The inmates were asked on their survey to list qualities, experiences, or courses they felt their correctional educators should have before entering the correctional setting. Some of the experiences or courses were:

* 1) Human Behavior courses
* 2) Sociology courses
* 3) To have been a social worker
  4) Criminology courses
* 5) Psychology courses
  6) Communication courses
  7) Prior correctional exposure - worked with ex-cons
  8) Having been incarcerated
  9) Awareness of street life

Some qualities inmates feel that correctional educators need to be able to relate in the correctional setting are the following:

* 1) Understanding
* 2) Patience - Tolerance
* 3) Treat individuals like human beings
* 4) Self Confidence - Self Control
  5) Respect
  6) Helping relationship
  7) Be able to control the class
  8) Positive attitude
* 9) Honest, open, caring, trustworthy, sincere
  10) Common sense
* Extremely important to inmates
VI. Is there a need for in-service programs for the present correctional practitioners?

The Correctional Educators were asked three questions on their survey to focus on if there is a need for any in-service programs. One of the questions was answered in Table 33 where 56 percent of the educators feel that there are courses that would be beneficial to them now. The other two questions can be found in Tables 35 and 36.

TABLE 35

Are There Presently Any In-Service Programs Designed To Keep You Informed Of New Information Or Teaching Methods In The Field Of Corrections?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no answers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel a need for any?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 shows that 54 percent of the current correctional educators feel that there is a need for in-service programs to keep them informed of new information or teaching methods in their work setting.
TABLE 36

Are There Any Organized Periodic Staff Meetings Where You Are Able To Share Ideas, Discuss Problems And Teaching Methods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no answer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel a need for any?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 shows that thirty-seven (69 percent) of the fifty-four correctional educators are involved in periodic staff meetings where sharing and problem solving is occurring.

There were four questions that pertained to in-service programs on the Correctional Administrators Survey (Tables 37 - 39).
**TABLE 37**

Are There Any In-Service Training Programs For Your Educators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes answer how often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 yearly</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 yearly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 yearly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37 shows that 84 percent of the correctional administrators provide at least one in-service program yearly for their correctional educators. Fifty percent of the educators are given in-service programs one or two per year. Very few educators are not involved with any in-service programs yearly.
Table 38 shows that almost 90 percent of the correctional educators are engaged in regular staff meetings.

Tables 37 and 38 show educators being involved in in-service programs and regular staff meetings. Table 39 focuses on the correctional administrators and their involvement with in-service training programs and also with their educators.
TABLE 39
Are There Any In-Service Training Programs
Or Workshops Provided For You?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes how often:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2/year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4/year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4/year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39 shows that 78 percent of the Correctional Administrators are involved in in-service training programs or workshops yearly. The Administrators Survey also focused on time spent with various groups of people or individually. Although the percentages varied, job duties were ranked in the following order according to the means.

Approximately how much of your time is spent in or with:

1) office
2) correctional educators
3) meetings
4) inmates
5) community (speaker, resource person, agencies)
6) other
VII. What are the Educational Background of the inmates?

The following questions were asked on the Inmates' Survey to focus on their age, their educational background, and their parents' educational background (Tables 40 - 47).

**TABLE 40**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 25</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - 41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - 48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40 shows that almost 90 percent of the inmates range between the ages of 18 - 33, with the clustering being between 18 - 25.
### TABLE 41

**Highest Attained Educational Level Before Incarceration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (1-6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High (7-9)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (10-12)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41 shows almost 75 percent of the inmates having a high school educational level before being incarcerated.

### TABLE 42

**Present Educational Level Since Being Confined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 shows that 80 percent of the inmates are at the high school educational level since confinement.
TABLE 43
How Long Have You Been Confined?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under a year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4 years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 14 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 14 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43 shows 85 percent of the inmates having been confined from under a year to four years.

TABLE 44
Is This Your First Prison Confinement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no: were you enrolled in an educational program during your other confinement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44 shows that of the one hundred and forty-three inmates, for one hundred and two (71 percent) of them this is their first confinement. For forty-one (29 percent) inmates who had been
incarcerated before, twenty-two (15 percent) were enrolled in an educational program.

**TABLE 45**

If This Is Your Second Or More Confinement, How Long Was There Between Confinements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 44, Table 45 also shows this being the first confinement for the majority of the inmates. For those inmates whose confinement has been two or more times (22 percent) were not confined for less than a year to 2 years. Of the 30 percent of the inmates whose confinement have been for two or more times, 8.4 percent were enrolled in an educational program while they were on the streets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 143</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 143</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46 shows the educational level of the mothers to be a little higher than the educational level of the inmates' father. Both parents' educational level clusters at the high school level.
The following set of questions pertain to the inmates' attitude toward public education as opposed to correctional education. The inmates rated the information on a scale from 1-4 (1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent).
TABLE U8
Correctional Education Versus Public Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>(1) Excellent</th>
<th>(2) Fair</th>
<th>(3) Good</th>
<th>(4) Poor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My attitude toward public education was</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents’ attitude toward public education was</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My attitude toward correctional education is</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My public education teachers’ attitude toward teaching was</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My correctional education teachers’ attitude toward teaching is</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got good grades in public school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was late for public school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used to do my homework</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt embarrassed to ask questions in public school</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I paid attention to the public school teacher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got in trouble in the public school</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked gym, shop, sewing, etc. better than English, Math, etc.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents helped me with my homework</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents made me be in the house by a certain time on school nights</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents went to school with me when I got in trouble</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents would punish me for bad grades</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were books and dictionaries in my home</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My public teachers seemed to pick on me</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My public teachers cared about me</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My public teachers were authoritarians</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to be like my teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get good grades in correctional education</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do my homework in my correctional classes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get in trouble in my correctional classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pay attention in my correctional classes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel embarrassed to ask questions in my correctional classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like vocational courses better than English, Math</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The correctional teachers seem to pick on me</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The correctional teachers care about me</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The correctional teachers act like authoritarians</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48 shows that the inmates' attitude toward public education, as opposed to correctional education is about the same with the mean being 2.5 (between fair and good). In the eyes of the inmates, the public school teachers' attitude toward teaching is better than the correctional educators. The parents' attitude toward education seemed to be the highest among the three groups.

Although the inmates' attitude toward public education and correctional education is similar, the inmates get better grades, do their homework more often, and pay attention more in their correctional education classes.

The parents' attitude being good toward public education is reinforced by the parents having books and dictionaries in the home for reference, having a curfew when their children should be in the house on school nights, and going to school when their children get in trouble.

According to the inmates, both public and correctional educators tend to act like authoritarians in the classroom. The public educators tended to pick on the inmates more but at the same time they cared more about them as individuals than the correctional educators.

VIII. Are correctional education programs meeting the needs of the inmates?

The following questions were asked on the Inmates' Survey to focus on the correctional education programs meeting the needs of the inmates. Five of the questions were discussed earlier in the chapter. Table 41, Highest Attained Educational Level Before Incarceration;
Table 42, Present Educational Level Since Being Confined; Table 43, The Present Length of Confinement; Table 44, First Prison Confinement; and Table 45, Length of Time That Existed Between Confinements. These questions were chosen to see if the educational level of the inmates has risen since being confined. The tables showed that 75 percent of the inmates were at the high school level before incarceration. Since incarceration, 80 percent are at the high school level with this being the first confinement for 71 percent of the inmates.

Two other questions were also asked of the inmates to focus on the educational needs of the inmates (Tables 49 - 50).

**TABLE 49**

Is The Correctional Education Programs Meeting Your Needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49 shows that 60 percent of the inmates feel that the correctional education programs are meeting their needs. The 36 percent who feel the educational programs are not meeting their needs specified the following reasons for their answer:

1) The work in the classroom is below their educational level

2) More teachers are needed
3) More diversified subjects are needed
4) Classroom material needs to be updated
5) Teachers show lack of interest

Although 60 percent feel that the correctional education programs are meeting their needs, some commented that it was only because they were eager to learn and avid readers. They also felt that teachers showed lack of interest.

**TABLE 50**

**Why Are You Enrolled In An Education Program?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole Board sent me</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot of leisure time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To impress the parole board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of sentence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To qualify myself for the streets</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just want to learn</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn a trade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50 shows there being various reasons why inmates are enrolled in an educational program. Forty percent of the inmates are enrolled because they are interested in raising their educational level. Forty percent more are enrolled for a combination of reasons. The most frequent combinations are: 'To qualify myself for the streets/just want to learn; Lot of leisure time/qualify myself for the streets/
just want to learn; to impress the parole board/just want to learn/qualify myself for the streets.

The Correctional Administrators were also asked the following questions to focus on how their correctional system is meeting the educational needs of the inmates.

**TABLE 51**

Is Your Correctional Education Program Certified Or Chartered As A School District By The Department of Education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51 shows that 57 percent of the forty-four correctional education systems are not chartered or certified as a school district by the Department of Education. 41 percent are chartered as school districts, while one more of the correctional systems is in the process of becoming chartered.

Table 52 shows which states are chartered or certified as school districts. The table will also show how many adults are incarcerated in their correctional system and what percent are involved in educational programs.
### TABLE 52

The Correctional Education Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Chartered or Certified</th>
<th># of Adults Incarcerated</th>
<th>% Enrolled in Education Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>30-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11,000+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Part of University of Hawaii Community Colleges System</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Part of Community College District</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Yes Voc. Ed. No Academic</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>Chartered or Certified</td>
<td>% of Adults Incarcerated</td>
<td>% Enrolled in Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>25 full-time 50 part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>33 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12,000+</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6,707</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>33 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52 shows that the number of adults incarcerated throughout the United States ranges from 91 (Vermont) to 22,000 (Texas). The number of adults that are enrolled in education programs also are quite varied from 10 percent (Delaware) to 80 percent (Vermont and Hawaii). The mean appears to be between 25 and 30 percent.

SUMMARY

Chapter IV addressed the descriptive findings of this study. The findings for each of the eight research questions were summarized in various tables.

Chapter V will contain a summary of this study, followed by conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This final chapter of the study will present a summary, findings, conclusions drawn from the analysis of the findings, a proposed correctional educators' education program, and recommendations for additional research in the area that was investigated.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to assess the present scope of correctional educators' education programs in the institutions of higher learning. Specifically, the study was designed to determine the need for a correctional educators' education program. The study was also designed to get some perceptions as to what should compose a correctional educators' education curriculum, if it was discovered that there was a need for such a curriculum.

The population utilized in the study consisted of one hundred and fifty-five (155) colleges and universities that had an enrollment of ten thousand or more students; forty-four (44) correctional administrators; fifty-four (54) correctional educators from Ohio; and one hundred and forty-four (144) Ohio inmates. The procedure used for gathering data involved the use of four surveys developed by the researcher. The surveys focused on existing correctional educators'
education programs, the need for correctional educators' education programs, possible curriculum areas and competencies a correctional educator may need, educational backgrounds of inmates, educational backgrounds of current correctional practitioners, and current correctional institutions' education programs meeting the educational needs of the inmates.

A review of the literature revealed a shortage of professional correctional educators. This shortage reflected upon the various universities in which there are minimal training models that exist to prepare individuals for working in the correctional setting.

The method used in this study was a descriptive research. The process of descriptive research is a needs assessment in which there are tabulations of responses, percentages, and correlation of responses between the different population groups by using the t and f tests. To facilitate the gathering of data for the needs assessment process, eight research questions were generated.

**Findings**

The eight research questions and their findings are:

**Question 1.** Are there any educational institutions that are presently preparing individuals to become correctional educators?

**Finding:** The finding revealed that there was a significant difference between the number of colleges and universities that were preparing individuals to become correctional educators as opposed to those who did not have a correctional educators program. Of the one hundred and fifty-five (155) colleges and universities that responded
to the survey, one hundred and thirty-nine (90 percent) institutions reported that they did not have a correctional educators' education program. Only sixteen (10 percent) Deans reported that their institution had such a program.

Question 2. Is there a need for a specific education curriculum to be developed to prepare individuals to become correctional educators?

Finding: The findings revealed that 41 percent of the colleges and universities that responded to the survey felt that a correctional educators' education program would enrich their present education curriculum. Forty-five (45) percent of the institutions reported that 1 – 20 percent of their education students were receiving minors in criminal justice related disciplines. Thirty-seven (37) percent also reported that 1 – 39 percent of their graduating students in education were acquiring positions as correctional educators.

Thirty-six (81 percent) of the forty-four correctional administrators and thirty-eight (70 percent) of the correctional educators felt that correctional educators need to be involved in a specific college curriculum.

One hundred and seven (75 percent) of the one hundred and forty-four inmates also felt that correctional educators need training in a specialized correctional college curriculum.

Question 3. What are the educational qualifications of the present correctional practitioners?

Finding: The findings revealed that 50 percent of the correctional educators have a Master's Degree or higher. Ninety-two (92) percent have a state teaching certificate. Of the correctional
educators, 70 percent have had prior teaching experience, while 40 percent have had prior correctional work related experiences. Ninety-one (91) percent were not involved in a specialized correctional curriculum, and 67 percent have had no coursework in corrections.

All correctional administrators hold at least a Bachelor's Degree. Sixty-eight (68) percent of the correctional administrators have had prior job experiences in corrections. Sixty (60) percent have been involved in job related university courses within the last two years.

Question 4. Are correctional educators, who have been public school educators, using any different teaching methods?

Finding: The findings revealed that 79 percent of the correctional administrators were involved in the public school setting. Of the 79 percent, 73 percent noticed a difference in the public educator as opposed to the correctional educator. The findings also revealed that 50 percent of the correctional educators had been public educators. Ninety-eight (98) percent of those educators who had been involved in public education felt they were involved in different teaching methods between the two work settings.

In comparing the methods of the public educators to the correctional educators, except for a few, there were significant differences between the means at the .05 level. For the administrative comparison, the means for the correctional educator tend to be somewhat higher. This statement is also true for the correctional educators.
Question 5. What are some of the competencies and knowledge that a correctional educator should possess to be effective?

Finding: The findings revealed that there was a significant difference in the means of the competencies between the groups of colleges and universities, correctional administrators, and correctional educators at the .05 level. The rank order of the competencies were quite consistent. Consistency also existed in what curriculum areas the three groups felt were important or unimportant.

A list was also generated by 56 percent of the correctional educators who felt that there are courses that still would be beneficial to them.

Inmates also felt that there are certain experiences and qualities that correctional educators should have before entering the correctional setting.

Question 6. Is there a need for in-service programs for the present correctional practitioners?

Finding: The findings revealed that 54 percent of the correctional educators felt that there is a need for in-service programs. Regular staff meetings are held for 89 percent of the correctional educators. Seventy-eight (78) percent of the correctional administrators are involved in yearly in-service programs.

Question 7. What are the educational backgrounds of the inmates?

Finding: The finding revealed that 75 percent of the inmates had a high school education level before incarceration. Since incarceration, 80 percent are involved in the high school curriculum.
Question 8. Are correctional education programs meeting the needs of the inmates?

Finding: The finding revealed that 60 percent of the inmates felt that the correctional education programs were meeting their needs. The finding also revealed that 57 percent of the correctional systems are not chartered or certified as school districts.

Conclusion

The findings of this study seem to justify the following conclusions:

The conclusions of this study are based on the findings and considerations for the limits which are stated in Chapter I. They are listed prior to the conclusions.

Limits of the Study

One limitation of this study was that the Correctional Education Survey was sent only to the Deans of the Department of Education and Directors of Teachers Programs. In the university setting, the Deans and Directors may not be the most knowledgeable individual of the criminal justice system.

A second limitation was that the study only utilized inmates and correctional educators from Ohio.

A third limitation was that the study only utilized institutions of higher learning with an enrollment of ten thousand or more students.

A fourth limitation of the study was in assessing the scope of current correctional educators' education programs, the qualitative aspects of the program were not being measured.
Conclusions

1. There are very few educational institutions, which have an enrollment of ten thousand or more students, that have a curriculum in education which are preparing individuals to become correctional educators. Of the one hundred and fifty-five colleges and universities that responded to the survey that was sent to the Deans of the Department of Education and Directors of Teachers Programs, only sixteen (10 percent) stated that a correctional educators' education program existed in their institution. Two institutions indicated that their Department of Education is in the process of developing such a program.

2. There is a need for a specific education curriculum to be developed to prepare individuals to become correctional educators. The findings revealed that 11 percent of the colleges and universities that responded to the survey felt that a correctional educators' education program would enrich their present education curriculum. This percentage number excluded the institutions which already have such a program. Forty-five percent of the institutions reported that their education students were receiving minors in criminal justice related disciplines. Thirty-seven percent of the institutions also reported that their graduating students in education were acquiring positions as correctional educators.

