DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 474 CE 030 471

TITLE Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions. A Report Based on Four National Hearings.

INSTITUTION National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.; National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Mar 81

NOTE 66p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Correctional Education; Correctional Institutions; Correctional Rehabilitation; Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Federal Regulation; *Federal State Relationship; Hearings; Outcomes of Education; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Improvement; Rehabilitation Programs; State Agencies; State Departments of Education; State Government; State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation

IDENTIFIERS National Advisory Council on Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Four hearings were held during 1979 by the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (NACVE) to determine the status of vocational education in correctional institutions. Testimony from 106 witnesses from 27 states led to the overall conclusion that the current level and quality of correctional vocational education is not adequate to provide, on a regular basis, comprehensive vocational education programs to offenders. Over the course of the four hearings, four major issues were implicated in all the problems, frustrations, and possible solutions discussed by witnesses. These issues are the following: (1) funding is inadequate, and there is lack of funding cooperation between state education and correctional agencies; (2) in the area of administration, recruitment, training, and retention of qualified vocational instructors is insufficient; facilities and equipment are inadequate; and there is a lack of coordination and integration of vocational programs with prison industries; (3) regarding comprehensive programming, vocational program standards are lacking and programs are not relevant to realistic job opportunities; and (4) concerning federal policy and leadership, overall coordination is absent; and there is a shortage of research, evaluation, data collection, and technical assistance. (KC)

Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions

A Report based on
Four National Hearings

Conducted by
The National Advisory Council
On Vocational Education

In Cooperation with the
Vocational Education Study of
The National Institute of Education

March, 1981

Opinions and points of view expressed in this report do not necessarily represent those of the Department of Education or the National Institute of Education and no official endorsement by either organization should be inferred.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION was created by the Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and extended by the Education Amendments of 1976. Its members are appointed by the President. The Council is charged by law to advise the President, Congress, and Secretary of Education concerning the administration and operation of vocational education, employment and training, and other pertinent programs. The Council is to make such other reports or recommendations to the President, Congress, Secretary, or head of any other Federal department or agency as it may deem desirable. The National Advisory Council, after consultation with the National Commission for Employment Policy, is to identify the vocational education and employment and training needs of the Nation, and assess the extent to which vocational education, employment training, vocational rehabilitation, special education, and other programs under this and related Acts represent a consistent, integrated, and coordinated approach to meeting such needs.

In addition, the National Advisory Council is mandated to provide technical assistance and leadership to State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education, in order to assist them in carrying out their responsibilities.

** Staff of the Education Corrections Program funded by the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice, Grant CM-6.

Contents

NACVE

March, 1981

The President
The Congress
The Chief Justice
The Secretary of Education

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, in accordance with the mandates of Public Law 94-482, submits this report on Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions.

The Report summarizes the significant concerns, issues, and findings that emerged from hearings. While the major thrust of the testimony described vocational education as being necessary in order for offenders to prepare for and legally participate in the free world labor market, there are many notable barriers which must be removed to enhance the delivery of services to this population.

Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Warren E. Burger, stated the matter succinctly when he recommended, in his February 8, 1981, presentation to the American Bar Association, that "We must accept the reality that to confine offenders behind walls without trying to change them is an expensive folly with short-term benefits --a 'winning of battles while losing the war,'" and, further, we must ". . . provide a decent setting for expanded educational and vocational training."

The Report will be used by the Council during the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, to prepare that section of our testimony on and recommendations for correctional education and special populations.

Carol S. Gibson
Chairperson
THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 412, Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 376-8873

Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D. C. 20543

CHAMBERS OF
THE CHIEF JUSTICE

October 28, 1981

Dear Ms. Gibson:

Thank you for sending me a copy of Vocational Education in Correctional Institution, the report by the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. An analysis of the report brought the following observations.

Crime and the fear of crime seriously threaten our way of life and we must find practical solutions for dealing with convicted criminals if we are going to make any progress in coping with this problem. Ninety-five percent of the nearly 450,000 adults who are presently confined in our nation's prisons will eventually return to freedom. Without any positive change, including learning marketable job skills, a depressing number -- probably more than half of these inmates -- will return to a life of crime after their release.

One small but practical positive step - indeed, a step that I have advocated for many years - is the introduction of mandatory educational and vocational programs for all inmates. Not one should leave prison without at least being able to read, write, do basic arithmetic and be trained in a marketable job skill. Unless we accept the hard reality that the confinement of offenders behind walls and bars -- without trying to change them -- defeats a principal objective of the penal system, we will never make any progress in the battle against crime.

This report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, which contains information and recommendations designed to improve vocational education within prisons, is a step in the right direction. We need to act to implement the

recommendations made in this Report and to take positive steps as a nation to improve the quality of educational and vocational programs within our prisons.

This is not a visionary idea but a common sense application of the concept of society's collective self-interest.

Cordially,

Ms. Carol S. Gibson
Chairperson
National Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
425 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 412
Washington, D.C. 20004

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM FRENCH SMITH
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL*

"As our Chief Justice has noted, criminals must one day return to society and it is a wise investment to make our prisons habitable places where prisoners can receive vocational training to enable them to be responsible citizens. A wide variety of efforts has been made in recent years to explore ways to strengthen vocational training programs in correctional institutions. A recent effort, sponsored by the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, involved a series of regional hearings. Over 100 witnesses, representing a wide variety of interests, contributed oral as well as written testimony. There was overwhelming consensus that vocational and eudcational programs can promote positive life styles in individual prisoners and can contribute substantially toward their chances of employment on release. The Advisory Council recommended and we concur in this recommendation, that incarcerated offenders be identified as a primary group to receive Federal support in vocational education programs."

*Before the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Law, United States Senate, Concerning Violent Crime, on October 23, 1981

Recommendations

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education received information as a result of four national hearings from individuals representing a broad spectrum of interests in and concerns about vocational education conducted by correctional institutions. Based on this information, the Council, in preparing its recommendations, recognizes that vocational education must contribute to and work in harmony with the total range of corrections education and other services to ensure the full development of the students' interests and talents.

The recommendations which follow provide direction for fundamental changes and new leadership roles by agencies to help prepare offenders to become productive workers and tax paying citizens. The Council's concerns are, however, not limited to these seven recommendations. We encourage other agencies to use the different ideas and recommendations presented by witnesses and found in this Report. To illustrate, the Federal Bureau of Prisons would want to examine the age limitations imposed on prospective teachers by Federal law or, the U.S. Department of Education in cooperation with the Department of Labor expand the Apprenticeship model essentially used in Federal prisons to more state programs and local programs or service deliverers. Other Federal and State agencies, including the U.S. Department of Justice and the state departments of corrections, will find pertinent information in this Report which should cause them to become more active in helping improve corrections education and occupational training programs and services.

The Council recommends --

That Congress:

- Acknowledge the need for a comprehensive instructional program (including vocational education) with support services by establishing through legislation an adequately funded Correctional Education Program.

  Coordination at the state level of existing resources from other programs for use in correctional education should be required.

- Specify the corrections population - juvenile and adult offenders - in vocational education legislation as a primary group to receive Federal support.

  Federal funds for services to this population should be administered by a state educational agency.

- Make available to states special financial resources which would be allotted to local programs that demonstrated successful efforts in such areas as the improvement through innovation of correctional vocational programs and outreach to and working relationships with community resources. The coordination of prison industries with the educational and training needs of students is absolutely essential.

- Require a description of local program operations as a condition precedent for receiving Federal funds to implement comprehensive vocational programs for male and female juvenile and adult offenders.

  The program description would include: (a) planning programs including the use of standards and of an appropriate advisory committee; (b) implementing programs including the involvement with remedial, adult, and other educational programs; (c) evaluating programs, and; (d) reporting on and using results from evaluations.

That U.S. Department of Education:

- Establish a corrections unit with full time staff.

  The unit should provide coordination services, technical assistance to and be a clearinghouse for the corrections field and governmental agencies. Among its responsibilities should be the development of standards and initiation of evaluations of correctional vocational education programs conducted by juvenile institutions, jails, and state and federal prisons. Such standards and evaluations would be compatible with and contribute to the overall corrections education system. Further, the Council believes that the standards be developed by a process undertaken in cooperation with a special panel or task force. Membership on this panel should be formed from such organizations as the National Institute of Corrections, National Institute of Education, Federal Bureau of Prisons, American Vocational Association, American Correctional Association, Correctional Education Association, community-based organizations, business and labor groups, and relevant advisory committees.

That State Education Agencies:

- Require a craft or program advisory committee, which has a majority of private sector representatives from industry and labor, for each local institution or agency receiving Federal aid for correctional vocational education.

  This committee should provide technical assistance for developing job readiness and job occupational skills through an appropriate curriculum; for identifying emerging or demand occupations where employment opportunities are available; and for evaluating the program including student job placement and staff development for security and educational personnel.

That State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education:

- Investigate through their State attorney general's office and other sources the state's laws/regulations that restrict offenders and exoffenders from "free world" employment in order to make recommendations for abatement to state legislative agencies.

Executive Summary

Within the past decade there has been a growing concern on the part of some members of Congress and the Executive Branch, correctional administrators, and the informed public about soaring crime rates, overcrowded, substandard, and violence-ridden correctional facilities, and the seeming failure of current rehabilitative practices, as evidenced by high recidivism rates and massive unemployment among ex-offenders. Analysis of public opinion also suggests that there is diminishing confidence in the system's ability to habilitate inmates. The public's attitude seems to be "...that anyone sent to prison does not deserve the opportunity to be rehabilitated."

Based on this growing concern and the general public's negative attitude, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (NACVE) decided, in 1979, to hold hearings as part of a study of correctional vocational education in the United States. From November of that year to April of the next, the Council conducted four national hearings on the "status of vocational education in correctional institutions" and received wide-ranging testimony from 106 witnesses representing 27 different states. By making correctional vocational education a priority for the year, the Council fulfilled part of its very broad mandate to advise the President, Congress, and the Administration on matters concerning vocational education and its administration.

OVERVIEW

Approximately 446,000 adults are at present incarcerated in the nation's 912 state correctional facilities, 4,000 local jails, and 49 federal institutions and centers. Fifty-nine percent of all adult inmates are in state prisons, 36 percent in jails, and the remaining five percent (or 24,000 inmates) in the federal prison system. Incarceration has dramatically increased during the last decade. Between 1973 and 1978 there was a fifty percent increase in the incarceration rate for adult offenders. Ninety-five percent of all those who are incarcerated will eventually return to the free world; approximately 150,000 inmates are released each year. Those released should have received quality, comprehensive vocational preparation prior to their reentry into the free world and subsequent participation in the labor market.

There is a good deal of support for the view that vocational and educational programs, given the appropriate resources, can promote positive change in individual inmates and enhance their chances of obtaining jobs upon release and becoming productive members of society. Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, advocated in his 1981 report to the American Bar Association, that vocational and educational programs be made mandatory, with credit against the sentence given for education progress. Two former offenders stated that successful completion of one vocational course may be the first real accomplishment for an inmate and thus a source of inspiration leading to rehabilitation.

Vocational education in corrections can be defined as instruction offered through the systems (i.e., jails, state and federal prisons) to

enable offenders to be employment-ready upon their return to free society. It involves the development of basic skills, specific occupational training, and an array of "job readiness" attitudes and talents, including the development of positive motivation, good work habits, and survival skills. By using this definition as a guideline, the hearings brought forth a general understanding of vocational programming as it is practiced in correctional institutions. Overall, the current level and quality of correctional vocational education is not adequate enough to provide, on a regular basis, comprehensive vocational education programs to offenders. As a result, when offenders return to society, they are not prepared to compete in its labor market. The tone of the testimony was that the problems and barriers hindering the efficient and effective delivery of vocational education are not insurmountable. Goals and efforts to bring about change must not be timid.

