

New Programs that Can Help Develop “An Army of Change Agents” to Improve Our Field

Abstract

The Center for the Study of Correctional Education at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) has been developing capabilities to address a problem that is central to our field: correctional educators have little or no access to information about correctional education—its history, literature, and best practices. Faculty associated with the Center have acquired an extensive collection of reference materials and prepared texts to help correctional teachers learn the social/cultural and historical context of their work. The Center is planning to begin new online courses, a new master’s degree in correctional and alternative education in Fall, 2006; a new Ph.D. program in correctional education, probably in Fall, 2008; and reference tools to support both. This article explains the needs which resulted in these initiatives, and some attributes of the new resources. A note at the end explains how to contact Program staff for additional information. The purpose of the article is to generate interest in establishing an “army of change agents” who would be willing and able to improve and consolidate the field of correctional education.

Introduction

Probably no element of the correctional education scene is more negative, more lacking, than that of professional status. If the educational process is to play any role at all in the rehabilitation of the inmate (or the change of correctional systems), it must have a professional status. This is its greatest lack and, at the same time, the resource with the greatest overall potential for a major breakthrough in penal systems. (Reagen and Stoughton, 1976 Report for the Ford Foundation, p. 27).

Correctional educators respond in different ways to this lack of professional status.

Sometimes they are influenced by situations specific to their site: an administrator who emphasizes or de-emphasizes the role education can play in helping inmates turn their lives around, a faculty that sees itself as either teachers or as workers in a bureaucracy, etc. Some correctional educators note that policy and practice reveal disrespect for the program and respond with an “I won’t care” attitude. Others see the same problem and respond with a social activist orientation, networking to build alliances for improvement. Many correctional educators neglect their own professional needs to focus on student learning. Others struggle to gain clarity about the work so they can maximize teaching and learning effectiveness. Some function like “walking, talking commercials for education,” hooked on learning for themselves as well as for students. This

article is for those who see education as reciprocal—“what’s good for the students in my class is good for me, even though I have to learn things that are different from what they have to learn right now.”

One thing that tends to unite correctional educators is the need to defend institutional programs. The education of the marginalized has been marginalized education. Conditions for teaching within the institutions can be so hostile and tenuous that, even when correctional education advocates are successful in a “battle,” powerful opponents ensure that they lose the “war.” Many of the systems that employ us do not value our services, and outside audiences sometimes just make things worse. This lack of support impacts most of us. Many feel alone and redouble their efforts—typically by aligning their own personal priorities with their professional aspirations for teaching and learning. However, none of us is really alone; correctional educators uniformly experience the same poor conditions at work. And when the systems that employ us will not support the program to the extent that it deserves, we can still support each other. In recognition of all this we need to prepare together for a protracted effort to advocate and improve institutional education programs. We need an army of change agents.

Several assumptions to the “education is an effective strategy to improve the human condition” approach are as applicable to institutional teachers as to inmate students. For example, one can assume that (a) learning has different purposes at different times in one’s life, (b) it is more engaging to be in the company of classmates engaged in self-development than with people who are not, and (c) everyone can benefit from being in the presence of a good teacher, working with useful instructional materials. Another central assumption is that (d) the more one pursues purposeful education, the more one’s life can be infused with personal purpose. This concept is developed in Figure 1, according to the “centers of gravity” of successive levels of education.

Figure 1: Generalized or Typical Sentiments of Educator Abilities, by Academic Development