Sixteen universities (10 percent) stated that a correctional educators' education program existed in their institution. Four of these institutions sent material to the researcher on their correctional educators' program. The material mainly consisted of listed course
material or a general overview of the program. None of the four institutions displayed a specific model that entailed the process of preparing an individual to become a correctional educator.

Many of the Deans of the Department of Education wrote comments on their surveys pertaining to interest in wanting more material on the existing correctional educators programs, what institutions were involved in such a program, and a bibliography on the review of literature pertaining to correctional educators' education program.

One institution which has a correctional educators' education program incorporated into their education curriculum feels differently than many other individuals, including the researcher, on the topic of preparing individuals to become correctional educators. He writes the following:

"Although the need for corrections education specialists at present is great, the last thing we should do is saturate the field as has now been done in such areas as learning disabilities, emotionally disturbed, and mental retardation. Part of our problem in professional education is that when a specialized need exists, so many people rise to the occasion to fill it that we create perhaps an even worse problem with overly-trained professionals in areas where few positions exist. There is, in my opinion, a need for specialization among colleges of education throughout the country."

Eighty-one percent of the forty-five correctional administrators felt that correctional educators need to be involved in a specific college curriculum.
Seventy percent of the current correctional educators felt that there is a need for specific education curriculum to be developed to prepare individuals to become correctional educators. Ninety-one percent of the correctional educators had not been involved in a specialized correctional curriculum, while 67 percent had not been involved in any coursework in the field of corrections. Fifty-six percent of the correctional educators felt that there are courses which would be beneficial to them presently.

Inmates, (75 percent) who are recipients of college curriculums, also agree that their correctional educators need to have been involved in a specialized correctional college curriculum.

All of the four population groups surveyed feel that there is a need for a specific education curriculum to be developed to prepare individuals to become correctional educators.

3. Correctional practitioners need a college degree and some prior coursework and experiences in corrections. Of the current correctional educators surveyed, 80 percent hold a Bachelor's or higher degree. The majority of the educators cluster at the Master's level. Ninety-two percent have a state teaching certificate while 70 percent had been involved in prior teaching experiences. Forty percent of the correctional educators had been involved in prior correctional work related experiences. Some of these experiences were teacher/counselor or group leader/counselor.
All of the correctional administrators that responded to the survey hold at least a Bachelor's degree. As similar to the correctional educators, the correctional administrators also cluster at the Master's level. The curriculum areas in which the majority of the correctional administrators hold their degree is education/administration. Sixty-eight percent of the correctional administrators have had prior job experience in corrections. The emphasis was on a teacher/counselor role. Sixty percent of the correctional administrators have been involved in university coursework within the last two years which directly relates to their job position.

The inmates also agree that it is important that their correctional educators have a college degree to be able to teach the subject matter, as well as being involved in prior correctional experiences. Inmates felt that prior correctional experiences would help with the awareness of institutional life and consequently more understanding would be incorporated in correctional educators.

4. There needs to be a difference in the teaching method of the public educator in comparison to the correctional educator. The findings revealed that 79 percent of the correctional administrators were involved in the public school setting. Of the 79 percent, 73 percent noticed a difference in the performance of the public educator as opposed to the correctional educator. The correctional administrator felt that correctional educators used innovative teaching methods, had a friendlier attitude toward students, accepted individual differences, communicated more on student's level, consulted and gave extra help,
gave individual instruction, and was able to relate with the students better than the public educator.

Of the 50 percent of the correctional educators, 98 percent felt that their teaching performance varied in the public and correctional work settings. As correctional educators the individuals felt they used innovative teaching methods, accepted individual differences, communicated more on student's level, consulted and gave extra help, gave individual instruction, developed specific learning objectives for the students, and had the ability to relate with student's more than as a public educator.

One important population group to focus on pertaining to difference in teaching methods between the correctional educator and public educator is the inmates. Since 100 percent of the surveyed inmates were drop-outs from the public school system, different teaching methods are needed by the correctional educator to help motivate and keep the interest of the inmates. The attitude of the inmates toward correctional education is more favorable as opposed to public education. Although the inmates' attitude is more favorable, they feel that their public educators' attitude toward teaching was more favorable than their current correctional educators.

The three population groups, correctional administrators, correctional educators, and inmates, feel that the traditional public school teaching methods have little relevancy in a correctional institution setting. To further support the idea that there needs to be a difference in the teaching method of the correctional educator as opposed to the public educator, it should be kept in mind that the
correctional educators are dealing with adults instead of youths. Although the content material may be quite similar, there is quite a difference in age. Therefore different teaching methods must exist to motivate and keep the interest of the adult learners.

5. There are important competencies and curriculum areas a correctional educator should have before entering the correctional work setting. While individuals are preparing to become correctional educators, there are some competencies and curriculum areas these individuals should be gaining from a correctional educators' education program. Both the correctional administrators and educators agree that interpersonal relations, communication skills, and decision making are competencies which are important to correctional educators. Some courses which would be important to correctional educators are the methods of teaching in a correctional institution, education programs in correctional institutions, confinement and the inmate social system, and curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting.

Inmates also felt that there are some courses and qualities that a correctional educator need to possess before entering a correctional setting. Some of the courses are: human behavior, sociology and psychology. Qualities which inmates felt that correctional educators need to be able to relate are: understanding, patience, caring, self-control, and being able to treat individuals like human beings.

6. In-service programs are needed for correctional educators. With 91 percent of the correctional educators not being involved in a specialized correctional educators program, 67 percent not having any
coursework in corrections, and 56 percent feeling that there are
courses which would be beneficial to them now, in-service programs
could be a positive vehicle for further training correctional educators.
Fifty-four percent of the correctional educators felt that there is a
need for in-service programs.

7. The educational level of the inmates surveyed is between
the 10th and 12th grade. The educational level of the surveyed inmates
being at the high school level is quite inconsistent with the national
educational level of inmates as well as with the educational level
reported by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections.
Roberts (1971, p. 30) cites that based on standard achievement tests
the educational level of inmates have been diagnosed as having a median
educational retardation of between the third and fifth grade. Harrison
Morris (1976, p. 3), the Educational Administrator for the Ohio Depart­
ment of Rehabilitation and Corrections, cites the following statistics
of the educational level of Ohio adult inmates. Seventy percent are
high school dropouts, with the average inmate educational achievement
being at the sixth grade level with large percentages functioning at
the first, second, and third grade levels.

8. More of the inmates need to have their educational needs
met by the correctional education system. Since there is a confinement
system, educational programs should be geared to meeting the needs of
the inmates to provide them with marketable skills. Sixty percent of
the inmates surveyed felt that the correctional education programs were
meeting their needs. Some of the individuals commented that their needs
were only being met because they were eager to learn and avid readers. Of the 36 percent who felt that the educational programs were not meeting their needs specified some of the following reasons: the work in the classroom is below their educational level, more teachers needed, more diversified subjects, classroom material outdates, and lack of interest shown by teachers. Eighty-two percent of the incarcerated women surveyed felt that the education programs were not meeting their needs for some of the already stated reasons.

In focusing on the correctional systems throughout the various states, 57 percent of the states' systems are not certified or chartered as a school district by the Department of Education. The number of adults that are enrolled in education programs in the correctional systems throughout the United States vary from 10 percent (Delaware) to 80 percent (Vermont and Hawaii). The average number of adults enrolled in programs per state is between 25 and 30 percent. The number of inmates per teacher also varies widely.

Proposed Correctional Educators' Education Model

References

In proposing a Correctional Educators' Education Model, four sets of reference will be utilized.

1. The Manual of Correctional Standards (Appendix I) states in its chapter on "Education" some essential factors which determine the effectiveness of education in correctional institutions. Some of these factors are the following: Philosophy and objectives of correctional education, Personnel, Program Planning, Correspondence
Education, Vocational Education, and Trade Advisory Committees.

2. The data gathered from the Deans of the Departments of Education and Directors of Teacher Programs, Correctional Administrators, Correctional Educators, and Inmates will be utilized.

3. The ideas gained through reviewing the literature on correctional educators' programs will be utilized. Also gathered information from some of the existing correctional educators' education programs.

4. Some of the researcher's ideas will be utilized.

Objectives of the Correctional Educators' Education Program

1. To bring about a rapport relationship with the correctional settings and colleges and universities.

2. To develop an experience based training program to prepare individuals to become correctional educators.

3. To bring awareness and exposure to potential correctional educators in dealing with themselves and correctional settings.

4. To expose individuals to the functioning of the criminal justice system.

5. To utilize an interdisciplinary approach as well as a specialized approach.

Length and Educational Level

This proposed model will be two years in length. Two years will lend time to intermingle specialized courses, interdisciplinary courses, clinical and field experiences. This model will be at the Master's level. The Master's level was selected since most of the
current correctional educators appear to be at this educational level. A bachelors or doctoral degree curriculum can easily be adapted from this model.

Selection Process

Correctional educators are a very select group of individuals. Therefore, before individuals are admitted to a correctional educators' education program, a selection process should exist. Primary considerations for the acceptance of an individual into the program should be based on several aspects. 1) Prior experiences such as teaching, correctional related work, volunteer work, or Peace Corps should be considered. 2) The maturity, personality, and attitude of the individual should be a point of focus. 3) Personal qualities such as understanding, sensitivity, equality of human beings, respect, sincerity, patience, and self-confidence are necessary to be effective in correctional institutions.

The above considerations have an impact as to the effectiveness of an individual as a correctional educator. These considerations have been determined from the surveyed correctional educators, inmates, and the review of literature.

Personal qualities and attitudes are often difficult to examine in a sole interview. Thus, in attempt to structure the selection process would endure a quarter. This would allow ample time to observe the individual and to determine if the needed qualifications and skills were possessed. Each individual after having a conference with a member of the selection process would be admitted into the correctional
educators' education program as a conditional student. The initial conference has the option of also being a screening process.

If, at the end of the quarter, after being involved in many varied experiences, the individual was deemed not to have the stated qualifications or lacked the potential for developing, the individual would not be accepted into the correctional educators' education program. Perceptions are clear that a risk factor is involved in entering the selection process. Although there is the possibility of a student being denied to enter the program, some positive outcomes should exist from the investment of the individual. Some of these positive outcomes should be: 1) more self-awareness and growth, 2) exposure to the criminal justice field and 3) clarity of vocational and career objectives.

It should be noted that individuals at any time may also do some self screening. There may be individuals who feel the program is not meeting their needs. Others may change their minds as to their career pursuit.

The selection committee would be composed of faculty members from the correctional educators' education program, related disciplines, and supervisors involved with field experience. Evaluation of the individual by the committee would be based on the varied experiences that the individual would be encountering in the quarter. Input would be received from faculty members, field experience supervisors, as well as the inmates (or other groups of individuals whom they worked with), classmates, and the applicant.
Proposed Program

First Quarter as a Conditional Student

Since this first quarter is focusing on the acceptance of the individual into the correctional educators' education program, many varied experiences will exist.

Upon entering the program, the individual will be involved in some testing. This testing is to help assess the affective characteristics of the individual. Observation and interaction with the applicant will also help to assess the validity of the results of the test. Attempting to assess personality is a difficult task. An even greater task is attempting to establish a relationship between personality and an educators' effectiveness. Some examples of inventories which may be useful are the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory by Gavan and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey by Gowan and Gowan. The Rorschach Ink Blot Test can also be used in helping to understand personality integration and organization. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory can be beneficial in viewing the attitude of an individual toward teaching. In focusing on values, the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale could be administered. In addition to the suggested mentioned inventories, some racial attitudes inquiries or inventories should also be administered. After completing the experiences that will occur in this first quarter, some, or all, of the inventories should be administered again for the reason of concentrating on change.
To also help in the assessing of values and attitudes would be the example of participation in a Life Planning Workshop. (Appendix K). This workshop is presently being used in many colleges and universities throughout the country. This workshop could be revised to include correctional educators' experiences. The emphasis of the Life Planning Workshop would be in helping the individual develop an accurate perspective of self as well as a realistic outlook on creating one's own future.

Many other group, individual, and clinical experiences should exist during this quarter. Self groups should be established in order for individuals to be able to explore their experiences and be able to assess them in relationship to self. Group experiences utilizing sociometric approaches can be beneficial. A sociogram would reveal the interaction among specific individuals within the group.

Field experience would also be a part of the first quarter. The individual would be involved in no more than three experiences. These experiences should be varied to incorporate as much exposure to the criminal justice area as possible. Within at least one of the experiences, the individual should have some active involvement with the clients or inmates.

The individual would also be involved with no more than three classes this first quarter. Such example classes as characteristics and organizations of correctional institutions, educational programs in correctional institutions, and confinement and the inmate social system would be of benefit to the individual. These three courses would
include the following content:

1) Characteristics and Organizations of Correctional Institutions
   a) Staff personal positions
   b) Goals of correctional institutions
   c) Size of inmate population
   d) Types of institutions and physical structure

2) Confinement and the Inmate Social System
   a) Physical and psychological isolation
   b) Family relationships
   c) Time
   d) Roles of the inmate

3) Educational Programs in Correctional Institutions
   a) Philosophy and objectives of correctional education
   b) Various educational programs (academic, vocational, and correspondence courses)
   c) Eligibility of inmates in education courses
   d) Backgrounds of inmates

Throughout this entire first quarter, the individual should be keeping a log or journal. This would help the individual to be able to focus on self-growth experiences.
STEPS FOR THE FIRST QUARTER
The remaining two quarters of the first of the correctional educators' education program will show an interrelation between specialized courses, interdisciplinary courses, and field experience.
The chart shows the field experience being the center of all coursework. The knowledge which is gained in the various classroom setting will result in practical application in the field experience. The chart is presented in such a way that it shows a strong relationship between the interdisciplinary and specialized courses. All the courses have relevancy to each other. The inner circle shows the relationship to the various disciplines which should comprise a correctional educators' education program. The outer core are specialized courses and disciplines courses to show how these courses are also interdependent on each other. The chart does not show all the interdisciplinary courses or all the specialized courses which could comprise a correctional educators' education program.

Imbrication exist firmly between the interdisciplinary curriculums that are involved in the correctional educators' education program. Following is a brief explanation of each discipline as it relates to the program.

Public Administration

Public Administration is the discipline which is designed for leadership careers in governmental organizations at all levels. It will enable the individual to understand the organization and administrative process of the correctional institutions.

Social Work

Social Work is the discipline which would help prepare the potential correctional educator to understand man, his social institutions, and social problems. Knowledge would also be gained of the various social welfare organizations and the social implications of rehabilitation.
Law

Law is the discipline in which an individual would become familiar with the legal aspect of the criminal justice system. Exposure would result in the legal problems of the poor, the correctional process, as well as the causes and effects of crime as they relate to the criminal law process.

Black Studies

Black Studies is the discipline in which an individual would be exposed to the development and composition of a Black community, economics of the Black community, and Black Americans and the legal system. This discipline is necessary in order to give correctional educators awareness of those many Black incarcerated individuals.

Curriculum and Foundations

Curriculum and Foundations is the discipline in which an individual would be exposed to the knowledge of how to develop a curriculum to meet the needs of an inmate, the concept of individual instruction, and the process of developing tests.

Psychology

Psychology is the discipline in which an individual would focus on the behavior and composition of the inmate. Awareness would result on the psychological changes that occur through adulthood, the psychological basis of delinquent behavior, and the concept of individual differences.

Sociology

Sociology is the discipline in which background information can be gained. Knowledge would be gained on the history of the criminal justice system, emerging new concepts to combat crime, the structure and relationship of the family in society, and the composition of an urban community.

Adult Education

Adult Education is the discipline in which an individual would become aware of the adult learner. Exposure would exist on how to teach an adult and problems and pressures an adult learner may be encountering. This discipline is necessary since the incarcerated individuals are adults.
All the disciplines have something unique to offer to the potential correctional educator. Yet all have information which overlap and is helpful in preparing individuals to become effective correctional educators.

Some titles of interdisciplinary courses which could be included in a correctional educators' education program are:

1) Criminology and the Problem of Crime
2) Applied Psychology
3) Remedial/Developmental Reading and Math
4) Understanding the Delinquent and Criminal
5) Principles of the Law of Criminal Correction
6) Principles of Rehabilitation
7) The Psychology of the Black Experience
8) Circumstances and Problems of Release

The student should also be involved in seminars on:

1) decision making
2) conflict management
3) leadership skills
4) values clarification
5) communication skills
6) individual instruction
7) interpersonal relations

While the student is involved in classroom learning, this individual will be involved in varied experiences for two half days a week for the first year. Each quarter the individual will be involved in different experiences to broaden their exposure and awareness of
correctional experiences. Some of these experiences the student will spend time in or with are:

1) juvenile homes (girls/boys/coed/maximum-medium security)
2) adult institutions (men/women/maximum-medium security)
3) halfway houses (men/women)
4) Seven Step Foundation
5) parole/probation officer
6) parole board
7) Department of Rehabilitation

**Second Year**

The second year the student will focus more on self-awareness and occupational awareness.

