

# THE WORKING POOR FAMILIES PROJECT

POLICY BRIEF ■ SUMMER 2009

## STRENGTHENING CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

Anne Roder, Economic Mobility Corporation<sup>1</sup>

### THE WORKING POOR FAMILIES PROJECT

Strengthening State Policies for  
America's Working Poor

Millions of American breadwinners work hard to support their families. But, despite their determination and effort, many are mired in low-wage jobs that provide inadequate benefits and offer few opportunities for advancement. In fact, more than one out of four American working families now earn wages so low that they have difficulty surviving financially.<sup>2</sup>

Launched in 2002 and currently supported by the Annie E. Casey, Ford, Joyce, and Mott foundations, the Working Poor Families Project is a national initiative that works to improve these economic conditions. The project partners with state nonprofit organizations and supports their policy efforts to better prepare America's working families for a more secure economic future.

For more information:  
[www.workingpoorfamilies.org](http://www.workingpoorfamilies.org)

### INTRODUCTION

Prison and jail populations have grown significantly over the past three decades due to federal and state policies that impose mandatory prison terms and longer minimum sentences for repeat offenders.<sup>3</sup> As of mid-2008, over 1.6 million people were in state or federal prisons. About 600,000 individuals are released from state prisons each year. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, at least 95 percent of all state prisoners will be released from prison at some point.<sup>4</sup>

Inmates in state prisons have significantly lower levels of educational attainment than the general population. About 40 percent of state prison inmates lack a high school diploma or GED<sup>5</sup> compared to 13.7 percent of all adults ages 18 to 64.<sup>6</sup> Only 11 percent of state inmates have taken any college-level or postsecondary vocational classes.<sup>7</sup> According to results from the National Adult Literacy Survey, prisoners also have a substantially lower level of literacy than the U.S. population as a whole.<sup>8</sup> Prior to incarceration, prison inmates are more likely than the general population to be unemployed and to be living in poverty.<sup>9</sup>

Educational programming has been a part of the U.S. prison system throughout its history. Support for prison education programs reached its peak during the 1970s when policymakers viewed education as an important part of prisoners' rehabilitation. However, support among policymakers and the public waned in the 1980s and funding for education in prisons underwent significant cuts.<sup>10</sup> A recent survey of leaders in the correctional education field suggests that attitudes are turning back from emphasizing punishment to rehabilitation.<sup>11</sup> About half of federal and state inmates released on parole are reincarcerated within three years.<sup>12</sup> The rationale for correctional education is that improving inmates' academic and occupational skills while in prison improves the likelihood that they will obtain employment or continue their education when they are released, reducing recidivism rates as well as fiscal and social costs.

**THE WORKING POOR FAMILIES PROJECT (WFPF)** supports the efforts of nonprofit organizations to strengthen state policies that can help low-income workers achieve economic security and become productive participants in the local economy. While the available evidence on correctional education is not definitive, numerous reviews of existing studies have concluded that correctional education reduces recidivism and improves employment outcomes. Increasingly, states are looking to strengthen their reentry efforts so that inmates are ready for employment upon release, and correctional education is an essential part of these efforts. The growth in the prison population and budget deficits present significant challenges to states interested in improving correctional education. Yet strengthening correctional education has the potential to reduce costs in the long-term while improving the economic success of low-income individuals. This report describes the current system and offers recommendations about what can be done at the state level to strengthen correctional education.

## **THE CURRENT CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEM**

Correctional facilities for adults within a state include federal prisons administered by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, local jails administered by counties and cities, and state prisons administered by state departments of corrections. This report focuses on educational programming in state prisons. Some states have centralized correctional systems while others have separate agencies that oversee probation, parole, jails and prisons. Most correctional education programs are administered by a central office in the state department of corrections, though some states administer them through the department of education or contract out for these services.<sup>13</sup> While there is no consensus about which structure is best, the states that are often featured in discussions of best practices have strong partnerships between the department of corrections and department of education.