<u>Education</u>	<u>Ethics</u>	<u>Clarity</u>	<u>Time Management</u>	<u>Praxis</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u>	<u>Efficiency</u>	<u>Confidence</u>	<u>Cooperation</u>	<u>Access</u>	<u>Audiences</u>
<u>Tier One Basic Level of Education</u>	‘Often self- or ego-centered: “What’s in it for me?”’	“I have a good education, but life is still mysterious.”	“I feel fragmented —‘so many responsibilities.’”	Theory and practice are different; “I am practical.”	“Hit or miss” record, intermittent periods of productivity.	Simple tasks always seem to require protracted labor, personal energy.	Many personal insecurities are experienced as tangible obstacles.	“My job at this point is to follow orders.”	Feelings of disempowerment; “No one attends —am I invisible?”	“I have to struggle to get my voice heard.”
<u>Tier Two Intermediate Level of Education</u>	Student centered (ego still strong, plus recognition that the work must emphasize student learning).	“There’s still so much to learn. But I am beginning to understand my purpose, my life work.”	“When I can manage my schedule so I have blocks of time, I can accomplish really great things.”	“Some of these theories are relevant at my workplace; they confirm and empower me.”	“Some great accomplishments have been experienced, but at great physical and emotional cost.”	Some tasks can be accomplished quickly, but others seem to drain energy; “I have to be focused to get anything done.”	“I’m still cautious about some tasks— speaking before large adult audiences, writing complex documents, and so forth.”	“I am prepared for leadership.”	Emerging participation in the dialogue of decision-making; “I can be heard.”	Professional networking is starting to pay off; “Some paths are opening up for me.”
<u>Tier Three Advanced Level of Education</u>	Community centered (ego and students still emphasized, within the community context).	“I can fulfill many different functions, but I am fully engaged in this work.”	“I guess we’re all overworked, but my professional life has been productive and rewarding.”	“I need a theoretical basis for my work; ‘think globally, act locally.’”	“There’s too much on our plates, but we accomplish great things when we work together.”	Many complex tasks can be accomplished with surprising speed and thoroughness.	Most Ph.D.s think “I already accomplished so many complex tasks—I can do almost anything.”	“We can all be leaders. But we can also be followers, rallying around community interests.”	“I’ve been fortunate— people invite me to engage in the political decision-making dialogue.”	“I am grateful; several audiences express sustained interest in my work products.”

Of course, Figure 1 is flawed because it portrays the general trend rather than the experiences of any specific person. As the saying suggests “you can bring a horse to water, but...” We all know individuals with academic degrees who do not “drink the water.” Despite advanced education some people continue to be fools or racists, etc. MacCormick reported that

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

Nevertheless, the attainment of higher levels of education is generally associated with higher levels of understanding: more skills, more nuanced and useful knowledge, even wisdom (see Arlin, 1993, 1999; Arlin is CSUSB’s Education Dean). In this there should be no double standard between our advice for students and the standards we apply in our own lives—if education is a good thing, it should be good for us, as well as for students in our classes.

But education is not always a good thing. For example, once educators have attained their degrees, they should not rush into a second degree at the same level, unless there is some compelling, personalized reason. It is rare for anyone to need several associate, baccalaureate, or master’s degrees. Generally speaking, once a certain level of education has been attained it is time to take it to the next level—few teachers would recommend that a student who had attained a GED should go back to earn it again. With this in mind, Figure 2 shows the courses in the new CSUSB master’s of arts degree, with an emphasis in correctional and alternative education. If these courses will be good for you because you are ready to learn more about correctional and alternative education, the faculty at CSUSB’s Center for the Study of Correctional Education are ready to work with you; “we’re all in this together.”

Figure 2: Degree Requirements (48 quarter units)

EDUC Core Courses (for all educators in the MA programs, regardless of setting; 12 units)

1. EDUC 603 Effective Communication in Education,
2. EDUC 605 Foundations of Education, and
3. EDUC 607 Introduction to Educational Research.

Education—Correctional and Alternative (EDCA) Program Core (16 units)

1. EDCA 614 Foundations of Institutional Education: History and Literature,
- *2. EDCA 616 Teaching the Institutional Student,
- *3. EDCA 618 Social and Cultural Dynamics of Institutional Education (Fundamentals), and
4. EDCA 620 Educational Change in Institutional Settings.

Culminating Experience (eight units)

Track A Master's Thesis

1. EDUC 600 Master's Thesis or Project (four units)
2. Four units of Electives chosen from the list below (four units each):

EDCA 628 Special Education in Correctional Institutions,
EDCA 630 Alternative and Correctional Education,
EDCA 632 Career and Vocational Education in Correctional Education,
*EDCA 634 Correctional Education Leadership,
EDCA 636 Pedagogy and Andragogy (Adult Education) in Correctional Institutions,
EDCA 638 The Organization of Correctional and Alternative Education Service Delivery,
EDCA 640 Literacy Instruction in Adult Confinement Institutions,
EDCA 643 Library Services for Alternative and Correctional Students,
EDCA 644 Pre- and Post-Release Transitions for Correctional Students,
EDCA 646 Comparative Correctional Education,
EDCA 684 Special Topics in Correctional and Alternative Education.