Specific Findings

Over the course of the four hearings several issues were addressed repeatedly. Four major issues were implicated in all the problems, frustrations, and possible solutions discussed by the witnesses. What follows is a listing of some of the problems and some of the related recommendations (expressed as observations in the last section of the report) identified by the witnesses for each of the four major issues.

Funding:

- Inadequate funding.

  Congress should include in the VEA reauthorization language and policy assuring correctional programs access to funding and services under all provisions of the Act.

- Lack of cooperation and communication, including fiscal matters between state education and correctional agencies.

  Congress, through the VEA reauthorization, should consider, or mandate, the establishment of a staff position for correctional education in each State Department of Education which would help link the many state resources and agencies that assist education and employment training.

  Federal vocational education legislation should specify and encourage formal communication on the state level between the State Department of Corrections and the State Department of Education and other agencies involved in providing services to offenders.

Administration:

- Insufficient recruitment, training, and retention of qualified vocational instructors.

The Federal Government should encourage quality programs and curricula for the training of correctional teachers and staff for academic and vocational programs.

- Lack of adequate facilities and equipment.

  Federal funds, either through the VEA or additional legislation, should be made available to upgrade and expand existing facilities and equipment used in correctional vocational education.

- Lack of coordination and integration of vocational programs with prison industries.

  Congress should consider amending VEA to ensure that prison industries are coordinated and consistent with the educational and training needs of inmates.

Comprehensive Programming:

- Lack of vocational program standards at all levels.

  The Federal Government, through NACVE or other appropriate agencies, should develop national minimum standards for educational and vocational programs in correctional institutions.

- Lack of programs relevant to realistic job opportunities.

  The Federal Government should encourage further involvement on the part of industry and labor in correctional education by requiring state advisory committees on correctional education with broad representation, including that of the private sector.

Federal Policy and Leadership:

- Absence of overall coordination.

  The U.S. Department of Education should establish an office for Correctional Education.

- Shortage of research, evaluation, data collection, and technical assistance.

  The Federal Government should assume a leading role in promoting and supporting much needed research, evaluation, and data collection in correctional education.

  Congress should provide funding for and charge the Department of Education with the responsibility to establish a national information, research, and reporting system for education and vocational training in correctional facilities.

Foreword

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education began this study of vocational education in correctional institutions in order to determine whether the public vocational education system was providing quality vocational education opportunities to offenders and whether any barriers to the use of federal monies for such services existed. This report is based on the testimony received from four national hearings held to assist in making those determinations. Many different sectors were represented at the hearings, including: business; industry; labor; judiciary; local, state, and federal vocational and correctional agencies and institutions; offenders and exoffenders; community-based organizations and national associations and agencies; and, state advisory councils on vocational education. Unfortunately, because of time constraints, not all those who wanted to testify could be accommodated.

While we were not able to hear about every issue, problem, and program, we believe our findings offer a true picture of the general condition of vocational programming in correctional institutions today. What these findings indicate is that the current level and quality of correctional vocational education is not adequate enough to provide, on a regular basis, comprehensive vocational education programs to offenders. As a result, when offenders return to society, they are not prepared to compete in its labor market.

Yet the findings also indicate that many of the problems causing this inadequacy could be overcome through a deliberate, sustained course of action. In the belief that comprehensive vocational education programs will help exoffenders become contributing members of the nation's work force, and, thereby, improve the social and economic well-being of society as a whole, the Council concludes that a concerted effort to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of correctional vocational education must be initiated.

Acknowledgements

The Council is grateful to all the many people and the several organizations involved in the development, conduct, and completion of this project. We especially wish to thank the witnesses who, at their own expense, came to the hearings and testified; the people who prepared and submitted written testimony; the universities which provided the space and facilities for the first three hearings and the State of California which allowed the fourth hearing to be held in a state office building; the moderators who guided the hearings; the members of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education who served on the hearing panels and asked informed, probing questions; the members of the review panel whose knowledge and experience contributed to the comprehensiveness of the report; and, the National Institute of Education which provided administrative support throughout the course of the project. We would also like to thank Glenna Ganster for all of her able assistance and Linda Mayo for the extra hours she willingly gave to the project. Special mention must also be made of the former members of the Council's Special Populations Committee, Karen C. Fenton, Lawrence R. Hawkins, Gloria T. Johnson, and Esther Levens, whose insight and concern were important factors in the development of the project.

Introduction

Within the past decade there has been a growing concern on the part of some members of Congress and the Executive Branch, correctional administrators, and the informed public, about soaring crime rates, overcrowded, substandard, and violence-ridden correctional facilities, and the seeming failure of current rehabilitative practices, as evidenced by high recidivism rates and massive unemployment among exoffenders. Analysis of public opinion also suggests that there is diminishing confidence in the system's ability to habilitate inmates. The public's attitude seems to be "...that anyone sent to prison does not deserve the opportunity to be rehabilitated."

Based on this concern, in 1979, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (NACVE) decided to begin a study of correctional vocational education in the United States. By making correctional vocational education a priority for the year, the Council fulfilled part of its very broad mandate to advise the President, Congress, and the administration on matters concerning vocational education and its administration.

Vocational education in corrections can be defined as instruction offered within correctional systems (i.e., jails and state and federal prisons) to enable offenders to be employment-ready upon their return to free society. It involves the development of basic skills, specific occupational training, and an array of "job readiness" attitudes and talents, including the development of positive motivation, good work habits, and survival skills.

NACVE had the benefit of findings from other research as it prepared to conduct its own study. Several recent Government Accounting Office (GAO) reports have pointed out that correctional institutions are not adequately equipped to perform, provide, and coordinate the tasks associated with effective vocational programs. The reports further assert that correctional institutions could, and must, do more to ensure the employability of offenders, regardless of race, sex, or language barriers.

Meager level of funding of correctional vocational education is a major reason for present inadequacies in the system as shown by a recent project undertaken by the Vocational Education Study of the National Institute of Education (NIE). As part of this extensive study of vocational education in the United States authorized by Congress through the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482), NIE initiated, in 1979, a one-year research project of "Vocational Education in the Prison Setting."

During this period of time Congress also voiced its concern over the sparse financial resources available to meet the education needs of offenders. As a result, Senate Bill 1373, the "Federal Correctional

Education Assistance Act" was drafted. The Act, which was not reported out of committee, declared that, "Existing education programs and financial resources are inadequate to meet the needs of offenders and...education is a key element to prisoner adjustment and that the Federal Government must take positive action to assist this effort."

Sharing these concerns and wishing further descriptive information on the issues discussed in the NIE report, NACVE and the NIE co-sponsored four national hearings on the status of vocational education in corrections. These hearings were conducted between November 8, 1979 and April 30, 1980. Witnesses were asked to address the following areas:

- Federal policy on vocational education in corrections;
- Federal funds for vocational education programs and operations;
- Legislative authority for corrections education programs;
- Legal, attitudinal, and procedural barriers to accessing quality vocational education programs for the target population; and,
- Solutions and recommendations.

Formal testimony was received from 106 witnesses representing a broad spectrum of agencies, organizations, occupations, and interests. In addition, many in the audiences presented their views and others, unable to attend the hearings, contributed written comments. These sources effected an abundant amount of testimony identifying many of the needs and current problems in correctional vocational education. Out of the hearings also came a number of creative suggestions, solutions, and recommendations. Still, the Council recognizes that the hearing process could not elicit all of the exemplary vocational activities conducted by institutions.

This report constitutes a summary, prepared for the purposes of sharing information and ideas with federal and state legislators, educational and correctional administrators, and the concerned public -- in other words, with all those who are in a position to ensure that increased efforts will be made on all levels to more adequately prepare offenders for productive tax paying lives in free society. The summary is divided into five major sections - Prison Population, Federal Funding, Administration, Comprehensive Programming, and Federal Policy and Leadership.

THE PRISON POPULATION

The Prison Population

In order to understand the scope of the issues discussed in this report, it is essential to keep in mind a few basic facts about the population currently being housed in U.S. correctional facilities.* Approximately 446,000 adults are at present incarcerated in the nation's 912 state correctional facilities, 4,000 local jails, and 49 federal institutions and centers. Fifty-nine percent of all adult inmates are in state prisons, 36 percent in jails, and the remaining five percent (or 24,000 inmates) in the federal prison system.

Incarceration has dramatically increased during the last decade. Between 1973 and 1978 there was a fifty percent increase in the incarceration rate for adult offenders. Ninety-five percent of all those who are incarcerated will eventually return to the free world; approximately 150,000 inmates are released each year. A high percentage, however, will recidivate; depending on the geographic location, estimates (even with inadequate data) range between 30 and 75 percent per year.

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

Regardless of attitude, however, all Americans pay a high price to develop and maintain correctional institutions. There is an average annual cost of over $13,000 for each of the adult inmates housed in state institutions. The total cost to taxpayers is an annual bill of over 4 billion dollars for incarceration of state prisoners. Recent data collected by the NIE show that federal and state monies used for vocational education and related programs amounted to less than 2 percent of the total cost of incarceration in FY 1979. This level of funding support and other problems delineated in this report permitted only twelve and a half percent (or about 33,000) of the total state prison population to enroll in vocational education programs, although as the following prisoner profile indicates, the need for more programs is dire.

The typical inmate is a 25 year old male, with an uncertain educational background, limited marketable skills, and few positive work experiences. He completed no more than 10 school grades and functions 2-3 grade levels below that. He is likely to be poor, having earned less than $10,000 in the year prior to arrest.

---

* This section is primarily based on information reported in the NIE study of "Vocational Education in the Prison Setting."

Numerically, white inmates outnumber black inmates; however, the latter, as well as Hispanics, Native Americans, and other minority groups, are over-represented in correctional institutions when compared with their population density nationwide. In 1980, the average unemployment rate for inmates prior to arrest and incarceration was about thirty percent, as compared to the national average unemployment rate of 7.4 percent. Although the U.S. prison population is ninety-six percent male, the plight of the incarcerated woman cannot be overlooked. She is typically under thirty, a single mother with two or more children, poor and on welfare. She is likely to have problems with physical and/or mental health, drugs and/or alcohol. Women in prison, according to a recent GAO report, have even fewer opportunities to take vocational education programs than do men in prison. In many cases, the shortfall in their vocational programming is related to a small cost-benefit ratio caused by the limited number of women who would be served.

Although the exact nature of the causal relationship between crime and unemployment has not been fully determined, increasingly, criminal justice scholars and economists concur that such a causal relationship does indeed exist. All other things being equal, incarceration is likely to decrease a person's chances for employment after release. A recent Department of Labor (DOL) report states that it seems likely that from five to ten percent of all unemployment problems result from criminal justice contact and the subsequent barriers to employment.*

There is a good deal of support for the view that vocational and educational programs, given the appropriate resources, can promote positive change in individual inmates and enhance their chances of obtaining jobs upon release and becoming productive members of society. Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, advocated in his 1981 report to the American Bar Association, that vocational and educational programs be made mandatory, with credit against the sentence given for educational progress. Two former offenders put the matter thusly:

> "Successful completion of even a single course may well be the first recognizable, socially acceptable, accomplishment of an inmate's life. For the individual who has previously failed to function within the limits that society will accept, this may well be the catalyst that leads to rehabilitation."

The benefits of participating in a vocational education program are further documented in "A Study of Academic and Vocational Programs in the Vienna Correctional Institution," 1979. The findings showed that parolees who had received vocational education at Vienna, had significantly fewer

---

* A Study of the Number of Persons with Records of Arrest or Conviction in the Labor Force. Washington, D.C.: Technical Analysis Paper No. 63, U.S. DOL, January, 1979.

arrests while on parole and were returned less often for parole violations than were other former inmates who had not taken vocational training.