## **MOST STATE PRISONS HAVE SOME TYPE OF EDUCATION PROGRAMMING AVAILABLE**

As of 2000, 91 percent of state prisons had some type of educational program.<sup>14</sup> Correctional education programming consists of a variety of forms of instruction, including:

- ◆ Adult Basic Education, instruction in basic math and reading comprehension for individuals who test below a high school level
- ◆ English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction
- ◆ Secondary education to work toward a high school diploma or preparation for the General Education Development (GED) exam
- ◆ Vocational training to develop skills needed for a particular occupation or industry
- ◆ College courses

The type of educational programs available varies by state and by institutions within states. Table 1 presents the percentage of state prisons offering each type of instruction in 2000. Adult basic education and secondary education are more commonly offered than post-secondary education or training.

In addition to education and training programming, many states operate prison industries, which offer inmates an opportunity to work in a particular industry while incarcerated. The intention of prison industry programs has traditionally been to keep inmates occupied and to provide a source of revenue for the prison system rather than to increase inmates' job skills.<sup>15</sup> The potential does exist for prison systems to structure prison industry programs so that inmates learn critical job skills and make connections to prospective employers.

**Table 1. Primary Educational Services Offered by State Prisons**

	Percent of State Prisons Offering Program	Percent of All State Prison Inmates Participating
Any educational program	91%	52%
Basic adult education	80%	3%
Secondary education/GED	83%	23%
Vocational training	55%	32%
College coursework	26%	10%

Source: Harlow, Caroline Wolf. *Education and Correctional Populations*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, 2003. Details do not add to total because facilities may have more than one program and inmates may participate in more than one program.

### PARTICIPATION RATES DO NOT MATCH THE APPARENT NEED

Despite the availability of programs, participation rates are low relative to the apparent need among inmates for education and skills (Table 1). In 1997, just over half (52 percent) of inmates in state prisons participated in some type of educational program, including 54 percent of inmates who did not have a high school diploma.<sup>16</sup> It is not known whether the lack of participation is due to a lack of programs, prisoners choosing not to participate, or prisoners being placed on waiting lists.<sup>17</sup> One survey of adult male medium security state prisons found that 56 percent of facilities had waiting lists for adult education, which suggests that lack of capacity is a problem.<sup>18</sup> Inmates' participation rates also vary by state. A 2004 study found that nearly all of the 44 states surveyed offered some post-secondary education or training programs. However, just 14 states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons accounted for 89 percent of all inmates enrolled in such programs.<sup>19</sup>

### THE NUMBER OF STATES MANDATING PARTICIPATION IS INCREASING

Some states mandate that certain inmates attend education courses for a specified period of time or until they attain a credential. Typically, mandated populations include those who score below a certain level on a standardized test or those who are under a certain age. The Federal Bureau of Prisons mandates that inmates without a high school diploma or GED participate in literacy programs for a minimum of 240 hours or until they obtain a GED, and more states are moving toward this model. The achievement level chosen affects whether programs emphasize literacy or GED preparation.<sup>20</sup> As of 2002, 44 percent of states had passed mandatory requirements.<sup>21</sup> Some states, including those with mandatory and voluntary policies, offer incentives for participation, including higher wages in prison jobs or a reduction in the number of days inmates are required to serve, contingent upon good behavior.<sup>22</sup> An analysis has not been completed to date of whether states with mandatory policies tend to invest more in correctional education or are able to serve all mandated prisoners.

### STATE DATA FOR ASSESSING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE IS LIMITED

State corrections agencies collect a significant amount of data about inmates but information that would enable administrators or policymakers to assess program performance is limited.<sup>23</sup> Other than GED attainment, states generally do not collect data on program completion or educational attainment among inmates participating in correctional education. State correctional databases are not typically linked to other state databases that would enable administrators to assess former inmates' employment and educational outcomes. The systems also make it difficult to determine what percentage of the eligible prison population is receiving services and the reasons why inmates do not receive services.

