

What Works, and Why? And What Doesn't Work, and Why? The Search for Best Practices in Correctional Education

by Thom Gehring, Ph.D.

Abstract

Prison educators frequently ask What works? because they have not had access to the literature of their field and the history of what has been proven to work. Lacking knowledge about best practices or model programs, prison educators provide programs that seem appropriate and then seek information regarding their impact on recidivism. This chapter outlines the four best documented versions of what has been proven to work, and the nine program elements that they all shared. The chapter applies Ken Wilber's integral quadrant system, which is useful because it reduces the tendency toward reductionism, or "putting all the eggs in one basket." An integral or balanced perspective has at least four dimensions: subjective, objective, social, and cultural.

The four versions of the single, What works? program were implemented in (a) the United States, beginning in the 1880s, (b) Canada during the 1970s to 1990s, (c) Europe, especially but not only in the Nordic countries, and (d) intermittently, in seven nations since the first decades of the 19th century. The nine program elements shared by each of these models or versions are (a) a system designed for either children or adults, or for both children and adults with differentiated activities, (b) vocational education (c) social education, (d) cultural education, (e) shared responsibility for education (this element has also been discussed as participatory management, the principle of community organization, and other euphemisms which actually mean democracy), (f) inclusion (for example, including students with disabilities or from different language/culture backgrounds), (g) technology, (h) library, and (i) some practical administrative configuration. The chapter ends with a few examples of terms that have been used to describe aspects of the one program, some explanatory notes, and a conclusion.

Introduction

Although research and scholarship are often used narrowly or prescriptively, they can be applied in flexible ways. For example, they can suggest how causes "push" effects (the search for causality), or how purpose "pulls" aspirations and events (telologically); to sort out how things are different (contrast), or how they are the same (comparison). With regard to teaching and learning in prisons, the current authors previously focused on how situational influences were caused, and contrasted their effects to learn how they differed. This chapter will focus on how common purposes have pulled on prison educators and students despite different situations—to compare instructional approaches during the last 120 years to learn their how they converged.

This focus is guided by practitioners' most frequently asked question What works in prison education? From a research and scholarship perspective, that question can be further delineated: (a) What practices have proven valid and reliable? or (b) What works, and why, and what doesn't work, and why? Prison educators are concerned about these issues because the historical literature on prison education has not been available to them. It has not been the subject of preservice courses or degree programs, or of on the job inservice training; it has not been a requirement for

qualification for prison education jobs; has not been a concern of leaders in education and criminal and juvenile justice systems; it is not included in the standards that are applied for the accreditation of prison education programs. Most prison educators would not know the names of the great prison education authors or the titles of their books, even if they accidentally stumbled upon them. The definitive books on prison education are long out of print and extremely difficult for individuals to access. They are commonly discussed as the “hidden heritage.”

As a result prison educators are unable to discern best practices. The field has been so neglected that almost no one has read its definitive volumes, despite the fact that it is a great literature by any criterion, full of exciting and well written books, some of which are in the same class as those by Charles Dickens, Herman Melville, or Mark Twain.

Prison educators ask What works? because they want to pursue excellence in their work of teaching and learning in confinement settings, because they care about their work with students and they want to help those who are ready to turn around their lives. In the absence of information about what works, institutional education is sometimes structured to inappropriately, even irrationally. For example, in North America overemphasis is often placed on individualized instruction, sometimes because teachers are afraid of students and individualization makes it easier for them to dominate in the classroom. Incarcerated students are infamous for being asocial, nonsocial, and even antisocial; it is difficult to learn interpersonal interaction skills when individualized instruction is experienced without the balance of grouped instruction. Another example is the overwhelming support in the literature for putting educators in charge of educational decisions (especially in relation to curriculum, and education budget and personnel matters), which can easily be accomplished in North America by transforming institutional education programs into systemwide correctional school districts (CSDs). Local education is configured in school districts because that structure provides program and financial accountability, transparency for outside monitors, and flexible management. Yet there is little support for restructuring prison education so it can flourish according to the school district standard that has been accepted as the universal standard for schools during the last 125 years. Prison educators ask What works? in part because the lack of information on model programs has resulted in the wholesale replication of flawed practices and models, often based on the uninformed opinions of non-educator institutional administrators.

Yet the literature’s answer to the What works? question is not mysterious. Indeed, despite differences of institutional situations, of language that has been used to describe program attributes at different times and places, and different summaries of the results, there has been a program that has worked since the 1880s—one program that has repeatedly been successful.