The first quarter the student will continue with coursework. While being involved in this coursework, the student will live in an urban setting. The rationale for having an individual live in an urban setting is that according to the 1970 U.S. Census in all regions, except the South, 90 percent of the black population live in such a setting. According to the 1970 Federal Bureau of Investigation Crime Report indicated that blacks comprised 60 percent of the individuals incarcerated. While the student is living in an urban setting, the individual would be involved in such classes as:

1) The Black Family
2) Economics of the Ghetto
3) Black Language
4) Crime, Criminal Justice, and the Black Community
The second and third quarter the student would be doing an internship (student teaching) in a correctional institution. The student would be involved in two different types of settings. One quarter perhaps in a men's maximum security institution; and the other quarter in a women's institution, or a men's medium security institution. Various combinations could exist for the internship. The internship would be four and a half days under the supervision of a professor in the correctional educators' education program. The remaining half day would be utilized for a seminar in which the student would discuss experiences, problems, concerns, etc.

As the student progresses through this correctional educators' education program, the individual will be progressing through some developmental stages which can be shown in a learn, live, work model.

The following is a diagram of the functional stage of the student's development:
The following is the results of the functional stage feeding into the decision-making process:

This model dealt with academic courses and adult inmates. This model can be flexible to include vocational courses as well as juvenile delinquency courses. As stated earlier, the model can also be adapted to be on the bachelors or doctoral level.
STAGES OF THE COOPERATIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM BY QUARTERS
Evaluation of any program is necessary and important. This is true especially of a newly developed program. It is often questionable as to how this evaluation process should occur. The researcher has developed a five year evaluation program for the correctional educators' education program. Five years was chosen since ample time is needed for a newly developed program to demonstrate its success or failure. After each year, some evaluation will transpire. Data for the evaluation process will be gathered from all individuals who had any type of involvement with the correctional educators' education program.

In developing the evaluation process, the objectives of the correctional educators' education program were used as the basis. The objectives were:

1) To bring about a rapport relationship with the correctional settings and colleges and universities.

2) To develop an experience based training program to prepare individuals to become correctional educators.

3) To bring awareness and exposure to potential correctional educators in dealing with themselves and correctional settings.

4) To expose individuals to the functioning of the criminal justice system.

5) To utilize an interdisciplinary approach as well as a specialized approach.
Monitoring System for the Growth Development of the Correctional Educators' Education Program

Five Year Proposal for Examination and Review

First Year

Feedback will be solicited from:

1) The students who will examine the content of the experiences which the individuals encountered in the program.

2) The selection committee on the selection process.

3) Those individuals who were denied acceptance into the program and also those individuals who selected the self screening process.

4) Field placement agencies.

Second Year

Feedback will be solicited from:

1) The faculty members from the involved disciplines.

2) Those individuals who had students doing internship with them.

3) The graduating students on the two year program.

4) The inmates who had an intern.

5) Job placement of the graduating students

   a) level of employment

   b) the request for correctional educators from correctional institutions or agencies

   c) the demand from the interdisciplinary areas for the correctional educator
Third Year

1) Follow-up on graduating students in relation to:
   a) correctional educators' education training program
   b) still employed as a correctional educator
   c) still at the same location

2) Comparison of effectiveness of correctional educator who was involved in a correctional educators' education training program as opposed to those individuals who did not have a specialized training program by inmates and educators.

3) Feedback will be solicited from the new students in the program, the selection committee, and the faculty members.

Fourth Year

1) Compare feasibility of proposed changes with existing program
   a) sufficient resources
   b) cost
   c) receptibility of the changes by the correctional institution or university or both institutions

2) Implement changes

Fifth Year

1) Comparison of first set of graduates from the correctional educators' education program to the second set of graduates
   a) job demand for the correctional educators
   b) level of employment
   c) effectiveness of the correctional educators as viewed by educators and inmates

2) New students in the program should be solicited for feedback along with the following groups of individuals: selection committee, faculty members, supervisors of interns, field placement agencies.
Recommendations

Every study leaves or gives rise to many unanswered and very pertinent questions. This study attempted to answer some questions, but there remain others which need the attention of future researchers. A few of these areas of concerns are addressed in this section. Future studies should focus on:

1) Correctional Educators' Education Programs in colleges and universities with a population of less than ten thousand students.

2) Correctional Educators in juvenile institutions.

3) The effectiveness of those correctional educators who have had a specialized correctional training program as opposed to those educators who did not have such a program.

4) The Correctional Education Programs in institutions for women.

5) The race of the correctional educators and the inmates.

6) The qualitative aspects of the existing correctional educators' education programs.

7) Specialized correctional training program for guards.

8) In-service programs or workshops for current correctional educators.

9) The sex of the correctional educators and the inmates.

Summary

Chapter V dealt with the summary of the study, the findings of the study, conclusions based on the findings, a proposed model for a correctional educators' education program, and some recommendations for future research.
An abundance of legal and social pressures has created an awakening about correctional institutions in the last decade. This awakening has provided a somewhat bleak picture of corrections education and the correctional educator. These legal and social pressures have become building blocks which are destroying some myths and sparking interest and change in correctional institutions. Colleges of Education can play a vital role in providing leadership and training in this critical area. More specifically, the Departments of Education need to be concerned about their educational training program for individuals preparing to work in correctional institutions.

An attached survey has been developed to collect vital information on the status of correctional educator programs in colleges and universities. The survey is concerned with existing correctional educator programs, competencies and general knowledge felt to be necessary for individuals working in the corrections education field. This survey is addressing corrections education as a formal education program that is established for training educators to work in the field of corrections.

The results of this survey will be instrumental in the completion of a dissertation from The Ohio State University. This research will also provide The Ohio State University, other colleges and universities, and the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections information which may become the basis for planning a correctional educator program.

We thank you in advance for taking ten minutes of your time to assist us in collecting information in this vital area.

Please return the survey in the enclosed stamp addressed envelope by June 21. All respondents will receive a copy of the results.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Scott
PhD Candidate

Dr. Richard Kelsey
Faculty of Special Services

Dr. Anthony Riccio
Faculty of Special Services

Mr. Harrison Morris
Educational Administrator
Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION SURVEY

Devised by Janet Elaine Scott

Name of the Institution ____________________________

Please answer Part A and Part C if your institution has a correctional educator program. If your institution does not have a correctional educator program, please omit Part A and answer only Part B and Part C.

PART A

Please check the appropriate boxes below.

1. The highest possible earned degree

   ( ) Doctorate
   ( ) Specialist
   ( ) Masters
   ( ) Bachelors
   ( ) Associate
   ( ) No Degree

2. Number of students enrolled in the program

   ( ) 1 - 25
   ( ) 26 - 50
   ( ) 51 - 75
   ( ) 76 - 100
   ( ) 101 - 125
   ( ) Over 126
3. The length of the program has been in existence

( ) Under a year
( ) 1 - 2 years
( ) 3 - 4 years
( ) 4 - 5 years
( ) Over 5 years

4. The organization of the classes are based on

( ) Lecture
( ) Lecture/discussion
( ) Lecture/laboratory experiences
( ) Seminars
( ) Lecture/seminars/supervised field experiences

5. Those who teach the classes are

( ) Educators
( ) Sociologists
( ) Social Workers
( ) Psychologists
( ) Administrators
( ) Community Resources
( ) Combination of above professions
( ) Other (specify_________________)
PART B

Please check the appropriate boxes below.

1. Would a correctional educator program enrich your present education curriculum?
   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No
   ( ) Undecided

2. Does another discipline have a program that deals with the criminal justice system?
   ( ) Sociology
   ( ) Psychology
   ( ) Social Work
   ( ) Public Administration
   ( ) Some of the above
   ( ) All of the above
   ( ) All of the above plus others (specify_______________________)
   ( ) None

3. Are education students receiving minors in the criminal justice related disciplines?
   ( ) Less than 20%
   ( ) 20 - 39%
   ( ) 40 - 59%
   ( ) 60 - 79%
   ( ) 80 - 100%
   ( ) Do not know
4. Are you aware of your graduating students in education acquiring positions as correctional educators?

( ) Yes
( ) No

a) If yes:

( ) Less than 20%
( ) 20 - 39%
( ) 40 - 59%
( ) 60 - 79%
( ) 80 - 100%

5. If a specialized curriculum was developed, the highest obtainable degree would be

( ) Doctorate
( ) Specialist
( ) Masters
( ) Bachelors
( ) Associate
( ) No degree
6. Are courses related to the criminal justice system being taught in any of the following disciplines?

( ) Education
( ) Sociology
( ) Psychology
( ) Social Work
( ) Public Administration
( ) Combination of above
( ) All of the above
( ) All of the above plus others (specify__________________)
( ) None

7. Classes are geared toward

( ) Youth Offenders
( ) Adult Offenders
( ) Both

8. Graduates have acquired job positions in

( ) Public schools
( ) Juvenile institutions
( ) Adult institutions
( ) Community agencies
( ) Colleges/Universities
( ) Combination of above
( ) Other (specify__________________)
9. Number of graduates who have received job positions as correctional educators

( ) Less than 20%
( ) 20 - 39%
( ) 40 - 59%
( ) 60 - 79%
( ) 80 - 100%
( ) Do not know
PART C

An individual in a correctional educator program needs some of the competencies listed below. Please rate, with a check mark, on the following scale: very important, important, less important, not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conflict management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Value clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Research procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interpersonal relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Group processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Interviewing techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some potential curriculum areas which may be a part of the correctional educator program. Please rate, with a check mark, on the following scale: very important, important, less important, not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Area</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Methods of teaching in a correctional institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational programs in correctional institutions</td>
<td>Theory and practice in correctional education</td>
<td>Curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting</td>
<td>Comparison of public education versus correctional education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Imp</td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Less Imp</td>
<td>Not Imp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Historical development of corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Types of offenses and offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Women in crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Circumstances and problems or release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Reform and community base corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 5, 1976

On June 4 we mailed you a letter asking for your input into a correctional educator program survey. We need your response to the enclosed survey in order that we are able to complete our sample. To date, we have received one hundred one (101) completed surveys out of a possible one hundred and seventy six (176). Your input is needed in order to further increase the validity of the study.

As stated in the previous letter, the results of this study will provide The Ohio State University, other colleges and universities, and the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections information which may become the basis for planning a correctional educator program.

We thank you in advance for taking ten minutes of your time to assist us in collecting information in this vital area.

Please return the survey in the enclosed stamp addressed envelope by July 17.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Scott
PhD Candidate

Dr. Anthony Riccio
Faculty of Special Services

Dr. Richard Kelsey
Faculty of Special Services

Mr. Harrison Morris
Educational Administrator, Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
The Ohio State University is in the process of collecting information related to the training of individuals to teach in correctional institutions. An attached survey has been developed to determine the status of present correctional educators. The survey is concerned with the status of correctional education administrators, the competencies and general knowledge felt to be necessary for correctional educators, as well as the need for a specific college curriculum.

This research will provide The Ohio State University, other colleges and universities, and the Departments of Rehabilitation and Corrections information which may become the basis for planning a correctional educators' program.

We thank you in advance for taking ten minutes of your time to assist us in collecting information in this vital area.

Please return the survey in the enclosed stamp addressed envelope by August 16. All respondents will receive a copy of the results.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Scott
The Ohio State University

Harrison Morris
Educational Administrator
The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
PART A. Personal Data

Directions: Please check the appropriate response.

1. Highest attained educational level:
   - High School diploma
   - Post high school up to 2 years
   - B. S. or B. A. Degree
   - Bachelor's Degree + 30 quarter hours
   - M.A. Degree
   - Master's Degree + 30 quarter hours
   - Ph.D.

2. Do you have a state teaching certificate?
   - Yes — — — —
   - No
   If Yes: What type?
   - Special Education
   - Standard Certificate
   - Temporary or Provisional

3. Are you ______ full time or ______ part time?

4. Have you had prior teaching experience?
   - Yes — — — —
   - No
   If Yes:
   - 1-3 years
   - 4-6 years
   - over 6 years

5. Prior correctional related work experiences:
   - academic or vocational teacher
   - social worker
   - counselor
   - law enforcement
   - psychologist
   - parole or probation officer
   - group leader
   - none
   - other (specify)
PART B. General Information

Directions: Please check or fill in each appropriate response.

1. Did you have a specialized correctional curriculum?
   - Yes   - No

2. Did you have any coursework in corrections?
   - Yes   - No

3. Are there any courses which you feel would be helpful to you now?
   - Yes   - No
   If Yes: Please list 2: __________________________

4. Do you feel there is a need for a specialized college curriculum in corrections?
   - Yes   - No

5. Are there presently any in-service programs designed to keep you informed of new information or teaching methods in the field of corrections?
   - Yes   - No
   If Yes: Please list programs.  If No: Do you feel a need for any?
   - Yes   - No

6. Are there any organized periodic staff meetings where you are able to share ideas, discuss problems and teaching methods, etc.
   - Yes   - No
   If No: Do you feel a need to have these meetings?
   - Yes   - No
7. If you have worked in the public education setting, do you feel there is a difference between the correctional setting and the public school setting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On the scale from 1-4 (1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent), please rate the following items on your experience as a public educator and now as a correctional educator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Educator</th>
<th>Correctional Educator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>innovative teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college training benefited you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendlier attitude toward students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job duties more clearly defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepted individual differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicated more on student's level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consulted and gave extra help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students were motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gave individual instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed specified learning objectives for the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used the reward system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aided student to develop ability to function in a positive fashion in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C

An individual in a correctional educator program needs some of the competencies listed below. Please rate, with a check mark, on the following scale: very important, important, less important, not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Value clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Community resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Research procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Team techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Individual instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Group processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Interviewing techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some potential curriculum areas which may be a part of the correctional educator program. Please rate, with a check mark, on the following scale: very important, important, less important, not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Methods of teaching in a correctional institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Social education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Educational programs in correctional institutions
4. Theory and practice in correctional education
5. Curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting
6. Comparison of public education versus correctional education
7. Administrative organization of correctional education
8. Arrest and police procedures
9. Adult and juvenile court procedures
10. Characteristics and organizations of correctional institutions
11. Crime and culture
12. Confinement and the inmate social system
13. Parole and probation procedures
14. Treatment modalities
15. Trends and volume of crime
16. Change strategies
17. Aftercare and placement procedures
18. Principles of the law of criminal correction
19. Social institutions and crime causation
20. Differential justice
21. Loss and restoration of civil rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Imp</td>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Less Imp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Historical development of corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Types of offenses and offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Women in crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Circumstances and problems or release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Reform and community base corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 4, 1976

On August 2, we mailed you a letter for your input into a correctional educator program survey. We need your response to the enclosed survey in order that we are able to complete our sample. To date, we have received thirty-four completed surveys out of a possible forty-nine. Your input is needed in order to further increase the validity of the study.

As stated in the previous letter, the results of this study will provide The Ohio State University, other colleges and universities, and the Departments of Rehabilitation and Corrections information which may become the basis for planning a correctional educators' program.

We thank you in advance for taking ten minutes of your time to assist us in collecting information in this vital area.

Please return the survey in the enclosed stamp addressed envelope by September 18.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Scott
The Ohio State University

Harrison Morris
Educational Administrator
The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
August 2, 1976

Dear Correctional Educators:

The Ohio State University is in the process of collecting information related to the training of individuals to teach in the correctional institutions. An attached survey has been developed to determine the current status of correctional educators, if there is a need for a specific college curriculum, and the status of in-service programs.

The results of this study will be instrumental in the completion of a dissertation from The Ohio State University. The results will also provide The Ohio State University, other colleges and universities, and The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections information which may become the basis for planning a correctional educators' program as well as in-service programs for current correctional educators.

We thank you in advance for taking ten minutes of your time to assist us in collecting information in this vital area.

Please return the survey to your principal by August 10. Your principal will receive a copy of the results.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Scott
Ph.D. Candidate

Harrison Morris
Educational Administrator, Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
Mr. K. Williams  
Principal of Education Programs  
The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility  
Lucasville, Ohio

Dear Mr. Williams:

The Ohio State University is in the process of collecting data related to the training of individuals to teach in the correctional institutions. The data is being collected by surveying four population groups. These groups are being asked their perceptions on the need for a specific college curriculum to train correctional educators. One group that will have quite an influence on the study is current correctional educators. The educators that have been chosen for the target group are from four of the seven adult correctional institutions in Ohio.