Current tracking and reporting of inmate characteristics, types of programs, participation rates, completion rates and costs are inconsistent

across states. Some states cannot separate out educational program costs from operational costs and cannot provide details about how correctional education is funded or what the total costs are. States vary in how they classify and count facilities and use different classification schemes for the types of programs they offer. Reported levels of participation are not comparable across states due to differences in when participation is measured (for example, at the beginning or end of classes). The lack of comparability across states impedes the use of state data to identify effective practices and inform policy decisions.

## FUNDING

Funding for correctional education comes from a mix of federal, state and private sources. States fund correctional education through appropriations to state departments of corrections, labor and education. Costs may also be subsidized by wages earned by inmates in prison employment. Private sources include payments by inmates and their families as well as scholarships sponsored by private foundations. Given the variety of sources and that staff costs from non-corrections agencies may not be allocated to corrections education budgets, it is difficult to determine the amount spent on correctional education.<sup>24</sup>

One Bureau of Justice Statistics report estimated that state expenditures on prison programming in 1996 totaled \$1.2 billion, including both educational and non-educational programs. This amounted to 6 percent of state prison operating expenditures and an average amount spent of \$1,196 per inmate per year.<sup>25</sup> More recent national estimates are not available. Another report reveals that national averages mask significant variation across states in spending on educational programming, which ranged from \$2,500 to a few dollars per inmate in 1994.<sup>26</sup>

Federal funding for correctional education has decreased since the 1960s. States receive federal funding through the Basic State Grant for Adult Education through the Office of Vocational and

Adult Education (OVAE) as part of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (AEFLA), Title II of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). Grants are made to state agencies based on the number of people age 16 and over who do not have a high school diploma and are not enrolled in school. States must match at least 25 percent with state or local funds and distribute funds to local organizations for basic education, special education, ESL and secondary school credit.<sup>27</sup> The 1998 WIA legislation limits states to spending no more than 10 percent of their Basic State Grant in state institutions, including corrections.<sup>28</sup> In 2004 states spent \$30,358,522 on institutional programs, or an average of 5.64 percent of their Basic State Grant, down from 11.8 percent in 1997. Thirty-five states spent less than 8 percent.<sup>29</sup> It is not possible to determine how much federal money is spent on adults because some funds are used to serve juveniles.

AEFLA and the Individuals with Disabilities Act require that correctional institutions provide education services to inmates under the age of 22 who have disabilities and accommodate students with disabilities of all ages. However, states fall short in meeting these needs.<sup>30</sup>

States may also apply to OVAE for funding through the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Act, reauthorized in 2006. Funds are allocated to state vocational education agencies or workforce development boards, which distribute the funds to secondary and post-secondary schools and other institutions that offer vocational training. States may spend no more than one percent of these funds on programs in correctional institutions and some states invest less than this amount.<sup>31</sup> At this time it is not possible to track the amount of Perkins funds spent on correctional education.<sup>32</sup>

The Workplace and Community Transition Training for Incarcerated Youthful Offenders (IYO) grant program gives states block grants to help state prison systems fund post-secondary education or vocational training programs for inmates age 25 and younger who are within 5 years of release. Prior to 1994, Pell Grants, or loans to qualified

students for post-secondary education, had been available to prisoners. However, the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act made prison inmates ineligible for federal Pell Grants.<sup>33</sup>

A 2003-2004 survey of states found that IYO is the most commonly used source of funding for post-secondary education (used by 83 percent of states) followed by self-payment (56 percent) and state appropriations (47 percent). Some states provide formula funding to public colleges and universities based on the number of incarcerated students they serve. Other state corrections officials are prohibited from using state funds for post-secondary education for prisoners. Thirty-nine percent of states report using private donations or scholarships sponsored by colleges to fund post-secondary education. Oregon and Minnesota have established private nonprofit foundations that raise money to support post-secondary education programs. In Oregon, the foundation funds 26 percent of the state's prisoners who are enrolled in college courses.<sup>34</sup>