Track B Comprehensive Examination

1. EDUC 999 Comprehensive Examination (0 units)
2. Eight units of Electives chosen from the list above.

Area of Specialization, selected from a related field of education, in consultation with advisor.
(12 units)

48 TOTAL quarter units for completion

*Note: These online courses are parts of the CEA Highly Qualified Correctional Teacher contract.

Features of the New Degree Program

Each course in the new degree program will be offered at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Most vocational teachers enter the field as journeymen and are working on their undergraduate degree; most academic teachers have attained their undergraduate degrees and are working on their master's. Experience suggests that, since both categories of teachers are adults and savvy about institutional dynamics and their impact on teaching and learning, everyone benefits from being in the same course and sharing the same activities. So we apply a differentiated learning approach to the products that are treated for the course grade. An undergraduate might have a final exam, while a graduate might have a midterm and a final; or an undergraduate might have a shorter paper to write than a graduate, etc. The new Program aims at helping teachers to attain their graduate degree; those who are working on their undergraduate degree will only be taking a few courses—they can come back later if they decide to pursue the MA. The three online courses will also be available for continuing education units (CEUs).

Compared with prices in most states, CSU costs are known for being reasonable. In addition, the Center has a tradition of taking courses to interested staffs at correctional institutions when there is a critical mass of enrolled students. Typically, this is done during one five day week, for a total of 40 hours of class sessions; alternatively on weekends (usually three weekends); both procedures work best if some of the time is granted for teacher study by the institution or systemwide administration. Full week or weekend intensive terms begin with directed readings prior to the actual classes, course activities during the prescribed times, and submission of the typed paper or project—usually a month or six weeks after the classroom experience.

The Center faculty make no claim to exhaustive understanding of the field of correctional education. That is why it is named the Center for the Study of Correctional Education. This field

is so vast that anyone who claims exhaustive understanding is either misinformed or lying.

Correctional education has been operational for nearly 225 years in North America alone, and many nations have formal programs. There are two claims, however. First, the Center has made a good beginning toward a comprehensive understanding of the field: now others will carry on with the work to foster continuing research and scholarship. Second, correctional educators must help each other in the many aspects of our work. No one can do it all alone; again, we are all in this together. The next section introduces some of the institutional issues that have been experienced by faculty at California State University, San Bernardino's Center for the Study of Correctional Education.

The CSUSB Context for Correctional Education

The author has been a full-time correctional educator since 1972, in New Jersey, Virginia, New York, and California, and intermittently as a part-time consultant in many states. Originally hired as a teacher at the Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown (New Jersey), he was assigned in 1974 as a Statewide administrator in the agency that eventually became Virginia's Department of Correctional Education. In 1987 he married Carolyn Eggleston and relocated in New York State, working first as a postsecondary counselor for inmates at a community college, then in the research unit of the Division for Youth in Albany. In 1991 they moved to San Bernardino, hired by CSUSB to establish a master's degree in correctional education. However, once hired they were told that, since there was no master's degree in correctional education, they would be teaching courses to local school teachers who were working toward master's degrees in education. In 2005 Gehring, Eggleston, and Wright worked to establish the master's degree in correctional education that will start in Fall, 2006. Three questions that people ask about that

Program are considered next; the first two by correctional educators, and the last by University professors.

Question 1: “Why Didn’t You Establish the Correctional Education Degree Program Earlier?”

It is difficult fulfilling the job requirements of a research professor. No one here just sits around wasting time. There were important things to learn from teaching the non-correctional education courses, and the students are always a joy. However, it is the field of correctional education that attracts the current author and the other Center faculty members. The purpose of the Center is to (a) give correctional educators meaningful opportunities to network together for mutual support, and (b) make the rich history and literature of the field accessible to them. Further, we believe that (c) the systems that employ institutional teachers have never been able to provide the level of staffing and resources needed to get the task accomplished—we have to support each other to make up the difference—and (d) the problems generated by the neglect of our field are so intense that an army of change agents is required just to begin setting things right. We hope to help prepare that army of change agents.

In university work generally, and at our campus particularly, it takes six years to get tenured, and five years after that to get promoted to professor (as opposed to assistant or associate professor). The evaluation requirements are substantial: teaching a full load every quarter, speaking and publishing for professional development, and service to the University and the community. After a few years the Education dean asked the author to reorganize the “MA Core” courses, in (a) communication, (b) history and philosophy of education, and (c) educational research; eventually she asked him to manage that unit. In addition, there was and is no funding for a master’s degree in correctional education; the “bread was on the table” as a result of the

traditional teaching work. In short, the staffing was inconsistent with the workload, just as it is in most human service delivery settings.