Enclosed are surveys for your 23 correctional educators at The Southern Ohio Correctional Facility. An extra copy is enclosed for your use. The results of these surveys will be instrumental in the completion of a dissertation from The Ohio State University. The results will also provide The Ohio State University, other colleges and universities, and The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections information which may become the basis for planning a correctional educators' program.

Your support in the collection of this data from your correctional educators is greatly needed. Please pass out the enclosed surveys to your 23 educators. The enclosed letter asks your educators to return the surveys to you by August 10. Please mail the surveys in the enclosed addressed envelope.

Thank you for your time in assisting in the collection of data in this vital area. A copy of the results will be sent to you.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Scott  
Ph.D. Candidate

Harrison Morris  
Educational Administrator, Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
PART A. Personal Data

Directions: Please check or fill in the appropriate response.

1. Highest attained educational level

- High School Diploma
- Post High School up to 2 yrs.
- B. S. or B. A. Degree
- Bachelor's Degree + 30 quarter hours
- Master's Degree + 30 quarter hours
- M.A. or M.S. Degree
- Ph.D.

2. In what curriculum area(s) is your degree?

- Administration
- Education
- Social Work
- Psychology
- Sociology
- Criminal Justice
- Corrections
- Other (specify)

3. Prior job experience in corrections

- guard
- teacher
- psychologist
- parole of probation officer
- counselor
- group leader
- none
- other (specify)

4. Prior work experience in education other than corrections

- public school teacher (academic or vocational)
- school counselor
- school administration
- psychologist
- librarian
- other (specify)
- none

5. Other prior work experiences related to present position

- social worker
- college professor
- law enforcement
- vocational trade
- other (specify)
- none

6. Have you had any training in administration?

- Yes
- No
7. Have you been involved in any university coursework related to your position?
   
   ___Yes ___ No

   If Yes: Within the
   a) ___ last 2 years
   b) ___ 3-4 years
   c) ___ 5-6 years
   d) ___ over 6 years

8. Are there any in-service training programs or workshops provided for you?
   
   ___Yes ___ No

   If Yes; How often
   a) ___ monthly
   b) ___ 1-2 a year
   c) ___ 3-4 a year
   d) ___ over 4 a year

9. Approximately how much of your time is spent in or with:

   ___ correctional educators
   ___ inmates
   ___ office
   ___ meetings
   ___ community (speaker, resource person, agencies)
   ___ other
Part B. General Information

Directions: Please check or fill in the appropriate response.

1. Is your correctional education program certified or chartered as a school district by the Department of Education?
   _____Yes        _____No

2. How many adults are incarcerated in your correctional system?_____%

3. How many or what percentage of your incarcerated adults are involved in education programs?_________________________

4. How would you rate the skill level and ability of your educators to work with inmates?
   _____Fair       _____Satisfactory   _____Good  _____Excellent

5. Do you feel there is a need for a specific college curriculum to train correctional educators?
   _____Yes        _____No

6. How many teachers does your correctional system employ?_____

7. How many of your academic teachers hold:
   _____Special Education Certificates  _____Temporary or Provisional Certificates
   _____Standard Certification        _____No teaching certification

8. How many of your academic teachers have been employed for:
   ____0 months-2 years           ____6 years-8 years
   ____3 years-5 years            ____over 8 years

9. Are there in-service training programs for your educators?
   _____Yes        _____No
   If Yes: how often
   ____monthly        ____3-4 yearly
   ___________1-2 yearly      ______over 4 yearly

10. Are there regular staff meetings held for your educators?
    _____Yes        _____No
11. If you have worked in a public education school setting, have you noticed any difference in the correctional educators as opposed to the public educators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On a scale from 1-4 (1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Excellent), please rate the following items on the experiences of public educators as opposed to correctional educators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Public Educators</th>
<th>Correctional Educators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative teaching methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College training was beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendlier attitudes toward students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job duties more clearly defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to relate with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept individual differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate on student's level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult and give extra help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided students to develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to function in a positive fashion in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C

An individual in a correctional educator program needs some of the competencies listed below. Please rate, with a check mark, on the following scale: very important, important, less important, not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Imp</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less Imp</th>
<th>Not Imp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conflict management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Value clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Research procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Problem solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Interpersonal relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Group processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Crisis intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Interviewing techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some potential curriculum areas which may be a part of the correctional educator program. Please rate, with a check mark, on the following scale: very important, important, less important, not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Imp</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less Imp</th>
<th>Not Imp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Methods of teaching in a correctional institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Educational programs in correctional institutions

4. Theory and practice in correctional education

5. Curriculum development and instruction for a correctional setting

6. Comparison of public education versus correctional education

7. Administrative organization of correctional education

8. Arrest and police procedures

9. Adult and juvenile court procedures

10. Characteristics and organizations of correctional institutions

11. Crime and culture

12. Confinement and the inmate social system

13. Parole and probation procedures

14. Treatment modalities

15. Trends and volume of crime

16. Change strategies

17. Aftercare and placement procedures

18. Principles of the law of criminal correction

19. Social institutions and crime causation

20. Differential justice

21. Loss and restoration of civil rights
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Imp</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Less Imp</th>
<th>Not Imp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Historical development of corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Types of offenses and offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Women in crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Circumstances and problems or release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Reform and community base corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal Title: A Perceptual Model of a Correctional Educators' Program

Purpose of Proposal (Attach Brief Summary): see back

Scope of Proposal: (Size and Type of Sample): The scope of the sample would be 10% of all of the inmates that are involved in educational programs in each of the following four institutions: Lebanon, The Southern Ohio Correctional Institution, Chillicothe, and The Ohio Reformatory for Women. These institutions were chosen to obtain a cross section of the inmates. The total number of inmates involved will be approximately 155.

Time Frame: Start Date: as soon as possible Completion Date: same day

Estimated Departmental Cost: Hours: none Dollars: none

1-2 hours for the researcher at each institution

Methodology: The method would be to survey the inmates with the attached instrument. The survey would be given to the inmates in randomly selected classes by the researcher.

Anticipated Results: There is a significant pattern in the inmates educational background. The entering level of the inmates educational background into the correctional setting ranges between the elementary and junior high level. Little interest in the public school educational system was shown by the inmates.

Final approval is contingent upon the following conditions:

A. Confidentiality of subject's identity.
B. Signed approval by subject if needed.
C. Copy of results is to be provided to this Department.
D. Approval of research advisor is part of an educational requirement.

Advisor's signature: [Signature]

Submitted by: [Signature] Date: 8/20/76

Research Committee Date: 8/1/76

Central Office Date: 8/1/76

*Submit three (3) copies of proposal for approval.
CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION SURVEY
Devised by Janet Elaine Scott

PART A. Personal Data

Directions: Please check or circle the appropriate response.

1. Age
   - 18-25
   - 26-33
   - 34-41
   - 42-48
   - over 49

2. Highest attained educational level before incarceration
   - Elementary (1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6)
   - Junior High (7 - 8 - 9)
   - High School (10 - 11 - 12)
   - College
   - Vocational School

3. Present educational level since being confined
   - Elementary (1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6)
   - Junior High (7 - 8 - 9)
   - High School (10 - 11 - 12)
   - College
   - Vocational School

4. How long is your confinement?
   - 1 - 4 years
   - 5 - 8 years
   - 8 - 11 years
   - 11 - 14 years
   - over 14 years

5. Is this your first prison confinement?
   - Yes
   - No

   If No:
   Were you enrolled in an educational program during your other confinement?
   - Yes
   - No
6. If this is your second or more confinement, how long was there between confinements?

- Not applicable
- less than a year
- 1-2 yrs.
- 3-4 yrs.
- 5-6 yrs.
- over 6 yrs.

Were you enrolled in an educational program while you were on the streets? Yes  No

7. Highest attained educational level of your parents
   (Mark with a M=Mother  F=Father)

   - Elementary (1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6)
   - Junior High (7 - 8 - 9)
   - High School (10 - 11 - 12)
   - College
   - Vocational School

8. Highest attained educational level of your spouse

   - Elementary (1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6)
   - Junior High (7 - 8 - 9)
   - High School (10 - 11 - 12)
   - College
   - Vocational School
PART B. General Information

Directions: With a check mark (✓), please check the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My attitude toward public education was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My parents’ attitude toward public education was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My attitude toward correctional education is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My public education teachers’ attitude toward teaching was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My correctional education teachers’ attitude toward teaching is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please mark with a check mark your response to the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I got good grades in public school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I was late for public school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I used to do my homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I felt embarrassed to ask questions in public school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I paid attention to the public school teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I got in trouble in the public school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I liked gym, shop, sewing, typing, etc. classes better than English, Math, History classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My parents made me be in the house by a certain time on school nights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My parents helped me with my homework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My parents went to school with me when I got in trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My parents would punish me for bad grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There were books and dictionaries in my home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My public teachers seemed to pick on me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. My public teachers cared about me
20. My public teachers were authoritarians
21. I wanted to be like my teachers
22. I get good grades in correctional education
23. I do my homework for my correctional educational classes
24. I get in trouble in my correctional classes
25. I pay attention in my correctional classes
26. I feel embarrassed to ask questions in my correctional class
27. I like the vocational courses better than English, Math, etc.
28. The correctional teachers care about me
29. The correctional teachers seem to pick on me
30. The correctional teachers act like authoritarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Is the correctional education program meeting your needs?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

If No: Please specify.

32. Why are you enrolled in an educational program?

[ ] parole board sent me
[ ] lot of leisure time
[ ] to impress the parole board
[ ] reduction of sentence
[ ] to qualify myself for the streets
[ ] just want to learn (raise my educational level)
[ ] other (specify)

33. Do you feel correctional teachers need a specialized college curriculum in corrections? [ ] Yes [ ] No

34. List 2 experiences or courses teachers should have before coming into the institution to work.

35. List 2 qualities teachers need to relate well in the correctional setting.
To: The Ohio State University Faculty Members
From: Janet Scott, Doctoral Candidate in the Faculty of Special Services
Re: Correctional Education Survey

Thank you for helping me with the pre-testing of my survey research. This survey will be sent to the Deans and Directors of Teacher Programs of various universities and colleges. The purpose of the survey is to find out if the various universities and colleges have a correctional education program. If the school has a program, I am interested in its organization and content. If a program does not exist, I am searching to find out whether a correctional education program would enrich the present educational program. My ultimate goal is to develop a correctional education curriculum. Thus, my interest lies in what competencies and general knowledge of the criminal justice system educators feel individuals working in the criminal justice field should have.

As you read the questions on the survey, would you please mark the attached rating sheet. First, indicate with a check mark whether you feel the question is a relevant one or not. After this decision, please indicate with a check mark whether you feel the question is an acceptable one or not. Acceptability should be based on such criteria as double-barreled questions, biased items, clarity of the question, length of question, appropriate responses. If the question is a relevant one but not an acceptable one, in the space provided, please recommend changes.

Also to make this a more profitable survey, please make any additional comments you feel that would be beneficial.

Thank you again for your help.
## CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION RATING SHEET

### Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Non-relevant</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Non-acceptable</th>
<th>Recommendation for acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Non-relevant</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Non-acceptable</th>
<th>Recommendation for acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part C (first part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Non-relevant</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Non-acceptable</th>
<th>Recommendation for acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C (second part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments
APPENDIX F
AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WITH AN ENROLLMENT OF TEN THOUSAND OR MORE STUDENTS

East

1) Chairman Donald Thomas
   Department of Education
   American University
   Washington, D.C. 20016

2) Dean Lester Przewlocki
   Associate Dean of Education
   Boston College
   Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

3) Dean Robert Dentler
   Department of Education
   Boston University
   Boston, Massachusetts 02215

4) Dean of Education
   Columbia University
   New York, New York 10027

5) Dean Harry J. Hartley
   Department of Education
   University of Connecticut
   Storrs, Connecticut 06268

6) Dean James B. Maas
   Department of Education
   Cornell University
   Ithaca, New York 14850

7) Dean Daniel Meale
   Department of Education
   University of Delaware
   Newark, Delaware 19711

8) Dean Dixon A. Barr
   Department of Education
   Eastern Kentucky University
   Richmond, Kentucky 40475

9) Dean Donald H. Herdman
   College of Education
   Fairleigh University
   Rutherford, New Jersey 07070

10) Dean Jonathan Messerli
    School of Education
    Fordham University
    Bronx, New York 10458

11) Dean Rodney Tillman
    Department of Education
    George Washington University
    Washington, D.C. 20052

12) Dean of the Education Department
    Georgetown University
    Washington, D.C. 20007

13) Dr. Roy E. Feldman
    Department of Education
    Harvard University
    Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

14) Dean John D. VanBuren
    Hofstra University
    School of Education
    Hempstead, New York 11550

15) Dean George A. W. Stouffer
    School of Education
    Indiana University of Pennsylvania
    Indiana, Pennsylvania 15701

16) Dean G. W. Denemark
    Department of Education
    University of Kentucky
    Lexington, Kentucky 40506

17) Dean F. Randall Powers
    Department of Education
    University of Louisville
    Belknap Campus
    Louisville, Kentucky 40208

18) Dean Robert Emans
    Department of Education
    University of Maryland
    College Park, Maryland 20742
19) Dean Earl Seidman  
Department of Education  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

20) Dean of Education  
University of Maine  
Bangor, Maine 04401

21) Dean James J. Muro  
Department of Education  
University of Maine  
Orono Campus  
Orono, Maine 04469

22) Dean Ercell I. Watson  
School of Education  
Montclair State  
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

23) Director Patrick D. Sheehan  
Director of Education  
New School for Social Research  
New York, New York 10010

24) Chairman Jeffery Golland  
Department of Education  
University of New York  
Bernard M. Baruch  
New York, New York 10010

25) Dean Irene H. Impellizzeri  
Department of Education  
University of New York  
Brooklyn College

26) Dean Doyle M. Bortner  
Department of Education  
University of New York  
The City College

27) Dean Hugh J. Scott  
Dean of Programs in Education  
University of New York  
Hunter College  
New York, New York 10031

28) Dean Marvin Taylor  
Department of Education  
University of New York  
Queens College  
Flushing, New York 11367

29) Dean Gilbert Moore  
School of Education  
State University of New York  
Albany, New York 12222

30) Edward L. Morgan  
Director of Education  
State University of New York at Buffalo  
Buffalo, New York 14222

31) Dr. Lawrence M. Stolunow  
Department Chairman of Education  
State University of New York  
Stony Brook, New York 11794

32) Dr. Andrew Virgilio  
Faculty of Education  
State University of New York at Brockport  
Brockport, New York 14420

33) Claudia Chiesi  
Educational Opportunity Center  
State University of New York  
Buffalo, New York 14214

34) Dean Daniel E. Griffiths  
School of Education  
New York University  
New York, New York 10003

35) Dean Frank Marsh  
Department of Education  
Northeastern University  
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

36) Dean Frederick B. Bunt  
Department of Education  
Pace University  
New York, New York 10038
37) Dr. James Barrecchia  
Director of Educational Services  
The Wm. Paterson College of New Jersey  
Wayne, New Jersey  07470

38) Dean Lester Anderson  
Department of Education  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pennsylvania

39) Dean James Kelley, Jr.  
Acting Chairman, Department of Education  
University of Rhode Island  
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881

40) Dean James Kelley, Jr.  
School of Education  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  15260

41) Dean Paul Berstein  
College of General Studies  
Rochester Institute of Technology  
Rochester, New York  14623

42) Dean Milton Schwebel  
School of Education  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, New Jersey  08903

43) Dean of Education  
Southern Connecticut State  
New Haven, Connecticut  06515

44) Dean Burton Blatt  
School of Education  
Syracuse University  
Syracuse, New York  13210

45) Dr. Jay Soribner  
Dept. Chairman of Education  
Temple University  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  19122

46) Dean Billy D. Hauserman  
Associate Dean of Education  
Towson State  
Baltimore, Maryland  21204

47) Dr. Thomas F. McHugh  
Department Chairman of Education  
Vassar  
Poughkeepsie, New York  12601

48) Dr. Leo M. Zuckowsky  
Department Chairman of Education  
Villanova University  
Villanova, Pennsylvania  19085

49) Dr. John L. Courline  
Department Chairman of Education  
West Virginia University  
Morgantown, West Virginia  26506

50) Dr. Norman D. Ehresman  
Director of Education  
Western Kentucky University  
Bowling Green, Kentucky  42101