Data suggest that the sources of funding for post-secondary correctional education are related to enrollment levels. State prison systems that primarily rely on state appropriations to fund post-secondary education and training are more likely to have high levels of enrollment than prison systems that rely primarily on other sources. Conversely, state prison systems that primarily rely on prisoner self-funding are more likely to have low levels of enrollment in post-secondary education and training than states that primarily rely on other sources.<sup>35</sup>

## STATE POLICY OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING PROGRAM QUALITY

Correctional education officials and researchers have identified a number of best practices in correctional education to improve the success of these efforts in increasing inmates' skills so that they are better prepared for work or further education upon release. The following are

programmatic and policy actions states can take to improve the quality of correctional education and increase participation.

### ASSESS INMATES' NEEDS AND OFFER A VARIETY OF PROGRAMS THAT MEET THOSE NEEDS

Inmates' literacy and education levels vary greatly. Upon incarceration, many inmates will require basic education classes to improve their skills prior to entering a program that confers a degree or credential, some will be ready to prepare to take the GED exam, and others will be eligible for post-secondary education or training. States should assess inmates' skills and needs upon entry into the prison system and match them with appropriate programs.

- ♦ The Oregon Department of Corrections Transitional Services Unit assesses inmates' risk factors at intake and develops an incarceration and transition plan to address these factors, which may include participation in education and work programs.<sup>36</sup>

### TARGET VOCATIONAL TRAINING TO OCCUPATIONS WHERE EX-OFFENDERS CAN OBTAIN JOBS

States can improve the success and value of their education and vocational training programs by targeting occupations where there is demand and where individuals with criminal records can obtain jobs. States should also ensure that vocational training programs teach skills that are needed in the labor market. The problem with many vocational training or prison work programs is that they teach only general skills and not those needed to get a certain job.<sup>37</sup> States should review and update the curricula they use for education and training to ensure that it meets employers' needs. Training programs should enable inmates to earn credentials that are recognized by employers. Programs should also connect training participants with employers to facilitate the interviewing and hiring process.

- ♦ In Texas, Project RIO is a partnership between the Texas Workforce Commission

(TWC) and the Texas Department of Criminal Justice that seeks to tailor programming to the needs of prisoners and the labor market.<sup>38</sup> Employment specialists in the prisons use the TWC database of labor market information and arrange for specific employers to visit individuals in prison. Project RIO staff members also work with the Windham School District, which provides education services in the prisons, on curriculum development.

- ◆ In Louisiana, the Department of Corrections based the welding curriculum at the Hunt Correctional Facility on the technical training provided by the area's largest employer, Avondale Shipyards, so that individuals who complete the program are strong candidates for job openings upon release. The employer recruits job candidates and conducts skills assessments at the correctional facility.<sup>39</sup>

#### STRUCTURE PROGRAMS TO EMPHASIZE EARNING CREDENTIALS, NOT JUST PARTICIPATION

States should structure programs and incentive systems to encourage attainment of a credential prior to release and not just participation in classes or improvement in skill level. Programs must be of sufficient length to address inmates' needs and enable them to earn a credential, such as a GED or vocational certificate.<sup>40</sup> Correctional institutions should consider program length and be sure to time participation so that inmates have sufficient time to earn a credential prior to their release. States may also need to reduce the number of involuntary transfers between facilities to enable individuals to complete the programs they are attending.

#### PARTNER WITH COMMUNITY COLLEGES

In order to increase participation in post-secondary education, state corrections agencies should create partnerships with community colleges and universities. Community colleges are key partners given their location throughout a state and their mission to provide broad access to education.<sup>41</sup> States should develop partnerships so that inmates

can earn college credits and continue their education upon release. Corrections agencies can also partner with community colleges for basic education as instructors have experience teaching remedial education.