Federal Funding

Inherent in the testimony of most witnesses was a belief in the equality of educational opportunity for all Americans. This underlying principle makes education a universal right. That the right applies to inmates of correctional institutions is now being upheld by the courts and by Congress.

Congress acknowledged the right primarily by allowing correctional institutions to apply for federally funded educational programs, including vocational and adult education. As seen in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, a total of 70 federal programs exists through which funding for educational and training-related activities can be obtained. Such funding possibilities are indeed promising but unfortunately they have not been fully used. Furthermore, with one exception (Part J of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the "Corrections Education Demonstration Act," authorized but not appropriated), legislators have not mandated or targeted funding specifically for corrections education efforts. When measured against the actual dollar commitment, their acknowledgement of the offender's right to education has, in effect, been a halting one.

The lack of specific federal funding and the problems involved in gaining access to federal education funds were two topics which many witnesses addressed throughout the hearings. Much of the testimony centered around the Vocational Education Act (VEA), as amended in 1976 (P.L. 94-482), one Federal Law to which correctional administrators most often look for funds for correctional education programs. The Act authorizes, but does not specifically mandate, the expenditure of funds for vocational education programs for the incarcerated. In addition, the Act permits the expenditure of federal funds to provide "Vocational and educational counseling for youth offenders and adults in correctional institutions" [Sec. 134(a) (5)]. The only legislative provision in the Act which directly addresses the needs of offenders, mandates the National and State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education to have as members, individuals who are informed about the special needs of correctional institutions.

PROBLEMS

The following problems were identified by those who testified at the NACVE hearings:

- Inadequate funding;
- Negative public attitudes about correctional education;
- Multiplicity of funding sources and correctional administrators' lack of knowledge about the sources and time to gain access to them;
- Problems caused by the many regulations associated with some funding sources;
- Correctional administrators' hesitancy to make use of short term, "soft," monies;

- Lack of set-aside funds for correctional education;
- Inadequacies in the definitions and wording of legislation governing federal funds; and,
- Lack of cooperation and communication between state education agencies and state correctional agencies.

Funding and the coordination of federal and state programs were two problems of great difficulty for administrators of correctional programs. Correctional administrators stated that both the level of funding and the accessibility of federal funds were inadequate. One factor contributing to these inadequacies is the attitude of the general public toward correctional education. Most people seem more willing to have tax dollars allocated for the cost of custody and security than for the cost of educational programs. Federal and state legislators, keenly aware of the prevailing opinion among their constituents, often translate the public's lack of support for correctional education programs into low levels of appropriations. It is, thus, very important for correctional administrators to offset this tendency by seeking the support of legislators. According to one former agency chief, "If you're not specifically mandated to provide those services by the legislature, it won't be done."

Another funding problem identified by witnesses was the multiplicity of funding sources and the many regulations associated with them. One witness testified that he had to combine eight different federal programs in order to provide minimum vocational services to the inmates of his institution. Other testimony revealed that within the Southeast Federal Region alone, at least 15 different funding sources were being used. While the difficulties stemming from this multiplicity are not insurmountable, the real problem lies in the fact that most correctional administrators, unfamiliar with authorizing legislation, do not have the sophisticated knowledge or the luxury of spare time to work through the complex process.

Witnesses also discussed the problems caused by the many regulations associated with some funding sources. The Vocational Education Act, for example, has stringent requirements and regulations for evaluation and followup procedures that many correctional agencies find difficult to fulfill because of the special nature of correctional institutions and their populations. The expectations are regarded as unrealistic and as obstacles to the use of such funds for correctional vocational programs. While the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act enabled ten skill training courses to be offered in Arkansas, for instance, its regulations limited the use of these funds to inmates who had no more than 12 months to serve before their parole date.

Federal funding is also often provided for only short periods of time. Many correctional administrators hesitate to solicit this "soft money" because the programs usually terminate at the same time the funding does. There are many activities associated with the initiation and staffing

of new programs and in the adjustments that have to be made for inmate and instructional needs. There are problems involved in dismantling programs and in handling the pressures and frustrations of the staff and inmates that follow program terminations.

Certain elements of the Vocational Education Act contribute to the inadequacies in the amount of funds available for correctional education. Because the VEA does not specifically mandate funding for correctional programs, states often allow correctional institutions to receive funds only under Subpart 2 of the Act (the handicapped and disadvantaged set-asides). In only eight states, correctional institutions are regarded as "local education agencies," and thus eligible to participate in all provisions of the Act. As it now is in most other states, the funding restrictions make it difficult for institutions to compete statewide with local education agencies for the small amount of money available under the set-asides. The limitations also weaken the ability of administrators to plan for improvements and support services to meet future priorities.

Some states allow correctional institutions to compete for funds under VEA's Subpart 3, in addition to its Subpart 2 monies. The amount of money which can be spent under Subpart 3, however, is small and must be used to administer a wide array of services, including guidance and counseling, curriculum, job and personnel development, job placement, and research and exemplary projects. With so few funds to work with, very little money, and sometimes none at all, filters down to the incarcerated population.

Besides the absence of a special mandate for offender programming in the VEA, one of its provisions actually disallows the use of funds for juvenile correctional purposes. Section 124(a) states: "no funds made available under Section 120 (Basic Grant) may be used for the purposes of this section for residential vocational schools to which juveniles are assigned as the result of their delinquent conduct." It was the perception of one witness that this exclusionary clause, in a sense, relegated the juvenile correctional facility and its charges to a lower status.

Two aspects of the VEA could affect correctional education in a positive way, yet even these have not been fully efficacious. One non-programmatic section of the Act specifically mandates an advisory role for corrections. Section 105 requires that the membership of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education include one or more persons representing correctional institutions. However, according to testimony, correctional vocational education was still not, in spite of the provision, fully advocated. In the other instance, the state level planning process required by the VEA and instituted to help ensure that the administration of funds effectively met the needs of the people was not working well for corrections. Many witnesses were unaware of the process and the way it could be used to help meet the training needs of offenders. Even the few who had knowledge of the planning requirements said that in their states, corrections was not mentioned in either the five-year or annual plan. One witness described

his organization's unsuccessful efforts to get information about the opportunities available under the VEA from the state department of education. He attributed the lack of communication to insufficient staffing of the department and recommended that the department maintain a suitable number of staff knowledgeable about correctional education.

Given the inadequacies of federal funding, it is usually only through cooperative arrangements between the state education agency and the state corrections agency that programs can be instituted. Unfortunately, inter-agency agreements are not easily struck, and, though variances exist, in many states very little communication takes place. It seems that more often the agencies work against each other, finding other uses for money intended for correctional vocational education programs. When funds are provided directly to correctional agencies, correctional administrators often divert money to non-educational programs. Likewise, funds channelled through educational agencies frequently are used for non-correctional education. Correctional administrators who testified were very critical of state education departments' lack of understanding of correctional education issues and needs, but they were, on the whole, even more critical of their fellow correctional administrators. So, if given an option, most correctional educators preferred that funds be administered by the state education agency rather than sent directly to correctional agencies.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Although problems far outnumbered solutions in testimonies at the NACVE hearings concerning funding sources, strategies, and channelling, a number of partially related solutions were recommended. They included the following:

- State correctional agencies should designate a staff member to deal exclusively with funding;
- State correctional agencies should emphasize the development of support in the state legislature;
- State correctional agencies should take a more active role in working with SACVEs and State Departments of Education;
- Correctional education administrators should utilize more than one funding source in spite of the problems resulting from multiplicity;
- State correctional agencies should take the initiative in developing "correctional school districts;"
- Congress should make clear that VEA applies to offenders; and
- Correctional administrators should strongly support United States Senate Bill 1373, "Corrections Education Demonstration Project Act" or its successor, and changes in VEA reauthorization.

Several witnesses described strategies which help to overcome the severe lack of funding of vocational programs in corrections. Two of those strategies included assigning a staff person to work exclusively with funding and the acquisition of funding information; and, giving more attention to gaining support in the state legislature, with SACVEs, and in the state department of education and thereby helping to overcome negative public attitude.

Some administrators gave an accounting of the fiscal operations required to pool funds for programmatic purposes. For example, Title I monies, from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, were combined with VEA funds and used for juvenile programs. As for adults, according to one witness, for example, the Illinois Department of Corrections has become skillful in obtaining funds from different resources, three of which are vocational education monies, general revenue appropriations, and CETA grants. Some of the vocational education programs that the Department funds are provided on a contractual basis by eight state community colleges. These colleges also pool resources. Along with the contract funds from the Department, the colleges use the reimbursement generated by the number of credit hours taken.

Another frequently mentioned possible solution to increase and stabilize the level of funding for correctional education programs is the creation of "correctional school districts", currently existing in only eight states. Several witnesses from states with such districting noticed a marked increase in the accessibility to the state's share of federal funds when monies were channelled through the state education department. The presence of correctional school districts also seemed to increase communication, technical assistance, and resource sharing between correctional and education agencies.

To make the VEA less subject to the vagaries of state-level interpretation, witnesses recommended that Congress make the law's intent clear by spelling out the necessity for correctional agencies to participate in all of its provisions. There was a definite consensus among witnesses supporting the establishment of a policy to divide and set-aside funds on a formula allocation basis for correctional vocational education. Others thought it was important to set-aside funds to allow state education departments to provide technical assistance to corrections departments.

One witness suggested that it would be beneficial to connect correctional vocational education programs and prison industries. If the experience gained from working in prison industries were regarded as on-the-job training, funds from Subpart 2 of the VEA would become available. A simple modification of the current law could make possible such a relationship, and, therefore, a funding increase.

It was generally thought that vocational monies -- including Basic Grant and set-aside monies -- should go directly to the state departments

of education, not through the correctional system, to prevent funds from being diverted to other purposes. Witnesses also stressed that guidelines and legislation which will govern a set-aside or formula allocation should be drawn up by NACVE, correctional and education agencies. A few who testified felt that obtaining set-aside funding should be predicated on meeting certain standards designed by those in the corrections education field. The American Correctional Association's standards were mentioned in this regard.

No legislation has to date been exclusively aimed at corrections education. The "Corrections Education Program," Part J of P.L. 95-561 is only a minor part of the law which has not been funded. Senate Bill 1373, specifically targeted at offenders was not reported out of committee. Both pieces of legislation were strongly supported by those who testified. In the absence of funded legislation specific to education of offenders, witnesses generally believed that the Secretary of Education should develop the Department's capability to coordinate resources and provide assistance related to funding programs for correctional education.

Administration

During the course of the four NACVE hearings, a number of problems in the administration of vocational education in correctional institutions emerged as did current deficiencies in the coordination between such programs and other resources.

PROBLEMS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

This section summarizes testimony focusing on the following key problems:

- The lack of priority status for correctional vocational education within the prison hierarchy, state legislatures, and state departments of education;
- The lack of federal, state, and local institutional philosophy and policy regarding vocational programs for inmates;
- Insufficient recruitment, training, and retention of qualified vocational instructors;
- Lack of adequate facilities and equipment;
- Lack of interagency cooperation and cooperative agreements to provide vocational education to incarcerated offenders;
- Lack of coordination and integration of vocational programs with prison industry; and,
- Inadequate involvement by correctional vocational education with private industry, labor unions, and apprenticeship programs.

For most of these problems, suggestions for improvement were also given by many of those who testified.

PRIORITY. Many witnesses testified that most correctional administrators regard the maintenance of security as the consideration that overrides all others. That is to say, there is no commitment to provide educational services in the least restrictive environment. Rewards to and promotions of the correctional staff are based on the maintenance of security. Many of the administrators believe, furthermore, that the security of their institution is somewhat disrupted by vocational education programs. For the correctional staff, from the top most administrator to the last of the line security guards, vocational education programs have a low priority.