CSUSB's Center for the Study of Correctional Education was established in 1991. But the literature of the field is so inaccessible that it took us 11 or 12 years, mostly before we arrived at CSUSB, to find, obtain, and read a good primary and secondary source collection.

A related issue is that the traditional resources that support the other fields of education are not especially useful in supporting correctional education. CSUSB has 17 master's degrees in education, all supported by electronic indices such as ERIC and EBSCOhost. To fill the gap so we could get to a state of readiness sufficient to start a master's degree in correctional education required preparation of electronic indices not only for the *Journal of Correctional Education (JCE)* back editions, but also for the Center's substantial secondary reference collection in correctional education and prison reform. Then there was the need to index the archival and other primary source material that had been collected. Because a useful supportive infrastructure was unavailable, it took a long time to collect and treat relevant material to support a degree program. Eventually all the out of print/archival materials will be scanned to make them accessible online to correctional educators who cannot come to San Bernardino.

There were and are huge gaps in the literature. For example, there was almost nothing on the role of African Americans in the history and literature of correctional education. The most dramatic episode to be found was that one night in 1830 Sing Sing chaplain Gerrish Barrett reported "After prayers I heard a black man read" (BPDS, 1972, vol. #1, p. 211). This might seem normal, but it was not. African Americans were systematically denied literacy, even forbidden to learn the ABCs on pain of death. Connections between the education of African Americans and correctional education are substantial for many reasons, including the high incarceration rate of

African Americans. That 1830 passage and a few others like it are insufficient to represent the Black contributions to teaching and learning “inside.” So, Orange County, California correctional educator Margaret Puffer, Bill Muth of Virginia Commonwealth University, and the current author planned a series of articles that will begin the process of filling that particular gap. Thanks to Muth’s extensive archival work, the first essay will be ready soon, on how Janie Porter Barrett established the first reformatory for African American girls in Virginia. The second will be on the education of the freedmen during and after the Civil War and the influence of Hampton Institute, and the third will be on education during the slavery time.

There are other gaps. Freddie Bowers, of Indiana University of Pennsylvania, collaborated on a series of three *JCE* articles with Center faculty to provide information on the links between major contributors of local public schooling and our own field. The first was on Mary Carpenter, who shaped 19th century English alternative and correctional education. The second was on John Henry Pestalozzi, who established schools for orphans in Switzerland after the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. The third was on Anton Makarenko, “the John Dewey of the Soviet Union,” who also worked with orphans after World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution.

An additional series of essays will appear in new texts, about correctional education’s role in world politics. Everyone understands that literacy instruction is related to local schooling, and many have a general idea that individualized instruction and special education first emerged in reformatories/prisons and were then replicated in local schools. However, few see how European imperialism, and the social activism that struggled against it, impacted institutional classrooms. Correctional education is related to these geopolitical issues, as much as to urban, vocational, special, and alternative education, and to the education of African Americans. So Center faculty are writing about (a) indentured servitude in colonial North America, (b) transported convicts in

Australia, (c) orphan trains that supplied free labor to the interiors of our continent, and (d) the Cold War.

Next there was the problem of texts for the degree courses, to provide a general context for the field. The Center directors had taught about a dozen university correctional education courses at different institutions, and had always used the classic, out of print literature as texts, supplemented with *JCE* articles. But a real master's degree would require real texts, so Center faculty had to write them. It takes at least a year to research and write a decent text manuscript. Then there were problems about getting them published. Four or five publishers reported that the market was insufficient. So the Center worked with the CSUSB president to publish one manuscript through a new University Press, with the CEA Publications Committee to publish another.

To summarize: (a) funding constraints impeded degree start-up, (b) it took over a decade to get the literature, and that process continues, (c) the collected materials had to be indexed in order to be used effectively and help others gain access, (d) there was a need to begin filling in some of the gaps in that literature, mostly on topics that had not been addressed or were not accessible to field-based practitioners, (e) if there were to be meaningful texts they had to be written by Center faculty, and then (f) publishing houses actually had to be established if those texts were to become available. These challenges made the establishment of other degree programs in education appear relatively easy—the Center had to start “from scratch.” Although many seem to think that a degree program can be established with a website and a glossy student recruitment brochure, these tasks required sustained labor to produce specialized products.