- ◆ In North Carolina, the Department of Correction (DOC) and the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) have a partnership that enables the state to offer post-secondary education in most of its prisons. In 2003-2004, two-thirds of prisoners who had a high school diploma or GED enrolled in post-secondary education. DOC provides the classrooms and lab equipment while the NCCCS hires and pays instructors and receives formula funding from the state based on the number of student contact hours. The costs of textbooks are divided between the agencies.

The state emphasizes short-term vocational certificate and degree programs to increase the number of inmates who can participate and earn a credential prior to release. Both DOC and NCCCS staff must approve courses based on labor market demand, availability of space, and average length of sentence in a facility. The certificates and degrees are identical to those offered outside of prison.<sup>42</sup> The DOC/NCCCS Interagency Committee on Correctional Education meets biannually to guide this effort, share information, discuss implementation issues, and create resolutions to remove obstacles to continued program development.<sup>43</sup>

#### ASSESS THE NEED FOR AND PROVIDE ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

In 1997, only 1.2 percent of state prison inmates participated in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. Data are not available on the number of English language learners in state prisons. Administrators tend to use the percentage of non-citizens (4.7 percent of state prisoners in 2008) as a proxy but this measure is not reliable as some non-citizens are native-English speakers and

some English language learners are U.S. citizens. States should collect information about inmates' native language and English skills at the point of intake and assess their need for ESL instruction so that appropriate instruction can be provided. The North Carolina Department of Correction offers ESL classes at each of its 15 prisons that house non-English speaking inmates. These prisons also have books and journals in other languages, and some offer services in other languages. In some of the prison schools, inmates are able to take the GED exam in Spanish, although inmates are encouraged to learn English.<sup>44</sup>

### INCREASE STATE SUPPORT FOR ADULT BASIC AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The lack of standardized reporting on program offerings and costs across states makes it difficult to determine which states have been most successful in providing basic and secondary education to inmates and how they have done so. States can allocate the maximum amount of federal Basic State Grant funds allowed under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act to state institutions for adult basic education (currently 10 percent). States that have strong partnerships between the corrections and education departments are often cited in discussions of best practices in correctional education. The case of Texas illustrates such a partnership.

- ◆ The Texas Legislature established the Windham School District (WSD) in 1969 to provide basic education, vocational training and post-secondary classes to individuals incarcerated in state prisons. The district is headed by a superintendent and reports to a school board made up of members of the Texas Board of Criminal Justice. In FY 2008 about 82,500 offenders received educational services through the WSD. Sixty-nine percent of prisoners released that year had participated in at least one educational program while incarcerated. The district is funded largely through state appropriations to the Texas Education Agency on a formula basis. Other sources of funding include General Revenue

appropriations for the Department of Criminal Justice, federal grants for adult basic education and vocational training, and agreements or contracts with the Division of Continuing Education and the Texas Workforce Commission for post-secondary education, vocational training and job search assistance.<sup>45-46</sup>

### INCREASE STATE SUPPORT FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

States with higher levels of enrollment in post-secondary education tend to receive funding from direct appropriations to the state corrections agency for this purpose and through other forms of state support, including the following.<sup>47</sup>

- ◆ States can ensure that public colleges and universities are able to include incarcerated students in the head counts used for state formula funding.
- ◆ States can require colleges that receive state support to provide classes and services to inmates and support this effort by covering the equipment costs inside facilities.
- ◆ States can allocate the maximum amount of federal Perkins funds allowed to correctional institutions for vocational training (currently 1 percent).
- ◆ Even though prisoners are not eligible for federal Pell Grants, states can make incarcerated students eligible for need-based state financial aid. Prisons should provide workshops on completing the application forms prior to state deadlines. In Texas, 5 percent of funding for post-secondary education comes from Texas Public Education grants that are provided through public colleges and universities that offer instruction in state prisons.
- ◆ States can make incarcerated individuals eligible for other state education initiatives. California serves inmates through the Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) program, which targets

students who face social and economic barriers to academic success, to cover the costs of books and counseling.