It is important to ask and to study what works. In drab, brutal, military oriented, often anti-education institutions, where correctional educators are systematically denied access to the history and literature of their own field, practitioners who do not take the time to ask What works? will invariably replace professional standards of excellence with the single standard of loyalty to the boss. Institutions are fueled by loyalty. Many practitioners shift loyalty from one administration to the next as if they had no concept of right and wrong. One can either do the right thing by studying and learning what works (or what would a research-based program look like, or which exemplary programs we should replicate) or one can sacrifice one’s personal integrity on the altar

of loyalty to the boss. Many who have had opportunities to observe various institutional education programs ask whether some practitioners have any professional integrity at all, any moral sense beyond the conventional status quo, any right to be called professionals. Correctional educators can either ask What works? or they can fit into the current milieu where they work, which is frequently characterized by loyalty to an anti-education institutional administration.

This chapter applies Ken Wilber’s integral quadrant system. From this perspective an integral or balanced approach has at least four dimensions: subjective, objective, social, and cultural. For prison educators these dimensions are anchored in the following aspects of our work:

Figure 1: Dimensions of Correctional Education

<i>Subjective</i> RATIONALE FOR THE WORK	<i>Objective</i> CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION
<i>Cultural</i> PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY	<i>Social</i> ADMINISTRATION

The chapter focuses on the Upper Right or Objective quadrant and is about the elements that have characterized the one program that has been demonstrated repeatedly to work in different settings. (The current authors have written about the subjective, social, and cultural dimensions elsewhere.) The next section introduces the elements of the one program that is the focus of our inquiry.

Nine Shared Elements of the One Program

The elements of the one program have been stable over time and place, despite local emphases among those elements, terminology to describe them, and technologies that support them. In this chapter most of the terminology used to describe the elements will be from MacCormick (1931); when other terms are required it will be because of social or legal changes that accrued in the decades since MacCormick’s writings stabilized Brockway’s original work (1912). These nine elements are as follows: (a) pedagogy/andragogy (MacCormick wrote of adult education), (b) vocational education, (c) social education, (d) cultural education, (e) shared responsibility (MacCormick called this “the principle of community organization,”(f) inclusion, (g) technology (MacCormick called this modern equipment), (h) library, and (i) administrative configuration. The remainder of this section introduces each of these elements generically.

The first element is the pedagogy/andragogy continuum. This is absolutely central to all forms of prison education. In this context pedagogy relates to the conditions of education for juveniles and andragogy to the education of adults. The terminology here is important because there has been a general confusion about this issue which has been exacerbated by the way terms are used. Reliance on adult education in adult prisons is an inherent aspect of the systems implemented by MacCormick in the U.S., Duguid in Canada, and throughout the nations

represented by the Council of Europe. However, the applicability of adult education principles to confined juveniles does not always fit, and even in adult prisons maturation is individualized. Some juveniles have experienced warlike hostility in their lives for years and make decisions like adults despite their youth. Some adults are incarcerated because they behave emotionally like children: the literature on the criminal personality is replete with discussions about problems normally associated with youth—impulsivity, egocentered behavior, inability to plan or set goals, and so forth. For a host of reasons, therefore, successful prison educators respond to each student’s needs individually; chronological age is not always the best indicator of maturity. The current chapter treats this first element in a way that transcends the categories of children and adults. Instead, we use the term “pedagogy/andragogy continuum” to describe how the one program under discussion is anchored for teaching and learning among juveniles, adults, juveniles who sometimes act like adults, and adults who sometimes act like children.

The second element is vocational education. Prisons have been closely linked to work. Most prisons act like factories. Many confined persons were unemployed or underemployed before incarceration. Most lack education and socialization sufficient to get and keep a job that can provide a standard of living sufficient to diminish interest in crime. Many prison educators believe prison education is vocational education. However, that situation applies to each of these nine elements—each element has advocates ready to reduce the entirety of the field to a particular part. Balance between the parts can be enhanced by access to the literature on best practices; without access reductionism dominates, an overemphasis on one or a few parts. Sometimes the term “vocational training,” instead of “vocational education” reveals this reductionist approach. Most educators see education as being for people within a normal range of abilities (they are “educable”); training is for people with limited or diminished abilities (they are only “trainable”).

Vocational education can be structured to include related theory, as is normally accomplished in apprenticeships and when academic-vocational linkages are emphasized. Approaches have traditionally differed in North America and Europe. In Europe, historically, education and socialization have been treated separately. Education is an understanding of culture that is passed from generation to generation; on the other hand, socialization relates to survival and coping skills. Vocational, occupational, career-oriented, marketable skill development, or technological education has traditionally been associated with socialization rather than with education. In the U.S., where Dewey’s interdisciplinary approach prevailed, schooling is structured so education and socialization can be accomplished in the same space, with the same personnel. This difference can relate to the difference between vocational education and vocational training. In sum, the acquisition of marketable skills, knowledge, and dispositions is central to modern education and an important element of our one prison education program.