51) Dr. Dean Corrigan  
Dean of Education and Social Service  
University of Vermont  
Burlington, Vermont  05410

Midwest

1) Dean II, Kenneth Barker  
Department of Education  
University of Akron  
Akron, Ohio  44325

2) Dean Leslie Mauth  
Associate Dean, Teachers College  
Ball State University  
Muncie, Indiana  47306
3) Dean David Elsass  
Department of Education  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

4) Dean Curtis E. Nash  
Department of Education  
Central Michigan University  
Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48858

5) Dean Hendrik D. Gidconse  
Department of Education  
University of Cincinnati  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

6) Dean Richard J. McArdle  
Department of Education  
Cleveland State University  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

7) Dean of Education  
DePaul University  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

8) Dean Peggy Steig  
College of Education  
Eastern Michigan University  
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

9) Dr. Robert H. Moore  
Acting Dean, Department of Education  
Illinois State University  
Normal, Illinois 61761

10) Dean of Education  
University of Illinois  
Chicago Circle  
Chicago, Illinois 60680

11) Dean J. Myron Atkin  
Department of Education  
University of Illinois  
Urbana-Champaign  
Urbana, Illinois 61801

12) Dean David T. Turney  
Department of Education  
Indiana State University  
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

13) Dean Arthur Drill  
Department of Education  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

14) Dean V. S. Lago Marcino  
Department of Education  
Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa 50010

15) Dean Howard R. Jones  
Department of Education  
The University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

16) Dean Samuel R. Keys  
School of Education  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

17) Dean Dale Scannell  
Department of Education  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

18) Dean Robert J. Alphonso  
Department of Education  
Kent State University  
Kent, Ohio 44242

19) Dean John M. Wozniak  
Department of Education  
Loyola University  
Chicago, Illinois 60611

20) Dean Benjamin A. Buck  
Department of Education  
Mankato State College  
Mankato, Minnesota 56001
21) Dean Robert B. Nordberg  
Department of Education  
Marquette University  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

22) Dean C. Neale Bogner  
Department of Education  
Miami University  
Oxford, Ohio 45056

23) Dean Keith Goldhammer  
Department of Education  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

24) Dean Wilbur J. Cohen  
Department of Education  
The University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

25) Dean Jack C. Merwin  
Department of Education  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

26) Dean Bob G. Woods  
Department of Education  
University of Missouri  
Columbia, Missouri 65201

27) Dean J. Joseph Doerr  
Department of Education  
University of Missouri  
Kansas City Campus  
Kansas City, Missouri 65201

28) Dean of Education  
University of Missouri  
St. Louis Campus  
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

29) Dean of Education  
Northern Illinois University  
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

30) Dean W. R. Hazard  
Department of Education  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois 60201

31) Dean Laszlo J. Henteyi  
Department of Education  
Oakland University  
Rochester, Michigan 48063

32) Dean Frederick Cyphert  
Dean of Education  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

33) Dean Samuel Goldman  
Department of Education  
Ohio University  
Athens, Ohio 45701

34) Dean of Education  
Wichita State University  
Wichita, Kansas 67208

35) Dean Henry S. Lufler  
College of Education  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

36) Dr. William E. White  
Asst. Chancellor for Education  
University of Wisconsin  
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

37) Dean Robert G. Iddings  
Wright State University  
Department of Education  
Dayton, Ohio 45431

38) Dean Arnold Moore  
Department of Education  
Youngstown State University  
Youngstown, Ohio 44503
| 39 | Dean R. B. Kane  
Director, Teacher Education  
Purdue University  
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907 |
| 40 | Dean Kenneth A. Ames  
Department of Education  
St. Cloud State College  
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301 |
| 41 | Dr. Richard Kinkel  
Department of Education  
St. Louis University  
St. Louis, Missouri 63103 |
| 42 | Dean Elmer J. Clark  
Department of Education  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, Illinois 62901 |
| 43 | Dean of Education  
Southwest Missouri State University  
Springfield, Missouri 65802 |
| 44 | Dean George E. Dickson  
Department of Education  
University of Toledo  
Toledo, Ohio 43606 |
| 45 | Dean Barry Anderson  
Department of Education  
Washington University  
St. Louis, Missouri 63130 |
| 46 | Dean Lyn M. Cubser  
College of Education  
Western Illinois University  
Macomb, Illinois 61455 |
| 47 | Dean John Sandberg  
Department of Education  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008 |
| 48 | Dean Robert L. Egbert  
Dean of Teacher College  
University of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508 |
| 49 | Dean Edward DeJnozka  
Department of Education  
University of Nebraska  
Omaha, Nebraska 68101 |
| 50 | Dr. James Cibulka  
Director of Education  
University of Wisconsin  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201 |

### South

| 1 | Dean Paul Orr  
University of Alabama  
Department of Education  
University, Alabama 35486 |
| 2 | Dean Fain A. Guthrie  
Department of Education  
University of Alabama  
Birmingham, Alabama 35294 |
| 3 | Dean Fred J. Vescolani  
Department of Education  
University of Arkansas  
Pineville, Arkansas 72701 |
| 4 | Professor Patrick Pendergast  
Department of Political Science  
Auburn University  
Auburn, Alabama 36830 |
| 5 | Rev. Francis J. Rodriguez  
Director of Education  
Florida Gulf Coast University  
Fort Myers, Florida 33905 |
| 6 | Dean H. P. Landrith  
Department of Education  
Clemson University  
Clemson, South Carolina 29631 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dean Name</th>
<th>Department of Education</th>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dean James L. Gant</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Tallahassee, Florida 32306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dean Bert L. Sharp</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville, Florida 32611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dean Roy M. Hall</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia 30303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dean Joseph A. Williams</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens, Georgia 30602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dean of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>Houston, Texas 77004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dean of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamar University</td>
<td>Beaumont, Texas 77710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dean Fred M. Smith</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dean Milton L. Ferguson</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana 70122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dean Robert Saunders</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>Memphis State University</td>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee 38152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dean M. M. Hawkins</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>State College, Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dean Sylvester A. Moorhead</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>University, Mississippi 38677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dean Morton Beach</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>Chapel Hill, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dean David J. Middleton</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>Greenville, North Carolina 27834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dean Carl J. Dolce</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina 27607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dean Jack O. L. Saunders</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>Denton, Texas 76203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dean David U. Darling</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dean John J. Horvat</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>Denton, Texas 76203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dean of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central University</td>
<td>Edmond, Oklahoma 73034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25) Dean D. W. Robinson
Department of Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

26) Dean Richard Wisniewski
Department of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

27) Dr. Dwight H. Newell
School of Education
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

28) Dean Syler E. Ryan
School of Education
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77340

29) Dean Leon Lessinger
Department of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

30) Dean of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida 33602

31) Dean Jasper Garland
School of Education
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

32) Dean G. Louis Coussan
College of Education
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, Louisiana 70501

33) Dean Robert T. McKibben
Department of Education
Stephen F. Austin State University
Nacogdoches, Texas 77961

34) Dean James D. McComas
Department of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville Campus
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

35) Dr. Joyce Buckner
Department Chairman, Education
University of Texas
Arlington Campus
Arlington, Texas 76019

36) Dr. Lorraine G. Kennamer
Director, College of Education
University of Texas
Austin Campus
Austin, Texas 78712

37) Dean Cyrus Mayshark
Department of Education
University of Texas
El Paso Campus
El Paso, Texas 79968

38) Dean Robert H. Anderson
College of Education
Texas Technical University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

39) Dean Don Seaman
Adult Education
Texas A. & M.
College Station, Texas 77843

40) Dean Warren Strandberg
Department of Education
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia 23220

41) Dean Richard M. Brandt
Department of Education
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
1) Muffin Laasko  
Department of Education  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, Arizona 85281

2) Dean F. Robert Paulsen  
Department of Education  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona 85721

3) Dr. Wayne Herlin  
Chairman of General Education  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, Utah 84602

4) Dean Carl C. Cummins  
Department of Education  
California State Polytechnic  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

5) Director Alvin Thompson  
Teacher Preparation Center  
California State Polytechnic  
Pomona, California 91768

6) Dean Anthony C. LaDue  
Department of Education  
California State University  
Northridge, California 91324

7) Dean Arley L. Howsden  
Department of Education  
California State University  
Chico, California 95929

8) Dean William Maxwell, Jr.  
Department of Education  
California State University  
Fresno, California 93740

9) Dr. Paul W. Kane  
Acting Dean, Department of Education  
California State University  
Fullerton, California 92634

10) Dean of Education  
California State University  
Long Beach, California 90840

11) Dean Philip D. Vairo  
Department of Education  
California State University  
Los Angeles, California 90032

12) Dean Thomas P. Carter  
Department of Education  
California State University  
Sacramento, California 95819

13) Dean Asa Hillard  
Department of Education  
San Francisco State University  
San Francisco, California 94132

14) Dr. M. L. Borrowman  
Chairman, Department of Education  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

15) Dr. Julius M. Sassenrath  
Chairman, Department of Education  
University of California  
Davis, California 95616

16) Dean J. I. Goodlad  
Department of Education  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California 90024

17) Dean Norman J. Boyan  
Department of Education  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, California 93106

18) Dean of Education  
Colorado State University  
Boulder, Colorado 80302
19) Dean Karl Openshaw  
Department of Education  
University of Colorado  
Boulder, Colorado 80302

20) Dean Melvin D. Spurlin  
Department of Education  
Metropolitan State  
Denver, Colorado 80221

21) Dean Charles E. Pauset  
Department of Education  
Northern Arizona University  
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

22) Dean Stanley E. Williamson  
Department of Education  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

23) Dean Robert D. Gilberts  
Department of Education  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon 97403

24) Dean Bruce W. Broderius  
Department of Education  
University of Northern Colorado  
Greeley, Colorado 80639

25) Dean William A. Jenkins  
Department of Education  
Portland State University

26) Dean Thomas A. Arciniega  
Department of Education  
San Diego State  
San Diego, California 92182

27) Dean Donald J. Leu  
Department of Education  
San Jose State University  
San Jose, California 95192

28) Dean Stephen Knezevich  
Department of Education  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California 90007

29) Dean Arthur P. Coladarci  
Department of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California 94305

30) Dean Stephen P. Henley  
Department of Education  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

31) Dean William J. Jenkins  
Department of Education  
Washington State University  
Pullman, Washington 99163

32) Dean Frederic T. Giles  
Department of Education  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98195

33) Dean of Education  
Weber State  
Ogden, Utah 84403

34) Dean Hubert V. Everly  
College of Education  
University of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
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Compiled by:
Mr. Harrison L. Morris, Director
Educational Services
Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
1040 Freeway North
Columbus, Ohio
Alabama
Mr. Courtney Crenshaw
Training Director
Alabama Board of Corrections
101 South Union Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

California
Mr. A. Dal Favero
Chief of Education
Department of Corrections
714 P Street, Room 550
Sacramento, California 95814

Alaska
INA

Colorado
Mr. Jack Ludlow
Correctional Educator IV
Colorado State Penitentiary
Box 1010
Canon City, Colorado 81212

Arizona
Mr. John Wright
Administrator-Officer of Client
Arizona State Department of Corrections
1601 West Jefferson-Fourth Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Connecticut
Mr. Edmund J. Cubbins
Director of Education
Department of Corrections
340 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Arkansas
Mr. James E. Mabry
Administrator of Treatment Services
Arkansas Department of Corrections
Post Office Box 8707
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601

Delaware
Mr. Wesley C. Smith
Supervisor of Education
Delaware Correctional Center
Rd. #1 Box 500
Smyrna, Delaware 19977

District of Columbia
Mr. John C. Brown
Education Programs Coordinator
Suite 1008
614 "H" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Florida
Mr. Bob E. Thomas
Education Administrator
Division of Corrections
1131 Winewood Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Ms. Ann Perkins Delatte</td>
<td>Educational Consultant/Director</td>
<td>Department of Corrections/Offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 605 - 800 Peachtree Street, N.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia 30308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Mr. Tom Lloyd</td>
<td>Education Supervisor</td>
<td>Correctional Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 7309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boise, Idaho 83707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Mr. J. Clark Esarey</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>School District #428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301 Armory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield, Illinois 62706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Mr. James R. Beasley</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>804 State Office Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Mr. John A. Thalacker</td>
<td>Deputy Corrections Administrator</td>
<td>Division of Correctional Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts Lucas State Office Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa 50319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Mr. Daniel Aquino</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Hoomana School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2109 Kamehameha Highway Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii 96819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Mr. John C. Hazlett, Acting</td>
<td>Director of Prisons</td>
<td>Department of Penal Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Office Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Topeka, Kansas 66612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Mr. Arthur M. Reynolds</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>Bureau of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Office Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfort, Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Ms. Elayn Hunt</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Louisiana Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 44304 Capitol Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Miss Ward E. Murphy</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Bureau of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>424 State Office Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta, Maine 04330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland
Mrs. Elizabeth M. Lebhertz
Director of Education
Division of Correction
6321, Windsor Mill Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21207

Mississippi
Mr. Mike Corbin
Director, Vocational School
Mississippi State Penitentiary
Parchman, Mississippi

Massachusetts
Dr. Philip J. Tardanico
Supervisor of Education Corrections
Cambridge Street
Boston, Massachusetts

Missouri
Mr. Lewis Welker
Director of Inmate Ed.
Division of Corrections
211 Missouri Boulevard
Jefferson City, Missouri

Michigan
Mr. Will Laubach
Director of Education
Michigan Department of Corrections
Mason Bldg. P.O. Box 212-A Station A
Lansing, Michigan

Montana
Mr. John W. Jaksha
Director of Education
Montana State Prison
Box 7
Deer Lodge, Montana

Minnesota
Mr. Al Maresh
Educational Coordinator
Department of Corrections
430 Metro Square 7th & Robert Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Nebraska
Mr. James Shadduck
Associate Warden
Penal and Correctional Complex
P.O. Box 81248
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Nevada
Mr. Boyd Marsing
Director of Education
Nevada State Prisons
P.O. Box 607
Carson City, Nevada 89701

New Hampshire
INA

Oklahoma
Mr. Frederick L. Keith
Administrative Assistant
Department of Corrections
3400 N. Eastern P.O. Box 11443
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Oregon
Mr. William F. Kennedy
Education Programs Coordinator
Oregon Corrections Division
2575 Center Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97310

New Jersey
Dr. Daniel J. Sullivan
Superintendent of Schools
New Jersey Dept. of Institutions
1901 N. Olden Avenue Ext.
Trenton, New Jersey 08618

New Mexico
Dr. William White
Director of Education
Department of Corrections
F.O. Box 1059
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

New York
Mr. Raymond H. Reisenger, Ph. D.
Director of Education
Department of Correctional Services
State Office Campus Building #2
Albany, New York 12226

North Carolina
Mr. James Kyriakakis
Head, Educational Services
Department of Corrections
831 West Morgan Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

Pennsylvania
Mr. Worley Pace
Chief, Educational Service
Bureau of Corrections
P.O. Box 598
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania

Rhode Island
Mr. Donald R. Ventetuclo
Director of Education
Department of Corrections
75 Howard Avenue
Cranston, Rhode Island

South Carolina
Mr. James H. DuBose
Director, Educational Services
S.C. Department of Corrections
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina

South Dakota
Mr. Dean Hinders
Educational Program Director
State Penitentiary
Box 911
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Tennessee
Mr. John Brittle
Principal
Tennessee State Penitentiary
Centennial Boulevard
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Mr. Lawrence Karsky</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>North Dakota State Penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 1497, Bismarck, ND 58505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Mr. Harrison L. Morris</td>
<td>Director of Educational Services</td>
<td>1040 Freeway North, Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Rehabilitation and Correction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Mr. Ernest D. Wright</td>
<td>Division Director</td>
<td>104 State Capital, Salt Lake City, UT 84114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Mr. William C. Hendrick</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Adult Services, Central Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lorton, VA 22079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Mr. Allen E. Harbort</td>
<td>Superintendent, Correctional Education</td>
<td>Division of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 669, Madison, WI 53701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Mrs. Lane Murray</td>
<td>Supt. of Windham School District</td>
<td>Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Box 400, Huntsville, TX 77430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Tropp</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Adult Corrections Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 1788, Olympia, WA 98504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Mr. K.D. Knapp</td>
<td>State Supervisor-Probation and Parole</td>
<td>Division of Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800 Washington Street East, Charleston, WV 25301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Mr. Duane Shillinger</td>
<td>Associate Warden</td>
<td>Wyoming State Penitentiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 400, Rawlins, WY 82301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Mr. R. Kent Stoneman</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Department of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Office Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montpelier, VT 05602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Category</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-High School</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Educational Training</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship Training</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETA Vocational Training</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational High School</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vocational Training</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/H.S. Independent Study</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College - In-House</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newgate</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTABE Testing</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Testing</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening School</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,848</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-High School (IBE)</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening School</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETA Vocational Training</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational High School</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.E.D.</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/H.S. Independent Study</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Education</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College - In-House</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newgate</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training - Other</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTABE Testing</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,285</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMERICAN prisons distinguish themselves from those of most other nations in their extensive investments in education and training. Justification for this expenditure is based upon the established fact that there is a high negative relationship between years of education and indices of delinquency and crime. It is reasoned, therefore, that by reducing the education deficiency of prison inmates, the need for crime and delinquency will be replaced by more socially acceptable aspirations.