- ◆ Texas allows incarcerated students to take out loans that they must pay back as part of their parole.

### USE TECHNOLOGY TO INCREASE PARTICIPATION

States can use distance learning technology to increase participation in education programs, including college courses. In Iowa, incarcerated individuals participate, at their own expense, in online courses with community and private colleges over the Iowa Communication Network. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction uses interactive videoconferencing technology that enables prisoners to take part in distance education programs.<sup>48</sup> Once distance learning classes are established, the cost of adding students is minimal. One obstacle to increasing distance learning is that some states have prohibitions against inmates' use of computers. In New Mexico, inmates may take part in internet-based college classes but they are not able to access the internet to send email or view external websites. Corrections personnel pass messages between instructors and students.<sup>49</sup>

### MANDATE PARTICIPATION OR INSTITUTE AN INCENTIVE SYSTEM

States may enact policies or laws mandating work or training during incarceration. Typically, states that mandate education target individuals who test below a certain grade level on basic skills tests or who do not have a high school diploma or GED. Some states may be reluctant to mandate participation in education due to the cost implications of providing services to all eligible inmates. An analysis has not been done of whether states with mandatory programs are able to serve all eligible inmates and whether these states have better outcomes. Research indicates that mandated participants have similar achievement rates as voluntary participants.<sup>50</sup>

States may also implement incentives for participation in educational programming.

- ◆ In Oregon, the Department of Corrections has implemented the Performance Recognition and Award System that provides prisoners monetary awards and privileges to encourage participation in the educational or other programs included in their corrections and transition plans.
- ◆ Through a partnership with the Department of Labor (DOL), the North Carolina Department of Correction offers inmates DOL certification as journeymen-laborers after completing classroom instruction and a period of work within a corrections industry. Participants may also earn incentive wages and production bonuses for their work.<sup>51</sup>

### MAKE SKILL ATTAINMENT THE GOAL OF PRISON INDUSTRY PROGRAMS

States should structure prison industry programs so that they help inmates develop skills that will be useful to them when they seek employment post-release. Michigan reorganized its corrections system to make the Office of Employment Readiness responsible for academic and vocational programming as well as its MI State Industries work program for prisoners. The goal is to make the state prison industries a training ground for building inmates' employment readiness and occupational skills.<sup>52</sup> One model program is the state's Prison BUILD Program, which teaches inmates skills in the building trades by building parts for modular housing units that are shipped statewide for assembly at Habitat for Humanity construction sites.<sup>53</sup>

### COLLECT BETTER DATA ON PROGRAMS, PARTICIPATION, OUTCOMES AND COSTS

In order to understand the outcomes of correctional education programs, identify best practices and determine the costs of effective programming, states should improve their capacity to collect data and adopt a standard reporting framework to facilitate meaningful cross-state comparisons. The Office of Correctional Education in the U.S. Department of Education sponsored the

development of a correctional education data guidebook (available online at [www.cedatanetwork.org](http://www.cedatanetwork.org)) to help state agencies develop a data collection system that will provide standardized, policy relevant information. Key indicators include the educational needs of inmates, the types of education programs offered, data about the number and characteristics of inmates who participate, daily attendance, program completion, degree or credential attainment, improvement in basic skills, post-release outcomes, program costs and sources of funding. In addition, state correctional agencies may find it useful to connect their data systems with the evolving state longitudinal K-20 education data systems in order to effectively track post-incarceration education activities.<sup>54</sup>

## CONCLUSION

This brief provides some policy and programmatic options states can take to strengthen correctional education programs with the goal of improving the economic success of incarcerated individuals upon release. Past studies of correctional education programs have been criticized for their inability to account for important differences between inmates who choose to participate in education and those who do not. New efforts should be made to conduct rigorous evaluations of correctional education programs in order to improve program performance and increase support for effective programs. In the meantime, several reviews of the existing evidence conclude that correctional education contributes to reduced recidivism rates and improved employment outcomes.