The third element is social education. Here again, various perspectives can be applied. Most prison educators recognize that resources are distributed so unequally in society that some people are almost pushed into criminal activity. Some children grow up in neighborhoods where violence is daily evident, abuse in many forms is always expected and intermittently experienced, the accoutrements of learning are insufficient (no print or writing materials, unequal education services, anti-education ideologies expressed by embittered learners), and where poverty, racism, sexism, drugs, and so forth define everyday life. If a person is not sure there will be food tomorrow, or a safe place to sleep tonight, it is difficult for that person to pursue educational

opportunities even when they are available. On the other hand, some children grow up in stable settings, where resources and educational opportunities are more than adequate, including travel and cultural excursions. These differences are not susceptible to being overcome by prison educators' interventions or outreach. Even if all the prison educators in the world combined forces and embraced a common plan there would still be rich and poor, and unequal opportunities. Therefore, prison educators tend to focus on problems that individual students face which can be mitigated through education—and especially on the attitudes which were often the immediate causes of particular crimes. This is where the reversal of local school approaches becomes central. Local schools are typically designed to foster “knowledge, skills, and attitudes,” but prison schools are designed to foster “attitudes, skills, and knowledge,” in that order.

MacCormick wrote of social education in unabashed terms. This principle has been called “social education hegemony.” By this we mean that he recommended all institutional programs should bend to the purpose of social education: housing, security, prison industries, and counseling, as well as school, vocational shops, and library. MacCormick posited that nearly every prisoner needed education, and that attitudes and dispositions should be prioritized—indeed, he saw social education as the main purpose of the prison. Today we frequently refer to pre-release programs, life skills, or coping skills. These are all elements of social education, a major plank in all the versions of the one proven program that is the point of this chapter.

The fourth element of that one program is cultural education. In 1931 MacCormick wrote that

The term ‘cultural education’ is an unfortunate one; it is likely to be sniffed at by both prisoners and officials. It is difficult to think of a better term for education which is unrelated to vocational advancement, which does not aim at increasing one’s pay, but which is entered into for intellectual or aesthetic satisfaction or for ‘the enrichment of self.’ (p. 189).

European prison education, with its emphasis on adult education, is noted for its success in this area. In the U.S. most prison educators are not savvy about the difference between Adult Basic Education (ABE) and adult education. Sometimes, if they hear the term adult education, their minds immediately shift to ABE, which is a fixture of their everyday work. This reductionist approach neglects the courses that have proven so useful in many European prison schools: drama, poetry, music, photography, and art, as well as handicrafts and, increasingly, computer applications and video production. By contrast, ABE focuses on basic academic skills only, and is often justified by its direct link to marketable skills. Nevertheless, cultural education is frequently important in the program aspirations of prison educators in the U.S., despite the reductionist policies of institutional systems. Phonics, grammar, arithmetic, and job interview skills are all important, but so is learning about one’s cultural roots, being engaged in intellectually rewarding tasks, and connecting with the world through artistic expression. Further, cultural education has cut across the various versions of the one program, regardless of location.

The fifth element is shared responsibility, and it is the one that may appear most anomalous to prison educators, especially those employed in harsh confinement systems managed according to the military model. Shared responsibility is a euphemism for democracy; it has

alternatively been called the principle of community organization or participatory management.

The suitability of democracy to prisons was expressed most succinctly by Gibb (1978). "When given responsibility for themselves," as in a democratic community, prisoners can be "highly goal-oriented, ethical, creative, and productive." (p. 251). When prison educators hear about the democratic anomaly in prisons, they usually first say it is an absurd idea. Then, when confronted by the massive historical evidence, which has been systematically denied to practitioners—that is why it is called the hidden heritage—they summarize their response by saying something like "Well, it might have happened there, then. But things are different here, today." To back their claims of historical exceptionalism they cite current problems with drugs and gangs, and sometimes the modern trend of harried parents retreating from the previous role of primary caregivers; alternatively they discuss problems associated with crack babies or immigration. Unfortunately, these comments only reveal that, in addition to being denied access to the history and literature of prison education they have also been unable to become acquainted with the magnitude of social problems during, for example, the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Although it is always possible to contrast the worst from the current time with the best from a previous time; indeed, that is the romantic formula.