Standards of practice gleaned from some of our more progressive correctional systems as well as those in public education are presented to show specifically what has proved to be workable and to suggest lines of future development. Each administrator, of course, must wisely evaluate and use such standards in terms of the special limitation of his own correctional system or institution.

**ESSENTIAL FACTORS**

The essential factors determining the effectiveness of education in correctional institutions are as follows:

1. **Philosophy and Objectives of Correctional Education.** The development and adoption of a broad philosophy and objectives of correctional education should result in an improvement in inmate attitudes and social adjustment, through the acquisition of skills, knowledge and attitudes.

2. **Personnel.** Adequate and competent civil service personnel must be recruited and provided opportunities for professional growth.

3. **Program Planning.** The program planned and selected should meet the requirements of the inmate and the institution and consist of a well-rounded general education program.

4. **Correspondence Education.** Provision for correspondence courses may supplement formal school programs and provide enrichment for on-the-job training.

5. **Vocational Education.** Vocational education must be provided either through shop training facilities or maintenance or industrial assignments.

6. **Trade Advisory Committees.** Correctional Administrators may secure

---

valuable consultative service in relation to the program of trade training through support of representatives of Management and Labor Day by the activation of citizens committees.

7. Educational Plant. The educational plant should reflect modern design and functional planning.

8. Budget Preparation. One of the most important considerations of a modern correctional program is an adequate budget.

9. Research and Evaluation. Programs should provide data for research on effects of education on post-institution adjustment.

DISCUSSION OF ESSENTIAL FACTORS

1. Philosophy and Objectives of Correctional Education.

Where no such statement is found in the law, the controlling authority should clearly enunciate the broad philosophy of the educational program for his institution or institutions and, insofar as possible, see that appropriate facilities are available to put into operation an educational system grounded in this philosophy. The basic differences between correctional education and public education should be recognized and reflected in specific objectives, content, techniques and procedures, and must be concerned with at least the following:

a) Selection, salaries, tenure, and professional growth of the educational staff.
b) Program of education designed to meet the needs, interests and abilities of the individual inmate in the institution.
c) Adequate budget efficiently prepared and administered.
d) A functional educational plant.
e) Equipment and supplies which meet correctional education program objectives.
f) Full use of institution maintenance for training purposes.
g) Coordination of prison industries and formal vocational training shops for production and training.
h) Services to other public agencies to increase training opportunities.
i) Use of audio-visual, programmed instruction, and other teaching aids.
jj) Purposeful experimentation and scientific evaluation of educational program.
k) Plan for use of citizens advisory committees to improve vocational training and placement.
l) Maintain a sound public relations program.

SCOPE OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

There is no common plan of education for all institutions. In reformatory type institutions, where education is largely compulsory, the para-
mount emphasis is on vocational training. There is need also in institutions for younger offenders, for academic education at all grade levels and for health, physical education and recreation. In maximum security institutions there is generally less provision made for education. In the larger institutions, a greater number of inmates may be seeking courses at the college level. Since the advent of the high school equivalency diploma, the demand for further education at the college level has increased.

In spite of the great variety of correctional institutions in the United States, any sound educational program should be broad in scope and strive to achieve, at least, the following goals:

a) To offer an inmate sufficient academic education to enable him to face the needs of the world as a better equipped person.

b) To provide vocational training so that he might take his proper place in society and be economically free and;

c) To offer cultural and hobby activities that will enable him not only to be better adjusted to his prison circumstances, but to broaden his area of interests and cultivate aptitudes looking forward to his return to civilian life.

2. Personnel.

A modern program of education in a correctional institution must depend upon a qualified civilian educational teaching staff operating under civil service regulations and meeting the standards of the education department of the state. Correctional education calls for professional work of a high order, and much can be accomplished by a competent staff in removing illiteracy, in developing occupational skills, in discovering latent talents, and in stimulating individuals to pursue creative activities. In some states, teachers are under contract with the local school district and assigned to the correctional institution as part of the public school system. This assures that salaries and working conditions are on a par with those engaged in public education. The working conditions should be such as to attract high grade men who may follow their profession in correctional education, and, who in addition to having sound professional preparation, are emotionally stable, agreeable, possessed of good judgment, and interested in the challenge of delinquent behavior. In other jurisdictions, it is the practice for the teachers in the institutions to be employed by and responsible to the department of corrections. Whatever the method of selection, it is strongly recommended, however, that the correctional authorities work closely with the state departments of education and the state teachers in the institution measure up to those in the adjacent communities.

The caliber of the teachers selected to work in a correctional institution must be of the very highest. Correctional education will suffer
when in the hands of personnel who are non-professional in their approach and so regarded by the teaching profession. It must not be overlooked that frequent association of inmates with men of intelligence, skill, and balanced personality, is one of the recognized means of achieving desirable changes in inmate personalities. The most important element in education is the teacher. In the correctional setting, particularly, the influence of a strong, sound teacher upon his students may be of more lasting importance than the skills or knowledge which he imparts. Likewise, the educational program will suffer unless directed by individuals experienced in penal practice as well as education. Correctional education is a highly professional job and correctional authorities should be willing to settle for nothing less than the highest standard of performance, salary schedules, professional recognition, and fringe benefits for staff in keeping with established educational standards and modern correctional institution processes.

Even with attractive salaries and fringe benefits, correctional authorities often experience considerable difficulty in recruiting the caliber of personnel needed to do an effective job of teaching in their institutions. The official who sits in his office waiting for applicants can expect little more than the dregs from the various colleges. As does the energetic and successful Superintendent of School, so too must the prison Educational Director visit the campuses, and interview prospective staff. The interview is a two-way exchange of information: the employer attempts to evaluate the suitability of the prospect; the prospect attempts to evaluate the suitability of the job for his own qualifications and desires. Many prospects will possess the academic and professional skills but will lack the somewhat rare quality of being able to do for others with little reciprocation on the part of their incarcerated students.

(a) Staff Growth: Teaching within the confines of an institution requires a staff of unusual ability. To effect professional growth, planned programs of in-service training must be provided. College and university help is necessary to provide courses essential for appropriate teacher development. Since institutions, for the training of teachers are not geared to the training of correctional institution employees, it is desirable to arrange with the training authorities to provide courses designed to improve the performance of the educational staff. Such courses as Principles of Guidance, Counseling Theory and Practice, Applied Psychology, Occupational Information, Abnormal Psychology, Remedial Reading, Developmental Reading, Shop Management, and Understanding the Delinquent and Criminal—toward work with delinquents and criminals—are recommended. Regardless of how extensive the preparation of teachers may have been before entering correctional institution work, there is need for in-service training provided by correctional authorities. The nature of in-service training should be related to the particular institution program in which the employee is to work. Some
of the brief intensive in-service training courses that may be offered are: 
Orientation to Correctional Work, Administration and Supervision in 
Correctional Institutions, Counseling Techniques, Curriculum Prepara-
tion, Record Keeping and Reports, and Use of Case Records. Professional 
development should be encouraged by providing opportunities for at-
tendance at professional meetings, by visitation to other institutions, to 
industry, to public agencies concerned with rehabilitation, and to Insti-
tutes and Workshops of short duration. Members of the educational 
staff should be encouraged to affiliate with professional organizations, 
particularly with the Correctional Education Association, national, re-
gional, and state associations, guidance associations; and, in the case 
of vocational teachers, trade unions and trade associations. The work 
behind prison walls too often results in walled-in living.

One encouraging observation is the marked increase in recent years in 
the number of administrative and supervisory positions that have been 
filled by individuals who hold an esteemed place in the education world. 
No program of correctional education will rise higher than the vision 
and leadership of well trained administrative and supervisory staffing. 
Although the institutional program may derive help and encouragement 
from the state department of education and the civil service system, 
leadership must rest with those directly responsible for the education 
of men and women in the institutions.

(b) Administration and Supervision: Correctional education adminis-
tration should emphasize sound concepts of education administration 
and give special attention to integrating the educational program with 
the entire institutional program. Where there is a central office of the 
department of Corrections, there should be one individual directly re-
sponsible to the director or commissioner who has primary responsibility 
for the administration and supervision of the educational program and 
all its aspects. He may be assisted by specialists in each of the three 
areas of education, namely: 1. General and Academic Education, 2. Vocca-
tional Education, 3. Health, Physical Education and Recreation. He may 
also be assisted by a specialist in library science. This would give over-all 
direction to the library services in the institutions and serve as liaison be-
tween the state library and the department of corrections. By this means 
a continuity of the educational program is assured, proper planning, 
budgeting, and a coordination of the educational program in the gen-
eral treatment program may be achieved.

It is recommended also this pattern be followed in the institution level 
where education is emphasized for the whole inmate population. The 
institution supervisor of education should report directly to the head 
of the institution, or to the deputy or assistant supervisor of education or 
superintendent in charge of training and treatment. A supervisor of edu-
cation by background of training and experience should be sufficiently 
broad to warrant giving him an important rank in the institutional staff.
Working under him should be supervisors of the most important areas, such as recreation, academic and vocational activities.

The central office staff will supply the necessary stimulation for improvement, systematized exchange in materials and ideas between institutions and correlate the programs with those of related state agencies such as State Department of Education, State Library, Department of Health, State and Local Boards, University Extension Services, home study courses, etc.

3. Program Planning.

Basic to any well conceived program of correctional education is a classification and program planning system.1 (Refer to Chapter 21.) Much time and effort is wasted if programs of education are planned without a thorough knowledge of the individual inmates. Systematic program review is necessary if the inmate needs are to be kept at the center of his program.

(a) Primary Education: Studies seem to indicate that from ten to more than thirty per cent of prison inmates are functional illiterates; that is, they test at or below the fourth grade level on standardized achievement test.2 The percentage is higher in institutions with large Negro and non-English speaking populations. One meets with comparatively little opposition even among those who generally are indifferent or opposed to correctional education in conducting programs of education to eradicate illiteracy. Tangible results are most easily seen in this area although it is one of the most difficult confronted by educators. To reason that illiterates can be taught effectively by untrained inmate teachers or by poorly equipped civilian teachers is unsound. The principle followed in public schools of placing fully qualified teachers in primary grades work is equally desirable for primary work in correctional education.

Coupled with the shortage of qualified instructors there has been a dearth of appropriate instructional material for teaching illiterate adults. Current interest in this problem is generating new methods and materials that may prove to be well suited to adult use. A textbook, Streamlined English, by Dr. Frank C. Lauback is in widespread use in correctional education, and several film series are now available.3 Some experienced teachers prefer standard children's materials for the development of fundamental skills, but all qualified teachers supplement these
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1 American Prison Association—Committee on Classification and Casework. Handbook on Classification in Correctional Institutions.

2 Ibid., p. 261.

materials with others better adapted to adult use. Suitable material is essential if inmate interest is to be maintained. No matter how difficult the situation may be in teaching at this level, no illiterate inmate should be excused from school until he has become literate or demonstrated beyond a doubt that he will not achieve such a level—a point of view widely accepted in modern correctional systems.

(b) Intermediate: For purpose of this discussion, intermediate education encompasses roughly the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades. The larger group of inmates in the more populous states, at least, comes within this range. Those who attempt to meet the educational needs in this area find many challenging objectives. For some inmates the objective is to close the educational retardation gap. For others, there is obvious need for better command of the tool subjects so that vocational training interests may be successfully pursued. Still others, particularly the more intelligent, often embark upon programs of academic education leading eventually to high school graduation or to a high school equivalency diploma. An objective here too should be to increase facility to use the tool subjects, so that reading interest or correspondence courses may be pursued with facility. Frequently, inmates do not read because reading is such a laborious task. They usually are unsuccessful in correspondence courses if they have trouble with reading. Modern correctional systems are either employing remedial reading specialists or providing for remedial teacher training of existing staff. Correctional administrators, through better diagnostic and classification work, are being made aware of the scope of the problem and the importance of providing remedial reading specialists.

(c) Academic: At this, the high school level, more attention is given to subject matter and academic class instruction in groups of fifteen to twenty. Most regular high school subjects are included in a well-designed and operated academic program for inmates. The more frequently offered subjects are: mathematics, English, social studies or citizenship education, languages, and science. Science courses will be both more popular and beneficial if liberal use is made of laboratory and demonstration equipment. Junior-senior high school credit courses parallel public school curricula but non-credit courses make greater use of adult subject matter and procedures and pay less attention to compliance with high school regulations. Emphasis is on trade science and trade mathematics, rather than prescribed courses for academic credit.

Often individuals with high school equivalency diplomas become interested in taking additional high school subjects to complete requirements for Regents or regular high school diplomas. Courses for high school credit should be offered by certified teachers and the program of studies should fully meet state standards. For the success of this program a selective process must be used so that classes are composed only of those who are willing and able to achieve academic goals. Time is not
too far away when authorities in modern correctional systems will view high level academic achievement for the average to bright young inmate with the same emphasis as is now placed on eradication of illiteracy. The fact that 3500 inmates have earned high school equivalency diplomas in one state since the program was inaugurated indicates that many inmates are capable and desirous of pursuing academic studies.

(d) *Special subjects:* As distinguished from academic or general education, this category includes such subjects as orientation of inmates in correctional institutions, pre-release instruction, home economics, commercial training, music, health and physical education, arts and crafts and dramatics. In these subjects individuals are helped to discover latent interests and talents; how to spend free or leisure time creatively and wisely; how to entertain as well as be entertained and how to be more useful family and community members. Not infrequently participation in one or more special subjects leads to vocational pursuits. Although it is desirable to have fully qualified teachers to provide instruction in the special subject matter areas, surveys of institution staffs for special interests and abilities uncover an amazing number who are capable and interested in teaching their specialty. Institutions that make use of the manpower potential at hand do not wait for budget authorities to provide all the needed teacher positions before starting programs. Impelling objectives in this area are in the direction of helping individuals to discover themselves and how to relate better to others.

One of the special subjects is briefly discussed to indicate their importance. Health education, in which so many people, particularly inmates of correctional institutions are woefully lacking, seldom receives the attention it merits. Rarely does one find in a correctional institutions formal instruction in health education. Institutions boast of their health services, and rightly so, for they have gone a long way toward establishing systematic inspection, providing corrective measures and taking the necessary precautions to control communicable diseases. In the establishment of a healthy environment they have taken precautions similar to those taken in a progressive community or school system on the outside. More and more attention is being given to safety measures. However, direct teaching in personal hygiene, first aid, individual and family health, how to take care of the sick, control of communicable diseases and in how to avoid exploitation by quackery are omitted from the curriculum of the school, leaving the entire job up to the institution hospital.

The contribution of physical education to a well designed health
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*Some of the special subjects are only mentioned in this chapter since they are more fully treated in other chapters. Reference is made particularly to music, arts and crafts and dramatics in the Chapter 32 *Recreation*; orientation of inmates in Chapter 23, *Counseling, Casework and Clinical Services* and pre-release instruction in Chapter 7, *Parole and Other Release Procedures.*
Education program is too often left to chance or to individuals who think primarily in terms of recreation. Although there is not a sharp line of demarcation between physical education and recreation, voluntary recreation programs alone will fall far short of developing in many inmates the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes for wholesome living. A carefully designed program of instruction in physical education, where comparatively small groups are involved, is required for imparting information, developing skills and attitudes essential to healthful living. Many will never acquire the skills necessary for voluntary participation without having an optimum amount of organized class instruction.

(c) Social Education: Correctional Education must improve an inmate's attitudes about himself and others or it fails, no matter how much subject matter or how many trade skills the inmate acquires. Every shop and every classroom, every book and lesson sheet, every activity should be considered a means to inmate socialization. In this broad sense, all education—indeed, all institution activities—are social education. The term Social Education, however, now refers to a direct approach to inmate attitudes through organized courses or projects. The objective of such courses is to improve an inmate's insight into his own problems and his relationship with other people.