Strengthening correctional education requires that states commit the needed resources to address inmates' needs and that the wardens and superintendents of prisons encourage and enforce attendance in educational programs. Such efforts require a commitment to viewing corrections as a means of rehabilitation and not merely a form of punishment. The fact that most state inmates will be released from prison one day and that many lack the basic education and job skills needed to succeed in the economy support state investment in strengthening correctional education.

## WORKING POOR FAMILIES PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Assess Inmates' Needs and Offer a Variety of Programs That Meet Those Needs
- 2) Target Vocational Training to Occupations Where Ex-Offenders Can Obtain Jobs
- 3) Structure Programs to Emphasize Earning Credentials, Not Just Participation
- 4) Partner with Community Colleges
- 5) Assess the Need for and Provide English as a Second Language Instruction
- 6) Increase State Support for Adult Basic and Secondary Education
- 7) Increase State Support for Post-Secondary Education and Training
- 8) Use Technology to Increase Participation
- 9) Mandate Participation or Institute an Incentive System
- 10) Make Skill Attainment the Goal of Prison Industry Programs
- 11) Collect Better Data on Programs, Participation, Outcomes and Costs

For questions about this policy brief or the Working Poor Families Project contact:  
Brandon Roberts  
[robert3@starpower.net](mailto:robert3@starpower.net)  
(301) 657-1480

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Anne Roder is Vice President for Research and Evaluation at the Economic Mobility Corporation. Thanks to Don Baylor, Center for Public Policy Priorities, Stephen Jackson, North Carolina Budget and Tax Center, Rebecca Kusner, Community Research Partners, Jeff Padden, Public Policy Associates, and Deborah Povich and Brandon Roberts, Working Poor Families Project for their review and comments on this piece.

<sup>2</sup> Brandon Roberts and Deborah Povich. *Still Working Hard, Still Falling Short: New Findings on the Challenges Confronting America's Working Families*, Working Poor Families Project, October 2008, p.i.

<sup>3</sup> Richard Coley and Paul Barton, *Locked Up and Locked Out: An Educational Perspective on the U.S. Prison Population* (Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 2006).

<sup>4</sup> Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Reentry Trends in the U.S.* (<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/reentry/releases.htm>).

<sup>5</sup> Caroline Wolf Harlow, *Education and Correctional Populations* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, 2003).

<sup>6</sup> Working Poor Families Project. 2009. Analysis of the American Community Survey 2007. (<http://www.workingpoorfamilies.org/indicators.html>).

<sup>7</sup> Harlow, *Education and Correctional Populations*.

<sup>8</sup> Coley and Barton, *Locked Up and Locked Out*.

<sup>9</sup> Wendy Erisman and Jeanne Bayer Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism: A 50-State Analysis of Postsecondary Correctional Education Policy* (The Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2005).

<sup>10</sup> Anna Crayton and Suzanna Rebecca Neusteter, *The Current State of Correctional Education* (New York: Prisoner Reentry Institute, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 2008).

<sup>11</sup> Gail Spangenberg, *Current Issues in Correctional Education: A Compilation and Discussion* (New York: Council for Advancement of Adult Literacy, 2004).

<sup>12</sup> Michelle Tolbert, *State Correctional Education Programs: State Policy Update* (National Institute for Literacy, 2002).

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Harlow, *Education and Correctional Populations*.

<sup>15</sup> Sarah Lawrence, et al, *The Practice and Promise of Prison Programming* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center, 2002).

<sup>16</sup> Harlow, *Education and Correctional Populations*.

<sup>17</sup> Crayton and Neusteter, *The Current State of Correctional Education*.

<sup>18</sup> Tolbert, *State Correctional Education Programs*.

<sup>19</sup> Erisman and Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism*.

<sup>20</sup> Tolbert, *State Correctional Education Programs*.

<sup>21</sup> Jerry McGlone. *Status of Mandatory Education in State Correctional Institutions* (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, 2002).

<sup>22</sup> Coley and Barton, *Locked Up and Locked Out*.