Nevertheless, it is easy to document, through the history and literature of prison reform and prison education, at least 22 democratic prison programs. Most were at the institutional level, but a few were in the school enclave. It is also possible to manage one's classroom democratically, even in the midst of a coercive institution. Of the 22 programs, the overwhelming majority were successful by any standard: educational achievements; industrial production; reduction of drug offenses, escapes, and homosexual rapes; and in most cases, improved and more regularized relations between prisons and the communities in which they were located. These programs were implemented with administrative support in at least seven nations, during the period between the Napoleonic Wars and the 1990s—and there may well be additional examples in other times and places about which the current authors are ignorant. The point is that the evidence is not, cannot, be refuted. Democracy happened in prisons, over and over again, in a wide range of situations, security levels, and places; it does not need to be defended, or even justified; it is a fact.

How prison educators respond to this shared responsibility element of the one program is especially revealing about their motivations. It demonstrates the attitudes of the participants to educational change. The disposition toward change, or more accurately toward improvement, can indicate why correctional educators are personally motivated to pursue this difficult field of education. Does one believe in the authoritarian world view and in maintenance of the status quo, or is one committed to community improvement? Is one an elitist or a democrat? A guardian of the culture or a revolutionary? An obstructionist or a reformist? In light of our frequent advocacy of freedom, equality, and democracy in our community dialogues, can we apply a different standard—a double standard—to prison communities?

Shared responsibility is not evident in the diagnostic-prescriptive model of teaching, which is called the medical model in prison management; it is not evident in a variety of that model which is called individually prescribed instruction. Rather, these are elitist (anti-democratic) models; they are top down approaches which tend not to be community oriented.

It is easy to close one's mind to information that seems absurd, anomalous, or contrary to one's everyday assumptions, and that is why this shared responsibility element of the one program can be so exciting and hopeful about the human condition once the facts are learned. The current authors addressed this issue in previous articles (Muth and Gehring, 1986; Gehring, 1989; Gehring and Eggleston, 2000). We urge readers to consider that it is hard work living in a democracy, requiring articulation of complex arguments and interpersonal and negotiation skills. Life in a democracy, alternatively known as a just community, changes the participants, at least in their cognitive functions and communicative styles. In short, democracy facilitates learning.

The sixth element is inclusion, an area in which our understanding has changed over the decades. Today the term usually means special education for disabled learners, and language courses typically (but not only) for persons whose native language was different from the language spoken in the place where they reside. In some periods there were Americanization courses and in some settings there are courses that emphasize Native American culture. Most nations have an oppressed minority. The inclusion element can be used to help equalize educational opportunities for the oppressed, as well as to promote multiculturalism and toleration of others.

Visitors to Virginia find too many African Americans in confinement and other forms of supervision, in South Dakota too many Native Americans, in California too many Mexican Americans. . . .—the Germans lock up too many Turks, the Scandinavians and Bulgarians too many gypsies or Roma, the Canadians too many Inuit and other Native Americans. (Muth, et al., 2006, pp. 1-2).

Many nations have moved beyond legal separation by race or ethnicity and are moving toward eliminating separation by sex, but there is still a great difference between current situations and community aspirations. The element of inclusion designates recognition of the need to desegregate, in all the many ways segregation has been embedded in traditional legal and social requirements and expectations. Inclusion does not mean that persons in minority groups, or in any other group, should be disallowed from gathering together with and supporting similar persons if they choose. Rather it means that, to the extent the concept is grasped by prison educators at any particular time or place, they should work toward dismantling traditionally oppressive legal, and social barriers. These initiatives should be anchored to concrete dimensions of the program. As in other fields, prison education needs to move toward shared multicultural, diverse, or pluralistic aspirations, to contribute to the generation by generation movement to phase out such restrictions.

The seventh element of the one program is technology, or the application of technology to help facilitate teaching and learning—but not because instruction is impossible without the newest, high technology accoutrements. Sometimes it is pursued simply because many students find technological applications motivational. Properly used, these applications foster learning by individuals and groups. They can also bring outside communities inside; their impact can be analogous to “breaking down the walls,” a step which is aligned to the European aspiration for normalization or the North American aspiration for equal access to educational opportunity.

The eighth element is library. Savvy observers of prison education often recommend that, if there are resources sufficient for only one program element, it should be the library. This is because when prisoners are ready to learn they can always seek out the library. However, it would

be a mistake to reduce the entire program to library services and exclude the other eight identified elements of the one program. Continuity of library services is also important. Each of the four one program versions had a strong library component, though each was slightly different.