Whether this low priority is the cause or the effect of the absence of a philosophy on correctional vocational education is unclear. But certainly there is a relationship between them. It is difficult for correctional vocational education to earn a higher priority without philosophical legitimacy and it is difficult for the agencies to develop a philosophical base given its present low priority. In any case, virtually

every witness recognized the absence of a philosophy and policy and observed the need to establish some at the federal, state, and local levels.

Low priority and the absence of a philosophical base make it very difficult for correctional vocational education programs to function. Instruction is hampered by, among other things, inmate counts, lockups, and staff reassignments. Taken together, all of this causes what witnesses described as divisiveness between security personnel and the educational staff. Each group tends not to understand the other's purpose and responsibility and, worse, not to trust the other. The effect is poor communication and little cooperation between the two. Many witnesses thought that such problems could be lessened if administrators, and the correctional staff, were made aware of the function of and need for vocational education in corrections. The vocational education staff would, in turn, have to be conscious and respectful of security considerations.

One witness discussed the importance of philosophy at some length and gave an example of how total organizational support might look. Ideally, a philosophy for correctional vocational education would exist at all levels of government. Such a philosophy would give educational programs parity with security considerations and would be made functional through formalized policy statements on its purpose, goals, and objectives It would also make course content focused, realistic, and practical.

The chief prison administrator has the responsibility for advocating correctional programs. If vocational programs are a low priority with him or her, they are even more likely to remain so with both the state department of education and the state legislature. As a result, funding and other resources are likely to remain scarce.

The testimony indicated general agreement that vocational and related programs should be directed by educators to ensure education programs have a higher or at least equal priority in relation to other institutional concerns. Some witnesses advocated for inhouse programs to be contracted for, and administered by, experienced community-based organizations because they felt that these organizations were less likely to be affected by correctional staff attitudes, priorities, and concerns.

Again, witnesses from states having a correctional "school district" suggested that this administrative structure has distinct advantages. Advantages include: programs receive automatic reviews, prison education programs are treated as entitlement rather than discretionary and staff responsible for different programs claim to work together with mutual respect and cooperation toward total prison program goals.

PERSONNEL. Problems associated with the recruitment, hiring, and retention of certified, qualified, and highly skilled vocational education instructors were generally indicated by prison administrators. Aside from

the obvious hesitancy on the part of civilians to work within the prison walls, testimony listed many factors which hamper recruitment efforts. These included: low pay, lack of in-service training and technical assistance, few opportunities for professional advancement, distant and isolated location of many correctional institutions from populated areas, and tension created by conflicts between the role of teacher and security obligations.

Many state prison administrators pointed out that state salary schedules for correctional instructors were much lower than for teachers in the local school district, which makes it difficult for prisons to compete for and retain instructors. In the words of one administrator, "One of our instructors could walk across the street to a vocational technical school and make $3,000 to $4,000 more per year."

Administrators of correctional school districts, however, testified that in their school districts correctional vocational instructors are paid the same salary as vocational instructors teaching in the public schools. Furthermore, their teaching staffs are credentialed and certified by the state department of education.

The following are additional suggestions proposed by state correctional administrators to remedy some of the deficiencies delineated above:

- Pay scales for correctional vocational instructors should be standardized and comparable to the wages of teachers in industry and the local school district;
- Funds should be allocated to provide correctional teachers with more substantial orientation and pre and in-service training, to include such topics as stress management and institutional security, policy, and procedure;
- Special efforts should be made at the college and university levels to provide special programs to meet the specific needs of correctional educators; and,
- SACVEs should serve as a catalyst in getting state correctional departments, state departments of education, and local universities to develop workshops for instructional and administrative staff (as demonstrated by the activities of the Wyoming SACVE).

In the federal correctional system, where salaries are often better than those at the state level, vocational programs also run the risk of losing staff, particularly to prison industries which in some locations may offer better pay to the shop supervisor. For example, while vocational education instructors are paid on a GS level, foreman wages in prison industries are determined by the Federal Wage Board and are made compatible with what the community pays people who are engaged in those trades. Consequently, "vocational teachers, seeing an opportunity for larger weekly

paychecks, with no loss in fringe benefits, may move from vocational training into prison industries." In addition, law prohibits the Bureau of Prisons from hiring anyone over 35 years of age. This artifically restricts the supply of vocational instructors and denies the federal system access to retired craftspersons who can teach effectively.

Possible solutions which were proposed by federal administrators included:

- Provide incentives for skilled craftsmen to seek early retirement with the provision that they teach full or part-time in a correctional facility;
- Reevaluate the 35-year age limit on instructors; and,
- Establish an occupational therapist corps, like the Teacher Corps, where people with highly specialized talents teach in a correctional facility for a year with a stipend paid by the Federal Government.

Sometimes the values held by teachers can present problems when implementing vocational education. According to one witness, many correctional vocational teachers of juveniles regard vocational education as just a good way to help backward and unskilled people keep out of trouble. These same teachers feel that it is unrealistic to expect an employer to even want to hire them. Consequently, the relationship of job preparation to employment is not made. With some, however, there is a different relationship. At the J.F. Ingram State Technical Institute for young males, teachers follow their students for as long as they can keep in touch with them. "One instructor, for example, can tell you where every student he has had within the last 13 years is today." This institute has a job placement rate in related occupations of about 65 percent.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT. Many administrators testified about the inadequacy of vocational training facilities and equipment that often severely limits inmates' access to needed programs. According to one witness from Texas whose prison population exceeds 27,000, "Facility shortages restrict vocational enrollment to only 5 percent of the total inmate population." Thus, while Texas is first in numbers incarcerated, it ranks near the bottom in inmates served.

Many institutions were constructed at the turn of the century and were designed with little, if any, space adequate for the types of training programs needed to meet today's job market demands. According to one witness, "it is not at all uncommon to find vocational programs operating in prison 'cubbyholes' once used to store mattresses and other institution commodities. The result is inadequate space, poor lighting and utilities, and in general, a negative and dreary learning environment." Likewise, strained correctional budgets often mean the use of surplus, antiquated, and makeshift training equipment, insufficient for skills training in relevant and marketable occupational areas.

Rather than duplicating similar training programs within the institution, many witnesses suggested that facilities in the community like community colleges and vocational schools should be made available to those portions of the prison population who are deemed appropriate through classification. A representative from the Association of American Community and Junior Colleges testified that most community colleges are not only geographically accessible to correctional institutions, but are also experienced in providing occupational training to meet both the needs of disadvantaged students and the labor market.

There are various ways to make use of community facilities. Either regular classes with regular students could be made available to inmates or special classes exclusively for inmates could be instituted during a school's off-hours. Witnesses suggested that the costs for such programs be covered by the state department of corrections. For offenders without security clearances, most witnesses concluded, funds must be made available to upgrade and repair existing institutional facilities and equipment or to contract with the private sector to establish internal programs furnished with the appropriate equipment. It was further suggested that the federal government study the possiblility or participation between federal and state institutions for joint use of facilities, equipment, and programs. Some comments emphasized the need for diversion programs as alternatives to prison, and thus more thoughtful use of community resources.

Testimony also indicated that problems are not limited to old correctional facilities. Many new prisons are being constructed with inadequate and poorly designed space for vocational programs. It was suggested that state advisory councils on vocational education take a more active role in the planning, construction, and renovation of prison facilities to ensure adequate and appropriate program space. Another possible solution to this problem is being tried in Louisiana, where as a result of a cooperative agreement between the State Department of Corrections and the State Department of Education, the vocational training facilities in all new prison constructions are designed by vocational-technical corrections experts.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION AND COORDINATION. Although many agencies share the responsibility for serving offenders, testimony showed inadequate cooperation among state departments of corrections, state departments of education and other social service agencies. Interagency cooperation, particularly between the state departments of corrections and education as formalized through cooperative agreements, is important because it can lead to more efficient use of funds, facilities, and personnel, and provide better vocational programs for offenders.

A correctional administrator from Kentucky, for example, described the benefits correctional vocational programs have derived from a Memorandum of Agreement between the Bureau of Corrections and the Bureau of Vocational Education (State Department of Education). Funding is provided by both agencies, and each institution's vocational center is administered by the Regional Director of the respective area vocational technical school. Each

correctional training school has a coordinator and staff who are Bureau of Vocational Education employees. All vocational teachers meet the certification criteria of the State Bureau of Vocational Education.

A Florida correctional administrator testified to the long and successful relationship between the Departments of Education and Corrections. Results of this collaboration have included: an increase in vocational education monies allocated to corrections, staff certified by the State Department of Education, annual program reviews, new vocational training facilities which meet the State Department of Education guidelines as to size and equipment, use of State Department of Education approved curricula, and the awarding of vocational certificates by the State Department of Education to offenders participating in correctional vocational education programs.

An example of the possibilities of community college involvement in coordinating correctional education is found in Ventura County, California. Ventura Community College built and now maintains a vocational school in one of the jails of the Ventura County Sheriff's Office. An administrator from the College described the way in which his institution came to be involved:

> I attended a California Advisory Council on Vocational Education meeting where the Department of Corrections made a presentation asking support for the community colleges for training for inmates. As a result, I went back to Ventura [Sheriff's Office], sat down with the commander of the custody division, and we laid some preliminary ground work for the program... . Approximately a month later, the Chancellor's office identified an augmentation of (possible money from) VEA Subpart 4 funding. We submitted an application, and we were funded.

The first program offered at the jail was a class in construction. As part of the program, the inmates built the facility that became the vocational school. In addition to classes in construction, the jail school offers instruction in auto mechanics and business office skills. Because the jail houses people who are often inmates for only short terms, the vocational programs allow for open entry-open exit. In this way, the individual can continue or supplement training after release.

Testimony also revealed that programs which have overcome a lack of coordination between agencies often made use of advisory committees, public relations, and community involvement to reach their goals. It was further recommended that the Federal Government take a more active role in this regard, both through legislation and the provision of technical assistance to states. It should vigorously encourage cooperative agreements with specific details among correctional agencies, including probation and parole, and state departments of education and labor, colleges, universities, and technical and vocational schools.

COORDINATION WITH PRISON INDUSTRIES. Testimonies also revealed that there are currently few formal relationships within correctional institutions between vocational programs and prison industries. In many cases, prison industry and vocational programs actually compete for inmates. For example, if inmates are needed in prison industries or prison maintenance programs because these programs provide an economic advantage for the institution, inmates are more likely to be assigned to those than to vocational programs. Some inmates testified that conflicts in schedules often require them to choose between participating in prison industries and taking vocational training. In spite of the fact that inmates think working in prison industries has little educational value and a negative effect on work habits, productivity, and motivation, most still prefer to work because of the minimal wage and instant gratification it gives them. In contrast, participation in vocational programs provides no monetary compensation and the long range benefits of learning a skill are often not appreciated by an offender.

One certain way around this work versus training conflict is to stagger the hours in which prison industries and vocational classes operate. According to a few witnesses, vocational education enrollments could also increase if a slight monetary incentive could be given for participating in the vocational program. Other interesting ideas for overcoming the lack of coordination were also discussed. For example, Illinois participates, as do six other states, in the Free Venture Program funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. This prison industries model tries to replicate the free world of work environment as closely as possible through wage incentive programs and full work days and by maximizing production, maintaining quality control, and ensuring profitability. Offenders participating in this program must assume personal responsibility and demonstrate good work habits. In return, they receive on-the-job training and monetary compensation.