As far back as 1953, the July issue of Correctional Research stated that although there had been some ambiguity as to the meaning social education "the meaning is clear enough." One definition reads:

Broadly conceived, the major objectives of social education are to help the men through a study of themselves and the society in which they live so to organize thinking that they will be able to critically examine their basic attitudes and personality patterns and through such evaluation grow in their ability to readjust their thinking, their motivations, and their behavior along the lines of progressive personal and social adjustment... this part of the education program would be aimed at improving the individual's ability to live with himself, to see things as they really are, accept other individuals with understanding and help him cope with ordinary day by day social situations.5

Consideration of social education takes one into many aspects of institution living. There is much evidence that the direct approach through courses such as orientation, pre-release, morals and ethics, and selected topics in the social studies or citizenship education have much to offer. Certainly group and individual counseling help too. Arthur V. Huffman, State Criminologist of Illinois, comments:

An effective program of correctional education must incorporate two objectives: (1) an appraisal of the social, academic and vocational lacks that an individual has and (2) an effort toward the de-
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Development of socially accepted attitudes to supplant either the antisocial attitudes or the general haphazard attitude toward life that has allowed delinquent behavior. Not all come to prison with poor economic and social training, but many never have developed their innate capacities so that they are able to compete on a level sufficient to sustain themselves. It seems important that a primary breakdown of our inmate group be made, with the larger group of approximately eighty per cent being what one may call the normal or sociological offender, and the twenty per cent group the segment in which criminality exists primarily because of deviation of personality. It is with the eighty per cent group that our rehabilitative program, in a general sense, is more effective; the twenty per cent group needing specialized, individualized therapy and treatment.°

A direct approach to changing of attitudes is a process fraught with disappointment. What we are striving for is “caught” perhaps more than it is “taught.” We must not overlook the indirect approach to the changing of attitudes. That being the case concerted effort must be made by those in contact with the inmates to be good examples of what inmates should acquire. An informal social education program places definite responsibility on custodial officers, shop instructors, maintenance and industry supervisors, chaplains, medical staff, counselors and administrative officers as well as the classroom teacher to help inmates acquire the will and capacity to live in accordance with the objects of social education.

(f) Post-high School Education: Not long ago practically no interest was shown in courses above high school. There are numerous requests today for post-high school courses following completion by many inmates of either regular high school programs or the earning of high school equivalency diplomas. One of the challenges ahead in correctional education will be to provide opportunities for certain individuals to continue formal training beyond the high school level. Some colleges and universities are already giving assistance to correctional authorities who are trying to assist inmates in furthering their education. The University of Chicago, for example, has granted scholarships to certain inmates to take college courses for credit by correspondence.

(g) Aids to Good Teaching: In view of what has been said about the personality, training and function of correctional teachers, the use of inmate teachers must necessarily be regarded as unsound. There is no substitute for a good civilian teacher and an objective should be to extend his effectiveness as a teacher as far as possible. If the aim of education in prisons is resocialization, then the inmate no more qualifies as a teacher than he does as a psychologist or guidance counselor. However, as an assistant, working under direct supervision, the exceptional inmate may be employed to good advantage. His talents may be brought

°From a speech delivered by Huffman, Arthur V., to the 12th Annual Conference on Correctional Education, June, 1963.
to bear in classroom, shop, library and school office, and his contribution in such capacity may enhance the effectiveness of the program. There are several ways to do this: 1. Inmates may be used to perform clerical, research and routine duties normally done by teachers, thus freeing them for more actual teaching time. 2. They may be used in the preparation of models, templates, flannel boards, charts, graphs, demonstration equipment and various other teaching tools which might be more extensively used to vitalize teaching and accelerate learning. 3. Inmate operators may be assigned to operate film, filmstrip, slide, opaque, and overhead projectors; record players, tape recorders, and other audio-visual aids.

Much discussion is taking place in the world of education, including correctional education, concerning programmed instruction and teaching machines. It has become increasingly apparent that such devices and the instructional programs they present are likely to have very important implications for education practice. Briefly stated, programmed instruction is the arrangement of course materials in short steps so that a learner can proceed under his own power from the simple to the complex to mastery of a subject with a minimum of errors. A teaching machine may be described as a mechanical device designed to teach a programmed course to an individual. It is noted that not much help is needed with programmed materials. Programming seems applicable to most school subjects but to date the more appropriate programmed courses are in English, languages (reading), and mathematics, each of which is appropriate for a correctional setting.

Every effort should be made to utilize the communication media in correctional educational programs as effectively, if not more so, as they are now being used in the public school system. Radio has been used as a communication medium in many correctional schools and developments in television to extend and improve programs of instruction should be studied and used when feasible. Closed-circuit television is a medium of instruction that merits careful consideration.

4. Correspondence Education.

Cell study and correspondence education are not good substitutes for organized shop and classroom programs of instruction although they may be good supplements. Few institutions are so well equipped with staff classrooms and shops that all educational needs can be met without cell study and correspondence offerings. Correspondence courses may be used to enrich on-the-job training where work assignments and other
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1 Complete and current information about programmed instruction is produced by the Center for Programmed Instruction, Inc., 353 West End Avenue at 77th Street, New York 24, N. Y. See also, Programs '63, A Guide to Programmed Instructional Materials, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

conditions prevent regular class attendance. Some advantages of correspondence study are: (a) The individual can start and stop at any time. (b) He can travel at his own pace. (c) Larger groups may be assisted. (d) A great diversity of needs and interests may be met. (e) Correspondence courses related to work assignments may enable inmates to regard the assignments as on-the-job training rather than as punishment. (f) A well managed correspondence study program can furnish valuable objective data for use in selling education to budget authorities and other interested citizens.9

Summarizing the past ten years of research on correspondence study, the Encyclopedia of Education Research concludes:

The evidence at hand suggests that correspondence study is an eminently useful and educationally defensible method of instruction. It puts maximum responsibility on the learner for his self-education, and yet places at his disposal authoritative material and opportunity for continuing contact by mail with a qualified instructor.10

All correspondence schools and courses, however, do not meet standards to produce the results described above. Since the educational advisor can hardly be expected to be familiar with each organization and institution he will find the Directory of Accredited Private Home Study Schools a useful and safe guide.11 College-level courses are available through extension department of most colleges and universities. The quality of such courses are generally commensurate with the academic standings of these same institutions.

A rather serious problem with correspondence study is the dropout rate. Most studies have shown that fewer than half of the courses begun are ever completed. It is to be noted, however, that most of these dropouts occur before the end of the fourth lesson.12 It is during this initial period that the educational advisor can perform his greatest service by words for encouragement and aid in the location of information.

5. Vocational Education.

Individuals sent to correctional institutions usually need more training and experience in the essentials of earning a living. Few will have little more to sell when they return to society than knowledge and skill. A well designed program of vocational education may contribute to socialization of the individual as well as to development of trade skills and knowledge. The training program should aim to provide for: (a) The development

11 Annual Editions of this brochure are free upon request from the Accrediting Commission of the National Home Study Council, 1601 18th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20009.
12 Loc. cit.
of skills necessary for successful work in a socially acceptable occupation.

(b) Opportunities for teaching related trade information including blue-
print, reading, trade science, trade mathematics, occupational information,
drafting and sketching, and safety education. (c) Exploratory shop
work to help certain individuals discover their aptitudes and interests.
(d) Assistance to those with limited capacities to become better equipped
to meet problems of semi-skilled workers in a technological age. (e) Training for long-term inmates so that they may be more useful and
helpful in institution assignments.

Consideration should be given to the criteria for assignment of inmates
to the vocational training program. The following should be set as a
minimum: (1) Educational Level Achieved. Because of the necessary
skills in application of the trade, a minimum of 8.5 in educational achieve-
ment is desirable prior to assignment to such trade training programs as
machine shop, electronics, cabinet shop, auto-mechanics, etc. Individuals
may need to be assigned to the academic program to achieve the required
educational level prior to assignment in the vocational training program.
By the same token, vocational programs should be leveled according to
the needs and understanding of the inmates. (2) Probable time in prison.
Obviously an inmate should not be assigned to a trade training shop pro-
gram which will require several years to complete if he is going to be in
the institution a matter of months. (3) Opportunities for employment.
An inmate should not be trained for an occupation that is not practical
or feasible for him to secure employment upon his release from the
institution. Such factors as prior criminal history, narcotics addiction, or
other factors that might limit his placement possibilities should be care-
fully evaluated prior to assignment to training in the vocational area.

Except in the more modern institutions, vocational training opportuni-
ties are largely limited to those operations necessary for the maintenance
of the institution and prison industries. These opportunities should be
augmented by vocational training shops. The training provided in such
shops should be based upon: (a) A scientifically developed trade analysis.
(b) Carefully prepared shop and related information sheets. (c) Rotation
of work assignments in the shop so that everyone will be taught funda-
mental shop operation in keeping with ability. (d) A definite schedule of
instructional periods. (e) Complete records of the progress of the learner.
(f) Instruction by skilled craftsmen who also have ability to instruct. (g)
Current knowledge of employment demands and opportunities.

Inherent in correctional institutions, prisons and reformatories, are nu-
merous opportunities for instruction and on-the-job practice in trades and
occupations having the same basic elements as outside employment.
These ever present opportunities should be supplemented by voca-
tional training shops to provide opportunities not otherwise available.
The problems in on-the-job training may be roughly grouped into
two categories: a) Those relating to internal operation, having to do with
staff funds, physical plant, equipment and supplies, organization, administrative and supervisory processes and b) those problems pertaining to who should be trained and for what, the nature and scope of available training, how to deal with opposition and how to relate training to release placement.

Institution maintenance and vocational education. Institution maintenance should have a two-fold objective: a) that of efficient operation and maintenance of the institution, and b) that of utilization in every possible way of maintenance work to provide on-the-job training. Training possibilities are frequently overlooked in an effort to maintain the institution and to provide necessary services by assigning inmates to such tasks with one thought, that of getting the job done. If this procedure is followed, comparatively few inmates will have a chance to work at all phases of the trade or occupation.

For maintenance assignments to make maximum contributions to training, several steps are necessary: a) The administration must insist on maintenance work being used as far as practicable for on-the-job training. b) Job analysis of each maintenance trade and service occupation should be made to determine the training potential. c) In-service training should be conducted to help staff in charge of these posts to see the training possibilities and how to give the training. d) The maintenance foremen and the vocational education supervisor should work as a team so that assignments can be so routed and timed as to afford maximum training while work is being done. e) On-the-job training should meet standards, be recorded and properly credited for employment purposes. Apprenticeship councils and trade advisory committees may be helpful here. f) Budgets should reflect provisions for such training. For example, to provide barber services to the inmate population in a barber shop that is equipped to give a complete training program will cost little more than to provide the services in a poorly equipped shop.

Prison industries and vocational education. More intensive planning than has been done in most correctional systems is required before prison industries contribute fully to the trade training of inmates. Vocational training programs in institutions should be administered so that they will likewise be of help to modern prison industries. Successful industries have followed the policy of pre-service and on-the-job organized training of employees. Correctional industries and vocational education should be so related that exploratory and preliminary training would be done in the vocational training shops with a systematic flow of trainees, through the assignment committee, into appropriate prison industries. In doing this a number of steps are essential: a) A progressive policy for guidance of operating units. b) Scientific job studies to determine training potential. c) Careful selection of trainees for the particular industry. d) Appointment of trade instructors and shop foremen who understand and will cooperate in the total training and production process. e) Acceptance by
Vocational education and service to other governmental agencies. There are numerous services having potential training value that a Department of Correction may render to other departments. There are many instances where correctional institutions saved taxpayers many thousands of dollars through maintenance of publicly owned and operated motor equipment. Sound vocational training in auto mechanics can be made available through this service. Likewise, numerous opportunities for service to the conservation program of the state can be afforded through the manufacture of camp furniture, road safety and fire signs, cooking equipment and the like. There is an endless amount of state furniture which can be maintained by institution upholstery shops, affording excellent vocational training in a trade that is very expensive to teach except through such a service. The essential steps for providing training through services to other departments parallel essential steps in relating vocational training to maintenance and industries.

Vocational Agriculture. Because farming is a major enterprise in many institutions, provisions for training in this important area should not be overlooked. Those men who are to return to rural areas upon release can profit from their work. Such instruction in some institutions takes the form of scheduled classes in agricultural theory during the off-season, winter assignments to farm machinery repair, a sequence of short courses in the building trades, lectures and demonstrations by visiting agriculture specialists, correspondence courses from colleges of agriculture, and closely supervised individual farm projects. Manifestly, that program is best which takes into account past experience of the individual and supplies him with the added experience and knowledge he will need in the locality to which he will return.11

Vocational education costs. To provide a vocational education program to meet fully the interests needs and abilities of inmate populations is costly. Those faced with this problem find it to be most difficult to secure public support and budget approval to establish and maintain up-to-date

11Apprenticeship councils have been established in several states, the purpose of which is the promotion of sound apprenticeship programs of training. The councils are responsible to the public, management and to labor. All three of these interests are represented on the council. Apprenticeship in New York State, New York State Department of Labor, Apprenticeship Council, Albany, New York is a booklet containing complete information about the council.

training facilities. The rapid advances in technology make necessary frequent changes in equipment and training supplies. Generally, salaries are too low to employ qualified instructional staff. Because of attitudes of the public, particularly management and labor, it is difficult to give the kind of training needed for placing individuals in occupations at the time of parole. Accordingly, evaluations should be initiated and kept current in the correctional system to assess the values of various vocational education and training activities. Such information would help to keep the program efficient, meaningful and realistic. Funds for vocational education and training would be easier to come by if the results of such programs could be expressed in terms of positive objective achievements rather than in subjective terms.

6. **Trade Advisory Committee.**

The two-fold task of giving appropriate vocational training to inmates and placing them in employment upon release, in keeping with their training, is of paramount importance in a total program of correctional work. Some of the more progressive systems have taken new approaches to resolve this baffling problem. In 1956 the Governor of New York provided for the establishment of a "Correctional Vocational Rehabilitation Service." Under this program, the major responsibility for conducting training programs for staff and group work and placement of inmates was assigned to the State Division of Employment.

Legislation was enacted in California providing for a Correctional Industries Commission consisting of two representatives of industry, two of organized labor, one of agriculture and one of the general public. The Director of Corrections is Chairman of the Commission.

Subsequent to the establishment of the Cooperating Committee has been the formation of numerous Trade Advisory Committees. These committees are appointed by the Director of Corrections under general policies established by the Correctional Industries Commission. The Trade Advisory Committees, which meet at least four times a year, have as primary purposes to assist in providing meaningful work through which inmates are afforded opportunity to acquire good work habits and basic skills that will be fundamental assets in gainful employment and adjustment to community living. The Advisory Committees provide guidance to assist parolees in completing training started in the institution. More than 100 leaders in industry and labor are members of advisory committees, whose efforts have done much to improve understanding and assistance of labor and industry in the development of institution training opportunities and placement.

The Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio in cooperation with the Ohio State Apprenticeship Council has taken steps to relate institution work and training of inmates to employment and further training upon release. The Federal Reformatory provides work and experience and
training to selected apprentices. Auto mechanics, brick masonry, cabinet making, dental technician, electricity, machine shop and sheet metal work are some of the trades in which training is provided.

7. Educational Plant.

Poor planning for education in correctional institutions is clearly revealed in various architectural studies. With very few exceptions there is a distressing lack of thoughtful planning for education even in institutions that have been constructed recently. Schools and shop buildings have usually been planned without consultation with specialists in correctional education. How far behind public school systems will correctional administrators have to lag in providing functional buildings; that is, buildings designed for carefully-thought-out programs of education? Educational authorities have been impressed in recent years by the effects of modern school building on the scope of quality of education. Contributions of a carefully designed educational plant to the total treatment program are impressive. Correctional school buildings of the future should be of modern design and located so that they may have maximum use. The building should be so constructed that with a minimum amount of effort, interior walls may be relocated to take care of future modifications in the program. Plans should also provide for expansion without excessive alteration costs. The various trade shops should be designed to adequately house each of the trades included in the program. Special attention should be given to the location and nature of the music suite, the commercial suite, arts and crafts, drafting and blueprint reading, science laboratories, a demonstration and audio-visual aids rooms. Either an auditorium or a large assembly room should be designed so that it can be divided into a number of smaller rooms by the use of folding partitions; an auditorium should be a dual-purpose space. Adequate office space should be provided for the educational staff. So often this is not done.