The ninth element of the one program is the configuration of administrative services. In another manuscript one of the current authors wrote

Historically, five systems have existed [in North America] for the delivery of correctional education: Sabbath schools, the traditional or decentralized pattern, correctional education bureaus, correctional school districts (CSDs), and integral education. Of these, the first (Sabbath schools) are officially defunct because they violate the Constitutional aspiration to separate church and state. The last (integral education) is personality based; it cannot be implemented throughout an entire jurisdiction (county, state, etc.). So . . . the middle three delivery patterns (traditional or decentralized, bureaus, and CSDs) . . . are the three modern, generic models of jurisdictionwide organizations that deliver correctional education services to confined students. All three are currently operational, often in adjacent states. The theme that unites these three models is that they emerged historically to increase educator authority over educational decisions—a trend that matches the needs of students, teachers, and community. . . . In a decentralized organization line authority [to hire, fire, and direct] extends from the institutional administration, through the education director or principal, to the teaching staff. In a bureau organization line authority remains as it did in the decentralized pattern; and staff authority [to recommend in matters of curriculum, education budget, and educational personnel matters] extends from the state director of correctional education, sometimes through a staff of statewide supervisors, through the principal, to the teaching staff. In a CSD organization, line authority extends from a jurisdictionwide superintendent of schools who is qualified according to the same state education department (SEA—state education agency) standards as other school district (LEA—local education agency) superintendents, through the principal, to the teaching staff; parallel staff authority extends through statewide supervisors (optional). (Gehring, 2007, pp. 2-3).

There is a universe of useful information about the administrative configuration of prison education services, though most prison educators do not have information about how prison education is structured in other jurisdictions, or sometimes even in nearby institutions within their own system. This dimension of our field directly impacts all the other dimensions. For example, it is entirely possible for a system to be staffed by good teachers who are also good people, with students who are willing and able to learn, and useful curricular and support services—but with a terrible education program in which very little teaching and learning actually takes place—simply because of a flawed administrative configuration. This ninth element helps regulate all the others.

For our current purposes four salient attributes of this administrative configuration element deserve immediate attention. First, the struggle to put educators in charge of educational decisions (regarding the curriculum, the education budget, and educational personnel matters) does not in any way contradict the fifth element (shared responsibility). Prison educators can and do put prisoner students in charge of some educational decisions, especially for aspects of their own education. Second, non-educator institutional administrators should not be in charge of these three

areas of decision-making (again, curricular, and education budget and personnel). A corollary of this point is that prison educators should not be in charge of the prison; they should not be assigned to make decisions regarding institutional security, the physical plant, and inmate traffic. Third, innovations and improvements can be implemented in a classroom or at an institutional school in any administrative configuration, but systemwide educational improvements can only be implemented when educators are in charge of education. Fourth and finally, the historical trend toward having educators assigned to make educational decisions (in the areas of education curriculum, budget, and personnel) has proceeded from minimal authority to maximal authority in the following order: Sabbath school, traditional or decentralized, bureau, CSD, and integral.

To summarize the themes of this section, for a variety of interrelated reasons most prison educators have not had systematic access to information about the history and literature of prison education. Faced with this problem they ask What works? From the perspective of the history and literature of prison education, there is a definite answer to this question—one program has been proven to work over several versions despite divergent situations. There are nine elements that have been included in these versions, though their relative emphases and the terms used to describe and summarize them have been situational. Those elements were explained: (a) pedagogy/andragogy, (b) vocational education, (c) social education, (d) cultural education, (e) shared responsibility, (f) inclusion, (g) technology, (h) library, and (i) administrative configuration. Next we will outline the four historical versions and their historical contexts.

Four Historical Versions of the One Program

In this section the connections and alignments between things are accentuated over their differences—emphasizing their similarities and celebrating their convergence, as noted above. From this big picture or synthetic perspective historical episodes coalesce into at least four discernable versions, all slight, variations on the one program that works. These can be attributed to the following: (a) Brockway and MacCormick (1880-1941, with important antecedents), (b) Ayers; Duguid; Ross and Fabiano (1970s to the 1990s), (c) the Council of Europe’s Prison Recommendations, especially as expressed by the Nordic Council of Ministers (1989-2005), and (d) what has been identified as the integral education model (intermittently since about the 1850s). The following paragraphs introduce the contexts of these versions or models of the one program.