Another example of coordination between many groups to provide effective vocational training was cited by a witness from Connecticut, where the vocational program and industries program were developed jointly. Basic occupational skills are taught in vocational education, then used in the industry's shop in order that the inmate practice positive work attitudes and habits. Furthermore, the Department of Labor has recognized this program as an apprenticeship program. Therefore, inmates not only receive vocational training and hands-on experience, but are also given credit for participating in a certified apprenticeship program. Related to this effort was a suggestion that all prison industries should be monitored by their respective state departments of education, so that potential employers would know that the programs have been validated and accredited, in concert with the Department of Labor.

Many federal and state regulations restrict the range of activities of prison industries. Title 18, Section 1761 of the U.S. Code generally prohibits the interstate movement of state prison industry products to private interests. The Walsh-Healey and the Prohibitory Acts, for example,

prohibit the sale of state prison industry products to federal agencies. According to many witnesses, market limitations like these have made prison industries' programs both irrelevant to post-release employment and uncoordinated with vocational education programs designed to meet job market demands.

Many witnesses believed that some of the restrictions would have to be eliminated in order to bring about the necessary coordination between prison industries and vocational programs. Actually, some easing has already occurred. In nearly 12 states, prison industries sales laws have been amended to permit intrastate open market sales and sales to non-profit organizations. At the federal level, the Justice Improvement Act of 1979 provided a waiver of some restrictions so that a small LEAA demonstration program could be pilot tested in order to stimulate private sector economic activity in prisons. The further lifting of restrictions, witnesses urged, would enable prison industries to provide a more realistic work environment for inmates, giving them on-the-job training and helping them enhance specific skills and good work habits.

It was generally believed that since prison industries have difficulty maintaining their profitability, they consequently do not have the resources necessary to resolve the lack of coordination existing with vocational programs. Hence, it was recommended that the Federal Government study the problem and provide incentives to enable such coordination to occur.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY. Industry, besides being a potential employer of ex-offenders, could make a significant contribution to the planning, development, and implementation of vocational/industrial programs. Yet testimony indicated that correctional vocational education programs generally do not have the benefit of outside advisory committee and local industry consultation.

One way to bring in more private sector expertise is by working with intermediary organizations like the National Alliance of Business. To illustrate, the National Alliance of Business (NAB) plays a significant role in encouraging business and industry leaders to hire job-ready ex-offenders with basic occupational skills, particularly in fields with labor shortages. Several witnesses, including NAB members, supported the idea of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program because of its success in providing incentives to industry to become involved in the training of offenders and the hiring of exoffenders. Some witnesses urged the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education to support legislation reducing the age limit as specified in the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program of the 1978 Revenue Act to 16 and target the juvenile offender for participation.

An example of successful partnership between the public and private sectors was introduced by a witness from Cobb County, Georgia, where an Alliance between the Cobb County Judiciary, the local CETA prime sponsor, Marrietta Cobb Area Vocational/Technical School and the Lockheed-Georgia Company has resulted in the establishment of a machine shop and welding

training program for offenders and probationers in a realistic industrial environment that meets industry standards. Clients are selected primarily by Cobb Rehabilitation Volunteer Services, a volunteer program of the Cobb County Judicial Circuit. An area vocational technical school provides the instructors, and Lockheed furnishes the training facility including machine shop and welding equipment. The program has been successful in placing offenders in industry upon their release.

UNIONS AND APPRENTICESHIP. While some witnesses questioned the willingness of organized labor to accept membership of exoffenders, others discussed the role unions have played in offender rehabilitation programs. Unions, witnesses emphasized, have served in important advisory capacities and have given offenders and exoffenders access to apprenticeship programs. An example of such union involvement can be found in New York City, where the United Auto Workers and one of its local affiliates operate an exoffender training program in auto mechanics. The program has given union memberships and job guarantees to youthful offenders upon their release and successful completion of the training. From a different perspective, three AFL-CIO programs were described as examples of union activities in working with the correctional system. The Virginia State AFL-CIO sponsors the Skill Training Employment Placement Upward Progress program for adult offenders and the Juveniles Upward Making Progress program. Another AFL-CIO program sponsored by its Human Resources Development Institute, assists in developing job opportunities for offenders and exoffenders in unionized industries.

Further evidence of the ability to establish apprenticeship programs was described by witnesses from Texas' "correctional school district," which currently has several operational apprenticeship programs in different occupational areas. Another example of an apprenticeship program model came from the Federal Correctional Institution in Fort Worth, Texas. Here, each apprenticeship program is regulated by the Department of Labor and accredited with the appropriate Joint Apprenticeship committee as well as sponsored by local businessmen and supported by labor. Quarterly Joint Apprenticeship committee meetings are hosted by the institution. On-the-job training is performed in prison industry with related vocational training provided in evening classes.

Comprehensive Programming

Former inmates who testified explained that if they had not had vocational education classes while in prison and been given job opportunities when released, they would very likely have been returned to prison. Written testimony from the Safer Foundation in Chicago, an organization devoted to helping exoffenders help themselves, cited its 1979 study entitled The Challenge Program showing that "clients who gained skills in prison were more easily placed ... [and] less likely to return to prison than unemployed clients." In other words, employment helped interrupt the crime, punishment, recidivism cycle. Let us accept as many witnesses had done, that there is a relationship between unemployment and recidivism. If we could somehow lessen the degree of unemployment, we would then have a right to expect that crime and recidivism would also decrease. We would further expect to save human lives and conserve economic resources. While this cause and effect relationship has not been clearly established, many criminal justice scholars and economists have come to believe it. More and more professionals and concerned citizens are beginning to realize that correctional education amounts to nothing less than the conservation of human and material resourses. Preparation for employment, then, is a crucial intervening force. Vocational education is an important component in enhancing the potential of offenders for free world employment.

However, testimony from correctional staff members, inmates, and employers of exoffenders indicated that the level of vocational programing in many prisons today is not capable of providing relevant, comprehensive training and support to the degree necessary. Most offenders have many problems besides their educational deficiencies. Often functioning at only the seventh or eighth grade level, most also have limited marketable skills and few positive work experiences. Their well-entrenched patterns of failure in school and in the community have given them poor self-images, low motivational levels, and few expectations for success. They are angry, depressed and very confused. With all these problems, vocational education programs as they now exist cannot by themselves hope to habilitate offenders. Instead, a more comprehensive approach to habilitation is needed for the 95% of all felons who will eventually be returned to the community. Vocational education must make provision through other resources for or integrate into its program the following:

- Basic, social, and employability skills development, job training, and post release and followup assistance;
- Programs designed to meet the individual needs of inmates;
- Programs developed to meet labor market demands;
- Adequate access and special services available for all inmate population segments;
- Services and programs must be comprehensive in scope, covering a full spectrum from assessment to job placement and follow-up; and,

- Vocational training should be integrated with on-the-job training, with such other resources as prison industry and appropriate work experience opportunities in the community.

As testimony indicated, however, currently it is the rare vocational program that fulfills these requirements.

PROBLEMS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS.

The NACVE hearings revealed a variety of serious problems in the program area, the most recurrent of which will be discussed in greater detail in this section. These include:

- The lack of vocational program standards at all levels;
- The lack of planning programs relevant to current labor market demands and realistic job opportunities;
- The lack of flexibility in scheduling;
- Inequitable and inadequate access to programs for all inmate population segments;
- Insensitivity to inmates with special needs;
- The lack of a team approach for holistic human development; and,
- The lack of relevant, flexible, and non-traditional curricula.

Many possible solutions were given. A discussion of these solutions and their integration into a comprehensive program focusing on improvements in administration and instruction is presented in this section.

PROGRAM STANDARDS. It was generally believed uniform program standards were necessary, particularly to provide a basis for program planning and accreditation. Standards would be applicable to the administration and operation of programs. One witness recommended that NACVE establish a study committee to review current standards for consistency and to make a statement on their status. In particular, it was believed that there should be program standards for jails as well as institutions that house youth under the age of eighteen. A few presenters suggested that an appropriate federal office review the standards developed by the American Correctional Association and make recommendations for adopting or improving them. Another suggestion was that the government set aside funds for the evaluation of correctional vocational education programs to be monitored by the General Accounting Office or another impartial agency rather than the agency providing funds.

PLANNING. Interviews with several current inmates revealed that the vocational training available to them is often for occupations in which

they cannot be employed after release because of federal and state regulations on licensing. In one state, for example, exoffenders are prohibited from entering over 300 kinds of jobs. Training is also given in occupations that are no longer in demand in the real world. Many witnesses thought that these problems could be corrected through a statewide planning effort incorporating labor market demand trends and potential employment opportunities.

For the most part, program planning is isolated from outside advisory groups and from the state's departments of education and labor. Yet effective planning in correctional vocational education is impossible without the cooperation of such groups and agencies. The knowledge and experience they could bring to planning would be very helpful in determining the extent to which vocational offerings accurately reflect free world labor market realities. Such committees should include representatives of state departments of education, labor and corrections, local community groups, business and industry, and labor.

That such arrangements are achievable is illustrated in Florida where, as a result of a cooperative agreement between the State Department of Education and the State Department of Corrections, correctional institutions statewide are viewed as a single school district. The Department of Corrections has access to the state vocational education regional planning offices, staffed with technical people in each of the occupational areas to provide assistance in determining manpower needs, in providing labor market data, and in developing curriculum. Labor market data for each planning region as well as statewide data are used in planning comprehensive vocational-education programs for a statewide system of vocational education in corrections. Also as a result of this cooperative agreement, corrections personnel requested program reviews, and now the Florida State Department of Education routinely schedules a certain number of annual program reviews in all major institutions.

Programmatic planning was also necessary at the institutional level. Establishing the best time to begin training and the best way to tailor courses to meet individual needs are just two of the many program questions that confront individual institutions. The time when programs should be offered has been a difficult one to determine and opinions about it vary. Some witnesses recommended that vocational classes should be started when a sentence begins. This would give an inmate enough time to learn a skill and fewer hours of idleness. After completing the vocational program, the inmate could use the training by working in prison industries. Other witnesses believed that training should be programmed in conjunction with the time of release in order to prevent acquired skills from being forgotten. Still others thought that the individual's own motivation should determine when the training begins. There was no consensus about which option was the best one; witnesses concluded that research should be conducted to help clarify which approach might be most appropriate.

In order to meet the needs and interest of the individual inmate, it

was suggested that institutions should design an individualized plan for each offender based on academic and vocational testing for aptitude and interests. It was recommended that pilot programs be developed and individual education plans (IEPs) for prisoners be initiated and tested. Some states have already begun incorporating this approach. In Florida, for example, due to a cooperative agreement between the State Department of Corrections and the State Department of Education, an Individualized Manpower Training system has been implemented for youthful offenders. This system tailors programs to meet individual needs while integrating and coordinating support services such as exploratory experiences, remedial and adult basic education.

It was also suggested that IEP development requires an effective team staff involvement so that the total person becomes the focus of the educational plan rather than one particular aspect of the person. To illustrate, in Minnesota, a team approach is used to plan, provide, and integrate vocational and regular guidance, counseling, remedial and vocational training. The team consists of the inmate, who sets his goals and objectives with the aid of a staff member provided by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, an academic teacher, a vocational instructor, and a correctional officer.

ACCESS AND EQUITY Access to correctional vocational education programs by special populations was a much discussed topic at the hearings. Testimony indicated that, paradoxically, although vocational education funds are targeted for disadvantaged and handicapped students, the admission criteria used in institutions frequently discriminate against disadvantaged youth, the handicapped, and Hispanics. Most institutions rely heavily on standardized test results to determine admission to vocational programs. Many witnesses expressed opinions that these tests do not adequately measure whether an inmate (juvenile or adult) can benefit from vocational training in general or a specific vocational course in particular. In addition, arbitrary cut-off points for test scores are particularly likely to exclude offenders with learning disabilities or with limited English speaking ability. Furthermore, in most states there is no mandated procedure for the diagnosis and treatment of inmates with special learning disabilities. Hispanic inmates in particular are often processed through a testing system which is devoid of properly trained bilingual staff to administer the tests.