One event that helped put the Center in a better position to pursue the degree concept was the arrival of Randall Wright on campus. An expert in the social and cultural dynamics of institutional education, Wright's expertise complimented those of the other Center faculty. There

was finally enough staffing and energy to continue with the regular teaching work and plan the new degree. The Center's condition can be summarized: "there are finally enough correctional education professors at CSUSB to have a correctional education community—in fact, all three faculty offices are in one part the campus' Faculty Office Building—Eggleston, Gehring, Wright.

Question 2: "Can I Teach Courses at Your University in Correctional Education?"

Without considering the many special experiences described above to make it possible to establish the degree, many correctional educators assumed that teaching the graduate courses would be easy. People pulled us aside or sent notes that essentially said "I've been a correctional educator for five years (or 10, or 12), and I'd like to teach a course for you." The truth is that people cannot teach these courses until they learn the literature of the field; being employed in the field is a starting place, but it is insufficient for teaching specialized, graduate level courses.

Question 3 (by professors): "What is This Thing You Call Correctional Education, and Why is CSUSB the Best Campus to Address It?"

CSUSB is a genuinely friendly place to study and work. The College of Education faculty members are community-oriented, hard-working, and rich with expertise in their various fields; the administration, Faculty Senate, and faculty union cooperate well. We are all overworked, but that is part of the modern condition and not unique to the campus. The longstanding campus personnel policy which supports hiring qualified couples is a great benefit—the University finds that couples work well and are involved in many campus activities. The Eggleston/Gehring family has friends at other universities, spouses who have to work in different states; we appreciate the opportunity to work together without being seen as a terrible anomaly.

However, one problem is that it is difficult for colleagues to conceptualize the dynamics of institutional education. For example, several professors continue to think that the Center's main

function is to educate inmates or train correctional officers, despite repeated explanations: “We teach teachers who work in confinement institutions.”

As the planning for the new master’s degree moved forward, there were increasing concerns about such misunderstandings. If colleagues did not comprehend what we were doing, they might eventually become hostile toward the correctional education master’s degree program.

All three Center faculty members are in CSUSB’s Educational Psychology and Counseling Department. The Department chair was told about how we inform wardens who belatedly decide to support the institutional education program because they realize it is the best way to prepare inmates for successful release. “We tell them that, every time they are in front of an audience, they should say something positive about correctional education, because the rest of the institutional staff take their cues from the warden.” The chair said she did not feel sufficiently informed about our field to discuss it in public. Then she remarked in public on the new degree. The chair had adopted the supportive sentiment that was sought, but she needed additional information. So the Center faculty prepared some “‘Talking Points’ on CSUSB’s Planned MA in Education, Correctional and Alternative Education Option,” some of which follow:

Twenty-five years ago the Correctional Education Association (CEA) estimated there were 20,000 correctional educators at prisons and juvenile facilities in the U.S.; unofficial current estimates suggest there are approximately 30,000. California State University, San Bernardino’s (CSUSB’s) Center for the Study of Correctional Education estimates there are 2,200-2,600 correctional educators within 50 miles of CSUSB at any time, depending on changing budget conditions. The Alternative Education Resource Organization (AERO) represents over 12,000 schools with more than two million students...No state has a licensure for correctional educators....There have only been two definitive books on correctional education theory and practice, and they are both out of print. Most of the best literature on the field is long out of print and inaccessible to most practitioners...[R]esearch indicates that only about 8% of institutional educators know the names of the great contributors to the field or the titles of their books; correctional educators do not know there is a literature on correctional education; only about 60% of these incumbents know that

the CEA exists, and only about 10% are members. These conditions, combined with the situation that most institutional education programs are managed by jailers rather than educators, makes correctional educators extremely vulnerable to intense institutional pressures—they have to ‘reinvent the wheel’ whenever they encounter a problem. (Gehring, 2005, p. 1).

Regarding the Planned Degree

This will be the world’s first ‘third generation’ program correctional teacher education program.

1. First generation programs were crafted by ‘good old boy’ managers from the local prison and university, usually in back rooms, in response to whatever particular emphasis they thought would be appropriate for institutional teacher preparation (law enforcement, counseling, adult basic education, elementary education, and so forth).
2. Second generation programs were driven by Special Education funds for personnel development; they were based on the (mistaken) notion that all confined students were disabled learners.
3. Third generation programs will be eclectic—based on the concept that the field of correctional education has a unique literature and history (as reflected in the planned Program’s correctional education core courses), and many specialties (such as vocational/correctional, English as a Second Language, special/correctional, correctional/literacy, etc., specializations in which MA students will take courses).