The Brockway/MacCormick Model

Zebulon Brockway is perhaps most famous for his application of Reformatory Prison Discipline (RPD) at New York’s Elmira Reformatory during his superintendency there, 1876-1900. RPD was developed as an alternative to the Pennsylvania system of prison management, which was dominated by solitary confinement, and the Auburn system, which converted prisons into factories. It was labeled “reformatory” to highlight its difference from the brutality of the two previous systems—RPD established indeterminate sentences and parole, so inmates could obtain early release through good behavior. This revolutionary new system was crafted by Alexander Maconochie at Britain’s Norfolk Island penal colony in the South Pacific during the 1840s. It was subsequently advocated by Matthew Davenport Hill, a prominent judge in Birmingham, England during the 1850s, and implemented nationwide in Ireland by Walter Crofton after the Great Potato Famine. Then RPD was studied by Brockway’s colleagues Gaylord Hubble and Enoch Wines.

By the time Brockway imported the RPD system it was known as “the Irish System.” However, Hill reported how independent applications of RPD principles were evident in Valencia, Spain; Hanover, Germany; the Mettray juvenile facility in France; and on some of the ships that transported English and Irish felons to Australia; in addition, Mary Carpenter implemented a similar system at juvenile institutions she established in and around Bristol, England, and she wrote books on RPD for American consumption, which Hubble and Wines brought to Brockway. In short, although it was Brockway’s writing that defined RPD for subsequent American consumption, and that emphasized its educational implications, the RPD system was the result of many minds, during the last half of the 19th century, in several nations. (Carpenter, 1969/1864).

Brockway’s work in general, and particularly his 1912 autobiography *Fifty Years of Prison Service*, became the standard for prison education in North America. In it, he wrote of the Elmira education program in ways that correspond to eight of the nine one program elements discussed above. Brockway documented (a) the connections between his institutional schools and colleges for adults, (b) the 42 vocational trades at Elmira—some of them quite innovative, such as telegraphy and machine shop work, (c) that the program facilitated inmate success after release, (d) Elmira’s Sunday morning Cultural Programs, in which scientists, actors, writers, musicians, and poets addressed inmates in the institution’s huge auditorium, (e) physician prescribed, comprehensive programs for “dullards,” “kindergarteners,” “awkwards,” “stupid,” “weaklings,” and so forth (we would now call this special education), (f) educational apparatus, (g) library (including a sizeable collection of English literature), all under (h) his administrative leadership. The one program element that Brockway never implemented was shared responsibility, although one might make a case that the RPD parole system, as opposed to the previous fixed sentence system, encouraged inmates to take control of their own behavior if they wanted to be released.

At an important 1870 conference in Cincinnati, in his summary of the close relationship between education and RPD, Brockway used the phrase “. . .the education of adult prisoners must not be neglected” (Brockway, 1969/1912, p. 407). When Austin MacCormick studied Brockway’s work to prepare for the first nationwide study of prison education (1927-1928), he named his manuscript *The Education of Adult Prisoners* (published in 1931), taking its title from Brockway’s injunction. This demonstrated to readers who were familiar with Brockway’s work that one of MacCormick’s purposes was to build on the foundation Brockway had left.

Several of MacCormick’s terms have been used to identify the one program’s nine elements in this chapter: vocational education, social education, cultural education, library. These elements will not seem mysterious to modern readers because MacCormick’s headings characterize them adequately. However, several terms require explanation about how MacCormick treated them. For example, MacCormick did not discuss the pedagogy/andragogy continuum; he discussed adult education—and by that he intended the fullness of what the term implies. In this way MacCormick in America was like Grundtvig in Denmark (the founder of the Folk High School movement), as suggested in the following passage from MacCormick’s book:

The adult education movement in America has two striking characteristics: (1) that it is not primarily concerned with giving men and women the utilitarian instruments of learning but with education as a ‘continuing cultural process pursued without ulterior purpose’; and (2) that it is reaching out to the industrial worker, the

farmer, the tradesman, the clerk, and to all others who have vocational competence and a fair amount of formal schooling but whose opportunities for culture have been limited or neglected. The folk-school movement in Europe similarly has a cultural rather than a utilitarian aim. Today coal miners in America study economics, philosophy and psychology, partly, to be sure, in order that they may fight their economic battles more successfully, but also for the satisfaction of exploring realms of thought unconnected with the dim shafts and chambers of their daily work. The Danish farmer reads the literature of his country and studies history and philosophy with no idea that they will increase the productivity of his brain. . . . One must. . . recognize the validity of a more liberal aim in the education of prisoners as well as of free men. . . (MacCormick, 1931, pp. 189-190).

In summary, MacCormick connected his work to Brockway's, and also to the adult education movement in the broadest sense.