<sup>23</sup> Steven Klein and Michelle Tolbert. "Correctional Education: Getting the Data We Need." (*The Journal of Correctional Education* 58(3):284-292, 2007).

<sup>24</sup> Coley and Barton, *Locked Up and Locked Out*.

<sup>25</sup> Steven Klein et al. *Correctional Education: Assessing the Status of Prison Programs and Information Needs* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, 2004).

<sup>26</sup> Coley and Barton, *Locked Up and Locked Out*.

<sup>27</sup> Erisman and Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism*.

<sup>28</sup> Prior to 1998 states were required to spend a minimum of 10 percent in state institutions.

<sup>29</sup> Crayton and Neusteter, *The Current State of Correctional Education*.

<sup>30</sup> Tolbert, *State Correctional Education Programs*.

<sup>31</sup> Coley and Barton, *Locked Up and Locked Out*.

<sup>32</sup> Crayton and Neusteter, *The Current State of Correctional Education*.

<sup>33</sup> Coley and Barton, *Locked Up and Locked Out*.

<sup>34</sup> Erisman and Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism*.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> For more information, see [http://www.oregon.gov/DOC/PUBAFF/oam\\_welcome.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/DOC/PUBAFF/oam_welcome.shtml)

<sup>37</sup> Lawrence, et al, *The Practice and Promise of Prison Programming*.

<sup>38</sup> Reentry Policy Council, *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council: Charting the Safe and Successful Return of Prisoners to the Community* (New York: Council of State Governments, 2005).

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.

<sup>40</sup> Reentry Policy Council, *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council*. Lawrence, *The Practice and Promise*.

<sup>41</sup> Erisman and Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism*. Lawrence, *The Practice and Promise*. Reentry Policy Council, *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council*.

<sup>42</sup> Erisman and Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism*. Jeanne Contardo and Michelle Tolbert, *Prison Postsecondary Education: Bridging Learning from Incarceration to the Community* (New York: Prisoner Reentry Institute, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 2008).

<sup>43</sup> North Carolina Department of Correction Educational Services Annual Report Calendar Year 2007. (<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/education/newsletters/AnnRep07.pdf>).

<sup>44</sup> North Carolina Department of Correction Educational

Services Annual Report Calendar Year 2007.  
(<http://www.doc.state.nc.us/dop/education/newsletters/AnnRep07.pdf>).

<sup>45</sup> Windham School District Annual Performance Report 2007–2008  
(<http://www.windhamschooldistrict.org/PDF/APR.pdf>).

<sup>46</sup> For the 2010-2011 funding cycle, funding for the Windham School District is down 10 percent from 2003 levels, while Project RIO has seen steady increases over the last several years to \$10.8 million per year in the current funding cycle. (Communication from WPPF's Texas partner, July 2009).

<sup>47</sup> The suggestions for funding post-secondary correctional education are based on recommendations in Erisman and Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism*.

<sup>48</sup> Erisman and Contardo, *Learning to Reduce Recidivism*.

<sup>49</sup> Doris Layton MacKenzi. *Structure and Components of Successful Educational Programs*. (New York: Re-entry Roundtable on Education, March 31 and April 1, 2008).

<sup>50</sup> Kimberly McCabe. "Mandatory versus Voluntary Prison Education and Academic Achievement." (*The Prison Journal* 74(4):450-461, 1994).

<sup>51</sup> Reentry Policy Council, *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council*.

<sup>52</sup> Communication from Jeff Padden to Brandon Roberts, July 29, 2009.

<sup>53</sup> MI Department of Corrections, Office of Employment Readiness, *OER Network News*, Winter Issue 2009.  
([http://www.michigan.gov/documents/msi/OER\\_Newsletter-Winter\\_Issue\\_09\\_268560\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/msi/OER_Newsletter-Winter_Issue_09_268560_7.pdf))

<sup>54</sup> For more on state K-20 education student data systems see <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/slds/>.