Even if a person with special needs actually makes it through the admission process, he or she is again likely to become subject to discrimination through lack of planning and implementation for special needs populations. Witnesses testified for example, that few courses are developed and offered for the benefit of physically/mentally handicapped offenders. It is often left to the individual instructor's initiative, rather than administrator's directive, whether courses are modified to meet the "least restrictive environment" requirement for handicapped students.

Similarly, Hispanics are often placed in programs in which neither the

curriculum nor the instructor takes into consideration their cultural and linguistic differences. In California, where the minority prison population including Hispanics doubled from 30 to 60 percent by 1968, few Spanish-speaking instructors have been employed by the California Department of Corrections.

As several witnesses showed, women offenders are also denied equal access to vocational programs in correctional institutions. The common reason given for the discrepancy between what male inmates receive and what female inmates receive is that the population of women inmates is too small to justify multiple program options on a cost-effective basis. The disparity in the State of Michigan prompted a class action suit on behalf of women prisoners against the state correctional system. Women in Michigan's prisons had less access than male offenders to prison industries, apprenticeship training, and vocational and academic courses. A federal district court rendered a decision in the case requiring women offenders to be given parity of treatment, i.e., rehabilitative programs of the same quality as those given to male offenders.

While this case may have wide-ranging implications in the future, present inequities are extensive. Most of the small number of programs now available to women are in traditional, low paying occupations, e.g., classes in sewing, cosmetology, secretarial skills.* Institutional sexism is in part the cause of this but so is what seems to be the female offenders' own reluctance to venture into the unfamiliar world of non-traditional training and jobs. A consequence of limited program offerings in institutions is severe restriction on the number of job options, especially the higher paying ones, available to female offenders when they return to society and its labor market. Witnesses recommended the development of career and vocational exploration programs for women to help broaden their understanding of the working world and what it has to offer.

Another special problem for women offenders is that most of them are single mothers with two or more children to support. Along with needing adequate vocational training to help them avoid dependence on welfare, they also must have training to develop parenting skills and special counseling to assist them in coping with their dual roles as breadwinner and mother. Such extra training as provided by Miami-Dade's Community College program - Career Development for Women Offenders - can help relieve family and custody problems and the transference of personal problems to the work place.

---

* These points were described in a recent GAO Report, Women in Prison: Inequitable Treatment Requires Action (December, 1980).

Additional ideas given to improve the situation of women offenders were:

- Further studies on the needs of women offenders should be initiated by the Federal Government and state governments;
- Exemplary models of vocational and counseling programs for women offenders should be identified and disseminated on the federal and state levels; and,
- Linkages with community training facilities should be increased so that varied and cost-effective programs for women offenders can be offered, preferably on a study-release basis.

In terms of linkages with the community and other support services, the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, has developed a successful model of apprenticeship training for women in federal correctional institutions. Training is given in non-traditional occupations such as automechanics, electronics, and plumbing. When women are released from prison, they are referred to the Joint Apprenticeship Commission in their home area. The Commission assists them in making the transition into private programs. The key ingredients to its success are: (1) coordination among the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Bureau of Corrections, vocational education personnel, community groups, and women's groups; and; (2) comprehensive career and individual counseling to cultivate an interest for non-traditional areas such as the craft and trade occupations. This federal model can be replicated in state institutions.

In addition to the foregoing ideas, the following solutions were proposed to increase access and equity for all sub-populations:

- Develop state correctional vocational education plans which contain a specific action plan to overcome unequal access to vocational programs in correctional institutions;
- Fund special studies of the needs of all minority populations and use the data in developing concrete affirmative action plans; and,
- Monitor all plans and programs to detect and put an end to discrimination in federal, state, and local level correctional institutions and programs.

Furthermore, in order to rectify the inequities particular to Hispanics, the following suggestions were made:

- Provide incentives to hire and promote Hispanic staff (on a non-quota basis);
- Provide in-service training for staff members to help them become aware of the Hispanic culture and bi-lingual needs of Hispanic offenders; and,

- Involve Hispanic organizations to help in the planning process and in providing technical support.

COMPREHENSIVE INSTRUCTION. Most of those who testified at the NACVE hearings generally agreed that strategies to maximize employment potential for reintegration of offenders into the free world must consist of both effective pre-employment, including remedial education when necessary, life and social skills development and vocational preparation. Pre-employment training of the offender includes human development (psychological and functional) to gain entry to the job market and to function in it. Such training should involve at least: preparation of a job application, work history or resume development of interview skills, good work habits and attitudes. It was also recommended that this training include understanding the factors which influence an employer in hiring and firing and how to deal with a criminal record when talking to prospective employers. Matters of dress, grooming, manners and job interest must also be part of the employability development of the individual. For example, much of the job readiness preparation in the Windham School District's Life Skills Program, in Texas, is provided through counseling activities and related training sessions. Another organization, the DeLancy Street Foundation in San Francisco, also works with offenders in a human development mode. DeLancy Street adopts offenders, ex-offenders and others and fosters, in a very structured way, their growth and rehabilitation. Operating its own businesses, from a restaurant to a trucking company to a credit union, Delancy Street embraces the community and its economic system and thus imbues its residents with a sense of community and community values. The Seventh Step Foundation, Inc., based in Cincinnati, Ohio, is another organization that takes into consideration the offender's need for human development. Seventh Step tries to re-socialize offenders through motivational education emphasizing discipline, self-worth, citizenship, and the attainment of freedom through self-control. The program first tries to help offenders recognize the potential they have to become good, productive citizens and, then, to help them fulfill their potential. The program's objective is to change the offender's attitude and level of motivation.

The employers who were among the witnesses confirmed how important these factors are. In addition to having the actual job skills, or beginning job skills, exoffender applicants should be ready to work and be able to get along with fellow employees. Employers also expect inmates, as they come into the company, to be able to take care of their own problems in daily living and not to bring them to work. It was also suggested that on-the-job training, whether it be provided in the prison industry setting or through a work-release arrangement, is a desirable component of a rehabilitation program designed to increase employability skills and maximize employment potential.

The concept of maximizing potential employment suggests that training be done for multiple job entry -- similar to the cluster concept in vocational education -- rather than one narrow skill in one occupation which

greatly limits the offenders' opportunity for finding employment. The multiple job entry concept is also tied to the need for effectiveness in the basic skills of reading, writing, and calculating. An offender's employment potential is dependent upon his/her basic skills. Witnesses recommended that such basic skill development be integrated into the vocational curriculum.

Witnesses felt that curricula to adequately meet the needs of inmates should be competency-based and provide "hands-on" experience facilitating on-going evaluation of student performance. Many witnesses further expressed their concern about the lack of vocational curricula to meet the special needs of offenders. Due to short-range and fragmented funding, correctional education administrators often try to incorporate system design and curricula that are being utilized by the local school systems. Although this may save time, it frequently produces a program delivery system that is inappropriate for the special needs and circumstances of the inmate client.

One example of customized comprehensive programming was introduced by a witness from Kentucky. The Kentucky State correctional system for adults has four program components: 1) vocational skills, 2) academic skills, 3) living skills, and; 4) on-the-job training. The Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) classification system is used to classify institutional jobs. This allows vocational interests and aptitude test scores to be related directly to various jobs and thus provides the basis for the creation of specific relationships between formal training programs and actual work experiences. The State is presently developing curricula and resources for each of the major areas of correctional industry and maintenance, so that each job can be assigned on the basis of inmate interest, aptitude, and OJT needs. Their correction's living skills program covers: a) communication and decision-making, problem solving and planning skills; b) daily living skills, such as health care, money management, and consumer education; and c) job-related skills, such as how to get to work, how to relate in an interview, payroll deductions, co-worker relationships and finding a job. Also, the vocational component is competency-based and open-exit with self-instruction modules based on skill acquisition. Similarly, the Texas Windham School District offers inmates competency-based vocational education tied to individualized evaluation of skill development.

Another approach in offering comprehensive services to inmates is demonstrated by the Illinois Department of Corrections' contract with eight state community colleges. One of those, Joliet Junior College, provides vocational and academic education and career services to over eight hundred residents from four adult correctional centers and one juvenile center.

Testimony from those representing juvenile institutions introduced several special concerns. Since their population tends to be more short-term than in adult institutions, there is a great need for short but meaningful courses and curricula. Traditional vocational courses which frequently take 500-1000 hours to complete are often inappropriate in the juvenile setting. In addition, vocational training welcomed by adult offenders, is

frequently rejected by juveniles, who often have low motivation and maturity levels and who have limited insight into their own aptitudes, abilities, and limitations, and possible vocational options.

In one state, for example, only twenty percent of the incarcerated youth had reached the 12th grade level; the average education achievement level for juveniles was fifth grade. Testimony stressed the need for high interest, low reading ability curricular materials for prevocational career exploration as well as vocational courses in occupational clusters. Some stated that vocational education should also emphasize the development of remedial education and self-understanding. Several witnesses suggested that a national task force be established to develop instructional design and curricula for delivering vocational and career education to youthful offenders. On-the-other-hand examples of programs that were providing exemplary experiences were received. A case in point was the Jamesburg Training School's "Distributive Education Program for Incarcerated Youth." Within this program, sixty-five percent (65%) of all participants have been successful as measured by satisfactory adjustment at community work sites and positive performance in the institution as measured by a favorable adjustment pattern. Recidivism among program participants was less than thirty percent (30%), significantly lower than for youth within the juvenile facility. The success rate has been attributed, in part, to continuous positive interation with adult role models through a community cooperative work experience program. Another example of an exemplary program was found in Chicago at the Cook County Juvenile Detention Center. The Center's Home Economics Related Occupations program attempts to develop food management and service skills of youthful male offenders in order to give them the kind of confidence that helps them return to the local school system for further education while maintaining part-time employment.

JOB PLACEMENT AND FOLLOW-UP. According to many witnesses, job placement and follow-up are often neglected components in an offender's rehabilitation plan. It was reaffirmed that placement and continuing follow-up are necessary to assist the individual in his or her work and societal adjustment. Witnesses said repeatedly that the period right after release, in the early days of a new job, is the most crucial time for the exoffender, during which the success or failure of his reintegration frequently hangs in the balance. At this critical juncture, offenders need help from organizations in the community to facilitate re-entry into society. One such organization is Project JOVE in San Diego, California, which receives funding from several different sources, including CETA, Title VII, and revenue sharing monies. Project JOVE's objective is to intervene at that point when the exoffender is most vulnerable, to increase his chances of making a successful adjustment and remaining crime-free. Project JOVE emphasizes job training, social skill development, and community contact and involvement.

Unfortunately, as most witnesses testified, due to lack of funds and inadequate staff, job placement and follow-up are generally irregular at

best and non-existent in many cases. Correction's staff does not sufficiently take into account the types of job opportunities, salaries, and further education that society is willing to allow the offender upon return to the free world.

Witnesses from organizations such as the National Alliance of Business and from community-based organizations helping ex-offenders, have attempted to provide placement services for them, but no consistent effort is presently being made at the institutional level to provide such assistance. Some witnesses advocated the creation of federal legislation which would provide funding of staff members for job placement activities and support services. It is essential, as one witness explained, that a support system be established, because historically the exoffender was often only supported by the parole officer. There are other effective resources that can be part of a support system. For example, the Safer Foundation of Chicago, Illinois tends to the initial survival needs of exoffenders by making arrangements for such necessities as housing, food, clothing, and medical and dental aid. (Another rationale for extended follow-up activities is that these would assist in the evaluation of programs and increase accountability.)