Nevertheless, there were some differences between Brockway's and MacCormick's versions. The biggest departure was in the area of shared responsibility. Brockway had embraced the Maconochie/Crofton vision of Reformatory Prison Discipline—but opportunities for Elmira inmates to share in responsibility for the education program were limited to “fitting in” the institutional routine. In the modern sense, Elmira inmates were treated as objects rather than subjects; membership in the decision-making community was not extended to them, despite the abstract RPD ideal. MacCormick implied a much greater emphasis on shared responsibility, but he did not write about it for common consumption. If one is not familiar with the work of MacCormick's mentor Thomas Mott Osborne, to whom MacCormick dedicated his book, one could easily miss the almost secret cues that reveal MacCormick's ideological commitment to everyday democracy in prison. For example, his euphemistic reliance on “the principle of community organization” is only available in its fullest meaning to readers who were already knowledgeable about Osborne's work. This was for a very precise, political reason.

Osborne was attacked in court by authoritarian “good old boys” who rejected his element of shared responsibility, but he successfully defended himself against all charges. Osborne was from an old, aristocratic family, a millionaire (an ally of Franklin Delano Roosevelt), with a strong nationwide reputation as an anti-Tammany (anti-Town Hall) New York Democratic politician. A Harvard graduate, he owned a successful farm machinery factory, and had been editor of an important upstate New York newspaper. Yet Osborne had democratized New York State's high security Auburn Prison through an inmate organization he helped to found called the Mutual Welfare League. He did the same at Sing Sing; and again at the U.S. Naval Prison at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Osborne died in 1926, and MacCormick was his designated successor. But in 1929 Sing Sing burned, along with several other New York State prisons. The impact on the nation was analogous to the Attica uprising in 1971. (By the way, MacCormick chaired the official inquiry after Attica). When the good old boy obstructionists said they had found guns in the League headquarters at Sing Sing the climate for prison reform and prison education became hostile. All this was still fresh in 1931 when MacCormick's book appeared. So there were important reasons why MacCormick's approach to shared responsibility was largely in code and intended only for readers who were initiated in the work of the Osborne/MacCormick team.

Other differences between the Brockway and MacCormick program were in the elements of inclusion, technology, library, and administrative configuration. MacCormick's inclusion emphases targeted services at local jails, and for female and illiterate incarcerates. Later in his career he also did important work in special education. MacCormick's idea of technology focused on 35 mm films and filmstrips; he found the toothbrush to be an outstanding educational tool and wrote often about how its use could improve prison life. MacCormick's ideas about prison libraries were informed by Carnegie influence and the innovations which had been established in Minnesota and Iowa correctional education, and by the American Library Association. He advocated broad use of general libraries in prisons. MacCormick also founded the Correctional Education Association. However, it was his readiness for the correctional education bureau configuration that is most revealing about MacCormick's approach—he was ahead of his time.

MacCormick's influence in New York State led governor Franklin Delano Roosevelt to initiate a series of innovations that resulted in the first statewide correctional education bureau. It consisted of a cadre of education consultants in the department of corrections central office, with authority to recommend on issues related to curriculum, the education budget, and educational personnel matters. As president later, FDR implemented this same system in the Federal Bureau of Prisons and assigned MacCormick as the first assistant director in charge of education. Part of MacCormick's genius resulted from his anticipation of this innovation. His 1931 package of correctional education improvements, although based on Brockway's traditional/decentralized approach to administration (in which the warden was in charge of all education decisions), really fit better in the new bureaus than in the old decentralized "system." In sum, MacCormick accepted Brockway's good ideas and also tinkered with that model to make it more effective.

The Ayers/Duguid/Ross and Fabiano Model

The next version of the one program under discussion in this chapter was implemented in Canada.

Canada experienced a gradual, planned unfolding of a replicable model, beginning in the late 1970s. . . . The benefits of this activity peaked in the early 1990s . . . the elements of the Federal Canadian correctional education paradigm. . . emerged from, and built upon local Canadian correctional education theory and practice, which had previously been very similar to the U.S. correctional education paradigm. In addition to these traditional origins, the Federal paradigm included elements with European origins (cognitive instruction), and others from the U.S. (cognitive-moral development, and theory of the criminal personality) and England (education as distinct from and complementary to socialization). These threads were woven together in a fabric much stronger than the traditional paradigm, capable of solving correctional education problems that were traditionally ignored. . . . the new fabric proved to be especially flexible and versatile. Canadian correctional education programs managed by Douglas Ayres and Stephen Duguid drew from the work of Feuerstein (cognitive instruction), the Samenow/Yochelson team (the criminal personality), Kohlberg (cognitive-moral development), and Freire (education for democracy), and were consistent with the main principles of social education and prison reform. Ayres and Duguid worked out of universities in British Columbia. Their programs were designed to avoid labeling and promote active