8. Budget Preparation.

Funds for correctional education have not usually rated high priority in the over-all budget plan in some areas. Part of this may have resulted by a failure of those individuals responsible for the educational activities to follow good budget preparation procedures based upon work load or other acceptable practices used in supporting requests for appropriation. Significant also, in the budget preparation is the relationship to the local school district as discussed in this chapter. If the local district furnishes the teachers, pays the salaries of the teachers, and the costs of the supervision, then the institution budget would reflect the cost of supplies, books, maintenance of equipment, etc. On the other hand, if the entire cost of the educational program must be reflected in the institution budget, then justifications will need to be prepared for the teacher positions as well as the other costs mentioned above. Those vitally concerned
with correctional education should carefully study Chapter 11, Fiscal Management.


A fruitful area for research is that of correctional education. Special attention should be given to Chapter 13, Research, for a more complete discussion of this aspect. Before correctional education is materially expanded, scientific research of an experimental and evaluative nature should be undertaken in relationship to such problems as the following:

A. Personnel.
1) What are the unusual personal characteristics necessary for success as a correctional educator?
2) What standards of preparation should be required?
3) What salaries and fringe benefits are necessary in order to employ and hold teachers and administrators?

B. Educational Program.
1) What are the characteristics of a well rounded education program for a reformatory type institution, a maximum security institution and an institution for the mentally and physically handicapped?
2) How can an adequate educational program be financed most effectively?
3) As a general rule which has the most to offer in a total rehabilitation program, academic education, social education, vocational education or health, physical education and recreation?
4) How effective is vocational training in preparing inmates to earn a living upon release?
5) What implications do failures on parole have for correctional education?
6) How does the percentage of success on parole of those who have earned a high school diploma while incarcerated compare with those who have less than a high school education?
7) What are the values to be derived from a correctional institution library?
8) What are implications of closed circuit television?
9) What are the essential changes in the administration of a correctional institution in providing the best possible educational program for the greatest number of inmates in an institution?
10) How valuable are inmate publications in developing and maintaining a sound program of correctional education?

C. Inmates.
1) What are the characteristics of inmates which should be considered in developing a modern program of correctional education?
2) What are the relationships of response to the educational program to success on parole?

3) How can inmate success in the correctional program be determined?

There is a constellation of problems of an experimental and research nature revolving around most of the questions raised. It is hoped that research facilities will be employed to answer these and other questions which may be raised by responsible authorities.
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In a recent Correctional Education Survey sent to you by individuals from The Ohio State University, you indicated that your institution of higher learning had a correctional educator program in the Department of Education. Of the one hundred and forty eight (148) respondents, (85%), fourteen (14) universities (less than 10%) indicated the existence of a correctional educator program. The statistical result of this survey clearly indicates the need for colleges and universities to begin training education students to work in correctional institutions. Since the results of this survey is to be used as a basis for planning a correctional educator program, more of your input is needed. Would you please send any material you may have available on your correctional educator program, including curriculum and class content?

Thank you again for taking time to assist in the collection of information in this vital area.

Sincerely yours,

Janet Scott
Ph.D. Candidate

Fordham University
Mankato State College
Texas A.&M.
California State University (Long Beach)
University of Georgia
Montclair State College
Boston College
Virginia Commonwealth University
University of South Florida
Georgia State University
Arizona State University
Western Illinois University
University of Massachusetts (Amherst)
University of Vermont
California State University (Sacramento) Had a Teacher Corp Program 1972-74
Memphis State-Proposed Corrections Counseling Program
August 26, 1976

Ms. Jane Scott  
The Ohio State University  
Canfield Hall  
236 West 11th Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Ms. Scott:

Our Graduate Studies program in Adult and Extension Education includes a number of individuals who are employed in the Windham School District, Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville. Several have completed master's degrees and some are pursuing doctorates. The main thrust of an individual's academic program includes a concentration in Adult and Extension Education from Texas A&M University, a major supporting field in the Institute of Corrections, Sam Houston State University, a area of research and statistics, and an internship in the Windham School District.

This arrangement meets the needs of teachers in the Corrections setting. In addition, we also are involved in developing some of the non-credit staff development activities for teachers in Windham.

I hope this information has been of some value to you.

Sincerely,

Don F. Seaman  
Associate Professor  
Adult & Extension Education

DFS/cg

cc: Dr. Donald L. Clark  
    Dr. Lane Murray
August 5, 1976

Ms. Janet Scott
The Ohio State University
Canfield Hall
236 West 11th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Ms. Scott:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter to Dr. Robert L. Saunders, Dean of the College of Education at Memphis State University, relative to findings showing a need for programs in the area of corrections.

At his request I am sending you a copy of the correction counseling program proposed by this department at Memphis State University. We have prepared corrections counselors for several years under the umbrella of a general counseling program, and the program we share with you has the support of the College of Education at this time. I will be happy to hear any reactions you may have.

Perhaps you can be of help to us in another way. We have located corrections counseling programs only at Cal Tech, Cal State at Sacramento, Chapman, and West Virginia. I would be appreciative of names of other programs which we may have omitted.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Davis, Chairman
Guidance and Personnel Services

cc Dr. Robert L. Saunders
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN GUIDANCE AND PERSONNEL SERVICES

(Corrections Counseling)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDRS 7521</td>
<td>Introduction to Educational Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7531-8531</td>
<td>Group Processes in Guidance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7581-8581</td>
<td>Theories of Counseling (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7582-8582</td>
<td>Theories of Counseling, Consulting, and Coordinating and the Elementary School Age Child (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7851-8851</td>
<td>Assessment Techniques in Community Agency and Corrections Settings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7811-8811</td>
<td>Survey and Development of Treatment Programs in Corrections</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7861-8861</td>
<td>Career Guidance in Community Agency and Corrections Settings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7881-8881</td>
<td>Corrections Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7891-8891</td>
<td>Supervised Counseling Practicum in Corrections</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 hours from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7781-8781</td>
<td>Marriage and Family Counseling (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUID 7785-8785</td>
<td>Legal and Ethical Considerations in Counseling (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 6202</td>
<td>Workshop in Alcohol and Drug Information (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COLLATERAL</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 23, 1976

Mr. Harrison Morris  
1050 Freeway Drive North  
Columbus, OH 43229

Dear Sir:

This letter is in response to a telephone conversation with Rod Ahitow, Department of Corrections, State of Illinois. Rod has indicated that you are interested in some explanation of our corrections education program at Western Illinois University. I shall try to present an overview of our program. Please feel free to write for additional information if blanks still exist in your mind.

Our basic concern is to encourage our graduates to be a team member in the whole idea of rehabilitation. In too many incidents it is our observation that custody or security, education, and social and psychological services each do their thing without a great deal of respect for each other. Therefore, our program combines selected Law Enforcement courses, sociology, special education and teacher certification courses.

Presently our students can fully certify as elementary education teachers or as social studies teachers at the secondary level. We are in the process of firming up an option which may allow special education certification or minimal qualification for reimbursement purposes.

The really outstanding feature of our program is the three field experiences which expose our students to approximately a year of practical experience before they seek employment. Social agencies, institutions and officials have been extremely cooperative with us in these field experiences. We have been able to link required coursework with the field experiences to enable students to gain academic credit for their time on the job.

Personally, I have inherited the program and redesigned it to offer more alternatives to graduates. At this time, I feel that I have accumulated background and experience which would be invaluable to anyone attempting to begin new or redesign a similar program. We have been blessed with some really dedicated and outstanding students who have been able to function extremely well in our program.
I would be happy to share my experiences and perceptions more fully at some time when it might be feasible to meet with you or university officials.

Sincerely,

Dr. Joseph Kersting
Coordinator, Corrections & Alternatives Education
455 Stipes Hall
Western Illinois University
telephone (309) 298-1630
dk
CORRECTIONS EDUCATION
FIELD EXPERIENCES

Education 201 - Educational Psychology

When students enroll for this course, they should not schedule classes on Friday. Friday is spent visiting and making observations at ten to fifteen institutions around Macomb. Institutions often include head start centers; homes for emotionally disturbed; court and probation services; juvenile treatment centers; public and private; alternative high schools; peer culture programs; youth service bureaus; and the state penitentiary. Students are expected to gather information about the institutions and formulate a group study about the characteristics or people who are inmates. In addition, perspectives is gained about different helping agencies and procedures.

Education 301 - Psychology of Learning

This course is typically combined with Education 302 - Social Foundations for an off-campus quarter during which the students work a half-day, every day, in an institution. Other courses can also be taken during this block experience to provide 16 or more credit hours.

During this experience, the student is expected to actively participate in a functioning agency which emphasizes instructional activities as well as social reconstruction of clients. To date students have worked with county court services including probation services, Department of Corrections youth centers, regional correction agencies, and private juvenile treatment centers.

Education 480 - Student Teaching

This 16 credit hour block requires supervised student teaching. This instructional work can be successfully completed in a corrections facility which has certified teachers who can supervise. The student can anticipate also having experiences which expose them to the rigors of the regular public school classroom.

Arrangements can be made for most students to live at home during the field experiences since positions are available throughout the State of Illinois and some neighboring states.
In recent years the need for specially-trained educators to help alleviate modern social problems has become widely recognized. Qualified personnel are needed to work in and administer programs of rehabilitation in correctional institutions as well as in alternative educational programs designed to meet the needs of special groups of students.

Graduates of the Corrections and Alternative Education Program can look forward to careers as teachers in public and private correctional institutions and alternative public schools. The demand for probation and parole counselors, youth service agency workers, and supervisors and counselors in group homes and half-way houses is also great. Opportunities are also available in curriculum and material development.

PROGRAMS OF STUDY

The Bachelor of Science degree program in Corrections and Alternative Education at Western Illinois University is designed to prepare students to teach in correctional institutions or alternative schools or work in related agencies throughout the State of Illinois and the United States. The program is offered by the Department of Educational Foundations in cooperation with the Departments of Law Enforcement Administration and other University Departments. Students are given coursework in combination with actual on-site participation experience in institutions which prepare them to understand the personal and educational needs of incarcerated young people.

Students may elect to complete one of two optional programs designed to prepare them for either elementary or secondary school teaching.

- **Elementary Education.** This program includes coursework in mathematics, art, physical education, music, learning resources, and elementary education. Students completing this option will qualify for a State Standard Elementary Certificate. Other certification options are planned.

- **Secondary Social Science.** Students enrolled in this program select as an area of concentration either political science, economics, geography, or history. In addition to the area chosen, at least one course is completed from each of the other three areas. Students completing this option may qualify for a State Standard Secondary Certificate.

DEPARTMENTAL CORE REQUIREMENTS

To prepare students for their work in correctional institutions and agencies, the department faculty has established a core of required courses that include studies in law enforcement, sociology and anthropology, special education, and political science. In addition, students complete a course in Introduction to Educational Measurement, designed to acquaint future teachers with the tools necessary to evaluate student performance.

BASIC CURRICULUM

All students pursuing bachelor's degrees at Western must complete the University's Basic Curriculum requirements. The Basic Curriculum accounts for about one-third of the student's total coursework and includes courses in English, speech, science, mathematics, social science, humanities, and human well-being. The Basic Curriculum is designed to provide all students with a broad liberal arts background to supplement the specialized knowledge of their major field of study.

FIELD EXPERIENCES

Field experiences are an important part of this program. Students are given the opportunity to observe conditions and programs at correctional and alternative education institutions. A half-day on-the-job training program at a selected institution off-campus for one quarter is offered, as well as a full-time one-quarter practicum (student teaching).

Arrangements can be made for most students to live at home during the field experiences since positions are available throughout the state of Illinois and neighboring areas.

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Western Illinois University has an enrollment of nearly 14,500 and is located in Macomb, a western Illinois community of about 24,000 residents. The campus consists of 52 buildings on over 1,050 acres, including the University Farm, Kibbe Life Sciences Station on the Mississippi River, and the Frank J. Horn Field Campus.

Several larger Illinois cities, including Peoria, Springfield, Quincy, Galesburg, and the Quad-Cities are located within an 85 mile radius of Macomb. Two U.S. highways (136 and 67) provide access to Interstates 55, 74, and 80. The city is served by rail between Quincy and Chicago. Air passenger service is available to and from Chicago and St. Louis.

For further information on Corrections and Alternative Education, write to:

Corrections and Alternative Education
Department of Educational Foundations
Western Illinois University
Macomb, Illinois 61455
APPENDIX K
The Life Planning Workshop:
A Future Oriented Program

The Life Planning Workshop, as utilized at Colorado State University, has evolved basically from the "Planning for Living Workshop" developed by Shepard (1969) and TRW Systems in California as a means of assisting managers in assessing their values and potentials, and matching them with opportunities within industry. Similar programs have also been used by National Training Laboratories (NTL) and at Esalen. NTL used the workshops as a "growth-producing" experience for adults who had concerns or anxieties about their future. Pfeiffer and Jones (1970) describe briefly the use of the Life Planning Workshop concept in human relations training. The participants are divided into triads and then go through several semi-structured activities with the occasional use of a "facilitator." It was felt that this type of experience would be valuable to college students, many of whom have poignant concerns about their future.

The Life Planning Workshop is designed to involve the individual in the process of influencing his own future. The majority of people don't think of themselves as actually creating their own future, but rather, just let it happen to them. Those who do make concrete plans often do so in only certain areas--education, career--and may neglect other aspects of life, rather than considering life as a whole. Frequently, future planning is not realistic, and ignores abilities, personality characteristics, and other important factors. College students frequently view the future through the eyes of their parents, or in undirected (often misdirected) "going to college" simply because
that's what is expected of high school graduates. Our focus is in helping the student develop an accurate perspective of himself in the present, as well as a realistic outlook on his ability to be the primary determiner of his future.

In the Life Planning Workshop the individual is actively engaged in the process of self-identification and group interaction. He is encouraged to reach the realization that he is the one responsible for his own life, and consequently, is capable of creating the future he wants for himself. In creating one's own future, an individual needs to have an accurate picture of himself in the present. The workshop activities are designed to assist the individual to assess himself now, and then to project himself into the future. Once a person has established where he is, and where he wants to go, he can begin work on short-term and long-range goals. Hopefully, by the end of the workshop session, the individual will have increased self-awareness, and will realize the need for a specific, but flexible, plan of action related to reaching his future goals.

The Life Planning Workshop involves a series of structured activities which are completed in a one day session. Typical workshops have approximately 16 participants; however, the activities take place in small groups consisting of four members and a facilitator. Facilitators are frequently interested, selected, volunteers who have been participants in previous workshops. The facilitators may be students, faculty, or staff members at the university. Participants are urged to form groups in which members are not well acquainted, since it is often easier to discuss personal information with strangers. The participants are encouraged to act as consultants to one another, and
to intervene, reflect, probe, and even push to help others examine their future.

The structured exercises, which are designed to help participants clarify and identify their roles in life, and to think constructively and realistically about the future, are presented on the following pages. These exercises are the primary activities of the workshop.

John E. Hinkle and Lucinda E. Thomas

University Counseling Center
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado

Fall 1971
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

LIFE PLANNING WORKSHOP

8:00 Introductory Remarks

8:15 Have each person pair up with someone in the lab whom they do not know. Have pairs form into groups of fours. Put extras into existing groups. Facilitators join with a group, or work with two groups if necessary.

8:20 Draw a life line on one of your cards. The line goes from birth to death and indicates some of the good and bad experiences you have had. Mark the line with an X to show where you are now in your life.

Share your life line with your small group, briefly describing the meanings you attached to the line as you drew it.

8:30 On the rest of your cards (should be ten cards) write a word or short phrase on each card which describes who you are now.

Rank order the cards with the first few being positive things you want to keep, the middle few being things you are fairly neutral about, and the last few being things you would just as soon not be.

8:40 Share the cards with your small group. The group members may respond in any way they wish to your cards: questions, comments, suggestions.

9:15 Fill in the life inventory with short words or phases.

9:30 Use the next thirty minutes to share your life inventory with your small group. The group members may respond in any way they wish.

10:00 Fantasize a typical day or week in your life four to five years from today. Take twenty minutes to write your fantasy.

10:20 Read your fantasy to your small group. The group will listen only and not respond at this time.

10:30 You have ten minutes to go back to the ten cards you filled in at the beginning of the workshop. At this time you may rerank them, add new cards, or drop some that do not seem to fit you any more.

10:40 Use the next fifteen minutes to fill in the goal setting sheet. As you fill it in, think in terms of your re-ranked cards and your fantasy for four to five years from now.
11:00 Choose one or two or more people from the total group to listen to your plans for the future based upon the cards, fantasy and goal setting sheet. You will have 45 minutes for this interaction.

Select one person to be the "contact" person who will follow up with your plans to check on progress or changes in direction. This is to provide each person with a support system after the workshop is over.

11:45 Large group discussion to evaluate the workshop. An open fishbowl design is recommended.

Jane Gammel
November 8, 1972
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