Examples of good placement services were given at the hearings. In Georgia, a Mobile Construction Crew program was established for inmates to work as a team to do minor repairs for different state institutions. Another kind of placement activity conducted at a Texas federal correctional institution was recounted. After a minimum of a six months evaluation period, a successful inmate who was in an apprenticeship program is placed in a community work release program, transferred to a halfway house, or released and given assistance to maintain employment in the free world.

EVALUATION. The need for evaluation was discussed by many of those who testified, particularly correctional administrators. An evaluation, through followup activities, identifies inmates who have succeeded as well as those who have not. It provides information on the important factors in program success that can be integrated into program and curricula design. Furthermore, evidence of program successes and achievements could provide a basis for changing the public's attitude toward and image of offenders and increase the support for vocational training.

Problems which have inhibited evaluation efforts include:

- Lack of funding;
- Lack of model strategies and design;
- Difficulties in tracking released offender; and,
- Inadequate criteria for and measures of success or failure.

Recidivism is often used as a measure of the effectiveness of educational programs. Yet recidivism alone is an inadequate measure of the overall success or failure of a vocational training program. Using recidivism as the only measure makes it difficult to prove that vocational training was the vehicle which did or did not make a difference. A better measure than recidivism, many witnesses suggested, is the employability and level of occupational skill development of the exoffender. Individual instructional programs should have built-in measures to determine their level of achievement. The use of competency-based instruction can provide a basis for participant evaluation.

The absence of any federal or state goals against which to measure success or failure was considered a severe problem. In view of this fact, and since systematic evaluative research is often too costly for state and local agencies, it was recommended that a percentage of federal vocational education funds be earmarked for evaluation research. Recommendations were also presented for the creation of a federal level management information system to track the employment progress of those who participate in correctional vocational education programs.

Federal Policy and Leadership

Testimony at the NACVE hearings stressed that, although millions of dollars are channelled into correctional education, there is a lack of policy, coordination, and leadership of this educational effort at the federal level. As a result, correctional education has suffered from fragmented program efforts, minimal commitments, and non-traceable paths of responsibility on the part of both correctional and educational agencies.

Many witnesses stressed that U.S. public education as an institution shares in the responsibility for the lack of prior educational achievement on the part of a large percentage of offenders. Therefore, it is appropriate that the Department of Education (established in 1979) be the lead agency in providing direction on remedial and continuing education for this target group. Congress listed seventeen reasons for the establishment of a U.S. Department of Education, including:

- Strengthening the federal commitment to assuring access to equal education opportunities for every individual;
- Promoting improvement in the quality and usefulness of education through federally-supported research, evaluation, and sharing of information;
- Improving the coordination of federal education programs.

Testimony presented to the Council further pointed out that correctional education should be identified as a federal priority through the establishment of a corrections office within the new Department of Education.

It was generally felt that Congress and the federal government could best address the inadequacies of funding, administration, coordination, and comprehensive programming delineated in this report through leadership in the following four areas:

- Overall coordination;
- Legislation and policy development;
- Research, evaluation, and data collection;
- Technical assistance and transfer of knowledge.

Participants provided numerous recommendations that were summarized and are presented below as "observations" to distinguish these from any "recommendations" made by NACVE.

OBSERVATION 1: <u>The U.S. Department of Education should establish an office for Correctional Education</u>.

This office should be charged with the responsibilities to: (1) coordinate federal funding programs for corrections education; (2) establish

a clearinghouse for education; (3) provide educational technical assistance to state correctional systems and; (4) provide local, state and federal legislators with current data and analyses of the cost benefit of educational efforts in the prison setting.

The designation of such an Office at the federal level would also signify a national priority for correctional education.*

OBSERVATION 2: Congress, through the VEA reauthorization, should consider or mandate the establishment of a parallel staff position for correctional education in each State Department of Education.

The position would function to plan, monitor, and link the many state resources and agencies that assist education and employment training.

OBSERVATION 3: Congress should include in the VEA reauthorization language and policy assuring correctional programs access to funding and services under all provisions of the Act.

Specifically, Congress should establish a level, or percentage, of VEA funding for explicit use in correctional institutions. VEA monies which are allocated for corrections should be channelled through State Departments of Education to ensure that funds are not diverted from purposes intended, as well as to encourage State Department of Education involvement and assistance in program planning, curriculum design, and evaluation. Guidelines and regulations governing such set-aside funds should be drawn up in cooperation with experts familiar with the problems and needs of correctional education, including members of NACVE and correctional agencies.

OBSERVATION 4: Federal vocational education legislation should specify and encourage formal communication at the state level among the State Department of Corrections, the State Department of Education and other agencies involved in providing services to offenders.

This should include federal policy requiring involvement of correctional personnel in the formal VEA planning process.

OBSERVATION 5: Congress should consider amending VEA to ensure that prison industries are coordinated and consistent with the educational and training needs of inmates.

---

* As of the date of this publication, such an office has been approved in principle by the Secretary of Education. However, no funds have been allocated. The National Institute of Corrections has temporarily funded a corrections program housed within the Department of Education in the Office of Vocational and Adult Education.

In addition, Congress should reevaluate, and perhaps repeal, restrictive laws which reduce the value and effectiveness of state prison industries.

OBSERVATION 6: The Federal Government should encourage further involvement on the part of industry and labor in correctional education by requiring state advisory committees on correctional education with broad representation, including that of the private sector.

OBSERVATION 7: Federal funds, either through the VEA or additional legislation, should be made available to upgrade and expand existing facilities and equipment used in correctional vocational education.

The Federal Government should also study the feasibility of joint participation of state, local, and federal institutions in sharing and more effectively utilizing resources, facilities, and equipment.

OBSERVATION 8: The Federal Government should encourage quality programs and curricula for the training of correctional teachers for academic and vocational programs.

Federal funds should be made available for in-service training of teachers and correctional staff. Furthermore, the Federal Government should play a leadership role in promoting pay scales for correctional teachers which are equitable with those in the public school systems and in providing other incentives to attract highly qualified instructors to the field of correctional education. Federal funds should also be made available for recruitment and placement activities of prospective teachers.

OBSERVATION 9: The Federal Government should assume a leading role in promoting and supporting much needed research, evaluation, and data collection in correctional education.

Witnesses unanimously pointed out that research is lacking in this area and that state and local funds are too strained to support these efforts. Information is needed in order to formulate appropriate policies.

In addition, the Federal Government should initiate research and evaluation of the impact of incentives (such as the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program) on the employment of offenders on work release and ex-offenders.

OBSERVATION 10: The Federal Government, through NACVE or other appropriate agencies, should develop national minimum standards for educational and vocational programs in correctional institutions.

Goals and standards are needed to ensure better educational opportunity and access for offenders (juveniles and adults) as well as to promote increased program accountability. Correctional academic and vocational

at the national as well as at the state and local levels, need clear, realistic, and specific goals.

OBSERVATION 11: Congress should provide funding for and charge the Department of Education with the responsibility to establish a national information, research, and reporting system for education and vocational training in correctional facilities.

Serious problems in program design, materials development, and curriculum design currently exist due to the lack of a national correctional education information system. As a result, many excellent vocational and academic programs exist in the free community which could be, but are not, utilized in corrections. Furthermore, increased dissemination activities are needed to bring existing information to individual jurisdictions and institutions. Such a national correctional education information system should provide information on, among others, the following specific areas:

- Systematic approaches to managing education in the prison setting;
- Curricula for use in correctional settings, with emphasis on competency-based courses and short term courses appropriate for a specialized and high turn-over population;
- Curricula for special need populations such as women, limited-English speaking, and the handicapped;
- Curricula which integrate academic and vocational training with pre-employment and life skills, career orientation, and counseling;
- Models for the development of individualized education and employment plans for inmates;
- Model strategies for the evaluation of educational and vocational programs in corrections and for follow-up of students; and,
- Research findings and data of relevance to program and curriculum design in correctional education.

These "observations" represent, in a sense, a reasoned appeal to Congress, the Administration, correctional and educational administrators, and the public to make a commitment to the promise of correctional education. Renewed efforts in correctional education to lessen the waste of human life and monetary resources could reverberate throughout the criminal justice system.

APPENDICES

THE FOUR HEARINGS

The sites of the four hearings were chosen to get a broad representation across four regions and, from this, to identify issues common to the nation. A panel, composed of five people per hearing, was selected to hear, clarify, and delve more deeply into the testimony.

The five people at each hearing consisted of two National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (NACVE) members, two State Advisory Council on Vocational Education (SACVE) members, and a moderator. One NACVE member, the Council's corrections representative, was designated to preside over the proceedings of the four hearings in order to provide a measure of continuity to the project. The other NACVE position was held by a different member at each hearing. The SACVE members were from the states and the regions in which the hearings were held. The moderators for the first three hearings were chosen from among those involved in criminal justice programs at the first three hearing sites. The moderator of the fourth hearing was the executive director of NACVE.

Taken together, there were 17 different panel members, from a total of 12 different states, who heard testimony from 106 individual witnesses representing a total of 27 different states. In addition, ten people from seven states made comments at the hearings. Besides the body of oral testimony, compiled into four volumes of transcripts, written statements and letters were received from more than 20 people.

A listing of the panel members and witnesses at each of the four hearings is given on the pages that follow.

November 8 - 9, 1979
National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
Ohio State University (Host Institution)
Columbus, Ohio

PANEL

John R. Erwin
Member and Hearings Chairperson
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Chicago, Illinois

Harrison L. Morris
Member
Ohio Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Columbus, Ohio

John D. Rowlett
Member
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Richmond, Kentucky

Constantine Souris
Member
Massachusetts Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Boston, Massachusetts

Charles M. Whitson (Moderator)
Director
Criminal Justice Program
National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

WITNESSES

Allen F. Breed
Director
National Institute of Corrections
Washington, D.C.

Daniel B. Dunham
Deputy Commissioner
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Gary A. Eyre
Executive Director
National Advisory Council
on Adult Education
Washington, D.C.

Donald S. Frey, Sr.
Educational Director
Seventh Step Foundation, Inc.
Cincinnati, Ohio

Christ L. George
Superintendent of Education
Ohio Youth Commission
Columbus, Ohio

Eugene Kavanagh
Former Chairperson
Ohio Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Former Superintendent
Great Oaks Joint Vocational
School District
South Charleston, Ohio

Rowland R. Lutz
Employment Specialist
Man-to-Man Associates
Columbus, Ohio
and in absentia
Robert B. Hadden
Metro Director
National Alliance of Business
Columbus, Ohio

Columbus witnesses continued -

Alfons F. Maresh
Director of Education
State Department of Corrections
St. Paul, Minnesota

Milton McAngus
Director
Alvis House
Columbus, Ohio

Lane Murray
Director of Educational Programs
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

John P. Rash
Columbus, Ohio

Paul Reibel
Chief of Counseling
Ohio Bureau of Employment Studies
Columbus, Ohio

J.D. Ross
Acting Dean of Special Programs
Joliet Junior College
Joliet, Illinois

Audria M. Simpson
Coordinator
Home Economics Related Occupations
Cook County Temporary Juvenile
Detention Center
Chicago, Illinois

Janice E. Smith
Director of Education
Indiana Department of Corrections
Indianapolis, Indiana
with
Larry Fosler
Coordinator of Special Programs
State Board of Vocational Technical
Education
Indianapolis, Indiana

H. Cooper Snyder
Member
The State Senate
Columbus, Ohio

William J. Taylor
Manager
Education and Training Services
American Correctional Association
College Park, Maryland

Ray White
International President
Seventh Step Foundation, Inc.
Cincinnati, Ohio

Jack Willsey
Director of Education
Southern Michigan Correctional
Institution
Jackson, Michigan

November 27 - 28, 1979
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

PANEL

Allen Ault (Moderator)
Chairman
Criminal Justice Department
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

E.T. Borders
Member
South Carolina Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Columbia, South Carolina