Regarding the Program’s Main Professors

1. Taken together, Drs. Eggleston, Wright, and Gehring have been in the field of correctional education for 88 years.
2. They authored 107 major articles and chapters on aspects of correctional education, most of which appeared in the *Journal of Correctional Education*.
3. Together, Drs. Eggleston, Wright, and Gehring have delivered 277 professional presentations on correctional education topics, 152 correctional education inservice sessions, and 29 keynote addresses.
4. Dr. Wright’s dissertation was on teacher voices and the professional identity issue in adult confinement institutions.
5. Dr. Eggleston’s dissertation was on the special education programming at New York State’s Elmira Reformatory before the turn of the 20th century.
6. Dr. Gehring’s dissertation was on the correctional school district concept, which is the term that applies when a jurisdiction improves its institutional schools so they meet all

the statutory and regulatory requirements of any other local education agency.

Regarding the Center for the Study of Correctional Education (CSCE)

Two longstanding problems in correctional education are that (a) most field-based practitioners do not know that there is a rich history and literature of their field, and (b) the relevant books are mostly out of print and especially difficult to access. To help alleviate these problems

1. Dr. Wright edited and contributed to an anthology on the correctional education professional identity issue (in press).
2. Drs. Gehring and Eggleston wrote a text on the history of correctional education (in press); they are preparing an additional manuscript on historical themes in correctional education, and one on educational change in correctional institutions.
3. Dr. Gehring prepared a manuscript of brief, descriptive essays on historical contributions to the fields of correctional and alternative education, and prison reform. He prepared another manuscript on the integral approach to educational change in correctional institutions.
4. In 2005 Dr. Gehring engaged in talks that resulted in the establishment of an organization that will act as a CSUSB University Press. Annual publications in correctional and alternative education are planned for this initiative, in one or two strands of five texts each. (Gehring, December 15, 2005, pp. 1-6).

This additional information helped the Department chair. Since then, she and the Education dean have been supportive and informative in their remarks about the new degree.

Summary

Some remarkable trends developing at CSUSB's Center for the Study of Correctional Education have reached a new threshold; readers of this article who are interested may benefit in real ways. A core group of dedicated faculty members has gathered together and prepared programs with useful courses and tools to facilitate access to research/scholarship resources (comprehensive library with electronic indices; texts for the specialized field of correctional education; a start on filling identified gaps in the literature of the field). In cooperation with the CEA, this group developed three online courses that will be available for undergraduate and

graduate institutional educators: Fundamentals of Correctional Education (Social and Cultural Dynamics), Teaching the Institutional Student, and Correctional Education Leadership. They are starting a new and eclectic (third generation) master's degree in Correctional and Alternative Education, and planning a Ph.D. Program in the same area of expertise. This group is committed to working with others who are interested in establishing an army of change agents capable of cooperative initiatives to improve and consolidate the field of correctional education. In short, if you pursue any of the programs discussed in this article, you will find that you have friends at CSUSB who would be pleased to work with you in this great adventure. Please direct Program questions to Thom Gehring [tgehring@csusb.edu or (909) 537-5653], or Carolyn Eggleston [eggles@csusb.edu or (909) 537-5654], or CSUSB's Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling [(909) 537-5606].

References

- Arlin, P.K. (1993). Wisdom and expertise in teaching: An integration of perspectives. *Learning and Individual Differences*, vol. 5, number 4, pp. 341-349.
- Arlin, P.K. (Winter, 1999). The wise teacher: A developmental model of teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 38,(1), pp. 12-17.
- (BPDS) Boston Prison Discipline Society. (1972). *Reports of the Prison Discipline Society of Boston, 1826-1854*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.
- Gehring, T. (2005). Plan for a new master's degree in correctional and alternative education. San Bernardino: California State University (unpublished document).
- Gehring, T. (December 15, 2005). Talking points on CSUSB's planned MA in Education, Correctional and Alternative Education Option. San Bernardino: California State University (unpublished document).
- MacCormick, A. (1931). *The education of adult prisoners*. New York: The National Society of Penal Information.
- Reagen, M.V. and Stoughton, D.M. (Eds.). (1976). *School behind bars: A descriptive overview of correctional education in the American prison system*. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press. See also the ERIC version, 1973.