John R. Erwin
Member and Hearings Chairperson
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Chicago, Illinois

Elie Jones
Member
Georgia Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Stone Mountain, Georgia

W. Asbury Stembridge
Member
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Macon, Georgia

WITNESSES

Clyde Arnspiger
Director of Educational Services
State Department of Offender
Rehabilitation
Atlanta, Georgia

James W. Brewton, Jr.
Acting Superintendent of
Educational Services
State Department of Youth Services
Columbia, South Carolina

P.A. Brodie
Manager of Industrial Relations
Refactories Division
Babcock & Wilcox
Augusta, Georgia

Delores L. Crockett
Regional Administrator
Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
Atlanta, Georgia

Richard A. Desrochers
Director
Youth Employment Programs
New York State Division of Youth
Albany, New York

David Fogel
Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Illinois at
Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois

George J. Greene
Atlanta, Georgia

Murry C. Gregg
Director
J.F. Ingram State Technical Institute
Deatsville, Alabama

Hugh L. Gordon
Director of Personnel
Lockheed-Georgia Company
Marietta, Georgia

Georgia witnesses continued -

Edmund J. Gubbins
Superintendent of Schools
Correctional Schools District
Hartford, Connecticut

T.P. Jones
Assistant Secretary for Programs
Florida Department of Corrections
Tallahassee, Florida
and
James A. Barge
Director of Special Programs
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Ollie Keller
Commissioner
Southeast Region
U.S. Parole Commission
Atlanta, Georgia

William E. Laite
President
William Laite Distributing Company
Macon, Georgia

Judith Magid
Attorney
Wayne County Legal Services
Detroit, Michigan

James Mahoney
Project Director
American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Donald Maley
Professor & Chairman
Industrial Education Department
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Eric Rice
Senior Research Analyst
Systems Sciences, Inc.
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

T.A. Ryan
Director of Planning, Implementation,
and Evaluation Programs
College of Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina

John Watkins
Commissioner
State Department of Corrections
Jackson, Mississippi

Anne Willer
Member
General Assembly
State of Illinois
Springfield, Illinois

Tony Williams
Marietta, Georgia

Jerry L. Wilson
Manager of Vocational Programs
Office of Career Development
Bureau of Corrections
Frankfort, Kentucky

February 21 - 22, 1980
Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

PANEL

James Barrum (Moderator)
Professor
Criminal Justice Department
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

John R. Erwin
Member and Hearings Chairperson
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Chicago, Illinois

Dorothy Robinson
Member
Texas Advisory Council on
Technical-Vocational Education
Palestine, Texas

Matt Savoren
Member
Colorado Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Salida, Colorado

Patricia M. Vasquez
Member
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Claremont, California

WITNESSES

John Armore
Vice President
Employment and Training Programs
National Alliance of Business
Washington, D.C.

Sandra W. Brandt
Area Representative
Human Resources Development
Institute
AFL-CIO
Norfolk, Virginia

W. J. Estelle, Jr.
Director
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas
and
Chris Tracy
Assistant Superintendent
Windham School District
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

Charles W. Fawns
Director
Education/Rehabilitation Programs
Dallas County Jail System
Department of Planning, Research
and Grants
Dallas County
Dallas, Texas

Robert Haag
Self-Employed
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Sam Harris
Regional Coordinator
Ex-Offender Programs
National Alliance of Business
Washington, D.C.

Harry Hubbard
President
Texas AFL-CIO
Austin, Texas

Texas witnesses continued -

Alton Ice
Former President
American Vocational Association
Austin, Texas

Thomas Knight
Vocational Training Director
Arkansas Department of Corrections
State Department of Education
Grady, Arkansas

Daniel Lopez
Executive Director
New Mexico Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Jeffrey Luftig
Associate Professor
Department of Industrial Technology
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Walter Martinez
Administrative Assistant
Representative Joseph Hernandez
Texas State Legislature
San Antonio, Texas

Sylvia McCollum
Education Administrator
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.
with
Richard Cassell
Education Administrator
South Central Region
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Dallas, Texas

William E. McCullough
Chief Consultant
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas
and
Maxia Ferris
Vocational Director
Windham School District
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

A.L. Nash
Personnel Manager
Electronic Devices Division
Rockwell International
Dallas, Texas

Donald Plemmons
Educational Specialist and
Vocational Programs Coordinator
Federal Correctional Institution
Fort Worth, Texas

Richel Rivers
Assistant Attorney General
State of Texas
Austin, Texas

Dorothy Shandera
Title I Bilingual Specialist and
Life Skills Education
Windham School District
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

Howard Skolnik
Superintendent of Correctional
Industries
State Department of Corrections
Springfield, Illinois

George L. Trabing
Program Director
Intro-Management Group
Houston, Texas

Wilhelmina Tribble
Director
Career Development for Women Offenders
Miami-Dade Community College
Miami, Florida

Raymond Van Buren
Administrator
CETA Prison Project
State Department of Corrections
Pine Bluff, Arkansas

Jack Van Sickle
Vocational Principal
Boys Training School
Eldora, Iowa

Texas witnesses continued -

Daniel E. Walton
Justice
178th District Court
Houston, Texas
with
Gerald Hall
Supervisor
Community Resources Division
Harris County Adult Probation
Department
Houston, Texas

Charles M. Whitson
Director
Criminal Justice Program
National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

March 13 -14, 1980
State Office Building
San Francisco, California

PANEL

John R. Erwin
Member and Hearings Chairperson
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Chicago, Illinois

Ruth Fedrau
Member
California Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
San Francisco, California

Carol S. Gibson
Chairperson
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
New York, New York

Raymond C. Parrott (Moderator)
Executive Director
National Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Washington, D.C.

John Wright
Member
Arizona Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Phoenix, Arizona

WITNESSES

Spurgeon Avakian
Justice
Superior Court of California
Oakland, California

Joe Botka
Chief Probation Officer
Juvenile Court
City and County of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Laura Bresler
Unitarian Universal Service
Committee
San Francisco, California

Martin Cano
Secretary
Board of Directors
California Congress of Ex-Offenders
Los Angeles, California

Carol Conger
Counselor
Project JOVE
San Diego, California

Henry Corrales
President
Mexican American Correctional
Association
Glendale, California

Raymond B. Curran
Executive Director
Safer Foundation
Chicago, Illinois

Lou Cushenberry
Project Director
California Congress of Ex-Offenders
Sacramento, California

Mark Dowie
Publisher
Mother Jones Magazine
San Francisco, California

Edward DuPont
Plant Manager
Twentieth Century Spring Manufacturing
Company
Santa Clara, California
with

California witnesses continued -

Rick Wagner
Veterans Manager
National Alliance of Business
Santa Clara, California

J.J. Enomoto
Director
Department of Corrections
Sacramento, California

John T. Evans
Vocational Director
Correctional Industries
Buena Vista, Colorado

Frederick Gibson
Director
California Correctional Services
The Salvation Army
Fresno, California
testifying for
Roy Rowland
Director
Illinois Correctional Services
The Salvation Army
Chicago, Illinois

Matthew Gill
Assistant Director
Department of Corrections
Cranston, Rhode Island

Gus Guichard
Executive Vice Chancellor
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California
with
Robert Tholl
Dean of Vocational Education
Ventura Community College
Ventura, California
and with
Dee Quinlan
Director of Programs
Ventura County Sheriff's Office
Ventura, California

Norma Phillips Lammers
Executive Officer
California Board of Corrections
Sacramento, California

John Maher
Co-President
DeLancy Street Foundation
San Francisco, California

Jan Marinissen
Criminal Justice Secretary
American Friends Service Committee
San Francisco, California
and
Joann Lee
Coordinator
Jail Moratorium Committee
American Friends Service Committee
San Francisco, California

Lloyd M. McCollough
President
Innovative Educational Systems
Fair Oaks, California

Barney Myers
Training Director
Joint Electrical-Apprenticeship and
Training Programs
Casper, Wyoming

Penny Nakatsu
Staff Attorney
Employment Law Center
San Francisco, California

Paul Phelps
Secretary
Department of Corrections
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
and
Cosby Joiner
Director
Memorial Area Vocational and
Technical School
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
and with
Gordon Florey
Member
Louisiana Advisory Council
on Vocational Education
Secretary-Treasurer
Louisiana AFL-CIO
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

California witnesses continued -

Caesar Smith
General Contractor
National Alliance of Business
San Francisco, California

Samuel W. Smith
Director of Special Projects
Division of Corrections
Salt Lake City, Utah

Pauline H. Tesler
Staff Attorney
National Center for Youth Law
San Francisco, California

Charles L. Toyebo, Jr.
Community Services Officer
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
Sacramento, California

Anthony P. Travisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association
College Park, Maryland

Pearl S. West
Director
Department of Youth Authority
Sacramento, California

SUMMARY OF REVIEW PANEL MEETING

In an effort to confirm that the findings of the hearings gave a comprehensive picture of the state of vocational education in American correctional institutions, the National Advisory Council asked authorities in the fields of criminal justice, correctional education, and education to review a draft of the report. Their comments were heard and noted at a meeting of the group held on February 6, 1981, in Washington, D.C.

The consensus of the group was that the report reflected the true state of correctional vocational education. Beyond general sentiments, the participants individually expressed their confidence in the veracity of the report. Most of the participants did, however, give suggestions for ways in which the report could be improved technically. Some, believing that the report in certain matters did not amplify the issues to the degree necessary, cited points in need of elaboration. Among the points these participants raised were:

- A recognition and explanation of the need for vocational education in local level institutions, i.e., jails, and of the importance and breadth of local level involvement by the community leaders in the criminal justice system;
- More discussion of the developmental disabilities of some incarcerated juveniles and adults and the role of vocational education in serving them;
- More examples of model programs inside and outside prisons that are efficient and effective in making use of existing resources; and,
- Elaboration on the problems of juveniles and the special difficulties encountered in providing vocational education to young offenders.

The National Advisory Council reviewed all of the suggestions the participants gave and, where appropriate worked them into the present report. Concern for maintaining the integrity of the original testimony made it difficult to incorporate every recommended change.

A list of the participants of the February 6, 1981 meeting follows.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE REVIEW PANEL OF NACVE's REPORT ON THE STATUS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Thomas Baxter
Director of Continuing Education
Texas Department of Corrections
Huntsville, Texas

Allen F. Breed
Director
National Institute of Corrections
Washington, D.C.

William Eckert
Senior Researcher
A.D. Little, Inc,
Washington, D.C.

David V. Evans
Staff Member
U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
Washington, D.C.

Thom Gehring
Rehabilitative School Authority
Richmond, Virginia

Deborah Kahn
Assistant Director
National Coalition for Jail Reform
Washington, D.C.

John F. Knoll
Assistant Directo: of Programs
Bexar County Jail
San Antonio, Texas

John Linton
Director of Correctional Education
Maryland Department of Education
Baltimore, Maryland

Jim Mahoney
Project Director
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Sylvia McCollum
Education Administrator
U.S. Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

Garry Mendez
Associate Director of Criminal Justice
National Urban League
New York, New York

Skip Mullaney
Executive Director
Offender Aid and Restoration
Charlottesville, Virginia

Donald Murray
Director of the Criminal Justice Program
National Association of Counties
Washington, D.C.

Arthur L. Paddock
Professor
Department of Corrections
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois

Melvena Sherard
Research Coordinator
American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research
Washington, D.C.

Steven Steurer
Title I Coordinator
Maryland State Department of Education
Baltimore, Maryland

William Taylor
Manager of Education and Training Services
American Correctional Association
College Park, Maryland

Anthony P. Travisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association
College Park, Maryland

Ralph Veerman
Vice President
Prison Fellowship
Washington, D.C.

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1981 523-562/191 1-3