modification of cognitive deficits (as per Feuerstein's advice); facilitate cognitive-moral development through moral dilemmas, just communities, and role modeling (consistent with Kohlberg); introduce social responsibility (consistent with Samenow and Yochelson); and put correctional education students in charge of the subjects selected for learning activities (consistent with Freire). Ayres and Duguid emphasized a liberal arts humanities content in education. They both maintained that this approach resulted in maximum socialization of offender students. (Eggleston and Gehring, 1986, p.)

This Canadian model began under Doug Ayres' leadership at the University of Victoria in the early 1970s and was continued by Stephen Duguid at Simon Fraser University in the early 1980s. Robert Ross and Elizabeth Fabiano's definitive book *Time to Think* (1985) was largely rooted in this tradition of British Columbia, university based, postsecondary education programs, funded by the Canadian Federal Government. It can be referred to as the "Ayers/Duguid/Ross and Fabiano" version of the one program. In the face of political changes in the Ottawa government in 1993, this exemplary program was phased out. Since then the Canadian emphasis has been more on Fabiano's part of the Ross and Fabiano model, with education relegated to lesser importance than during the earlier period. Nevertheless, this Canadian model was a beacon to informed correctional educators all over the world, and its descriptive literature continues to be received enthusiastically. We will turn next to its version of the one program's nine elements.

The British Columbia approach was through postsecondary education at four prison sites. Although this was clearly adult education, many postsecondary students tutored inmates in the basic education program. In other words, it was an adult postsecondary program, but the benefits were also somewhat generalized throughout the inmate populations. The orientation on vocational education was that attainment of a liberal arts degree would assist in obtaining gainful employment after release. Learning in the social sciences was analogous to the element we call social education, and learning in the humanities was its approach to the cultural education element. Regarding inclusion, there was an English as a Second Language (ESL) program component that offered an ESL certificate for inmates if they were interested in qualifying for employment as teachers after release; this program trained ESL tutors and conducted ESL classes in the prison. Inmates with "cultural as well as developmental needs" (Duguid, 2007, p. 1) were a focus of program innovations, but there was no program for learning disabled prisoners. In Canada Native Americans are frequently referred to as belonging to First Nations. The Simon Fraser Program experienced "mixed success" in this area, mostly by addressing "some. . .cultural as well as developmental needs" (p. 1). Computers were used, mostly for word processing purposes; internet and e-mail activity was not permitted in the institutions. Each of the Simon Fraser prison sites

had a separate University Program Library stocked with mostly academic texts related to the curriculum being offered—average size about 10,000 books. They were purchased via combination of University . . . [and Canadian Penitentiary Service] funds and some contributions. They were all catalogued using the Library of Congress system and administered by prisoner-librarians trained by staff first from University of Victoria and later as Simon Fraser University. The libraries included study carrels and were part of the 'school.' Interlibrary loan was available. (Duguid, 2007, p. 1).

The elements of shared responsibility and administrative configuration revealed the special

genius of the Ayers/Duguid/Ross and Fabiano model. Students were in charge of aspects of the postsecondary program, through a council elected for that purpose. The council decided which courses to offer and when they should be scheduled. This regulated curriculum and personnel matters, since faculty were attached to specific courses. The budget was assigned by the Canadian Federal Government in Ottawa, but the council made many of the decisions about how it would be used. All this led to what has been called the democratic enclave model—the postsecondary program was managed democratically, and it was located within four coercive institutions. The “just community” variety of democracy was evident. Kohlberg described life in a democratic or just community as one method of promoting cognitive-moral development. By this Kohlberg meant that living in a democratic or just community is difficult work: one has to negotiate nearly everything, and demonstrate concern for the feelings of others. Ayers discussed this element as a way for students to learn the value of reciprocity; Duguid discussed it in Jeffersonian terms—“to inform their discretion” as citizens in a democracy; Ross and Fabiano discussed it in terms of opportunities to acquire interpersonal cognitive skills. All these interpretations were correct. With an exemplary reputation based on positive results, new of the British Columbia model spread throughout North America and Europe and helped to influence subsequent developments.

Ayers had made a prophetic pronouncement about the administrative needs of such a program. He wrote that a Federal Canadian correctional school district should be established:

A country-wide unit, centralized in Ottawa, that would be responsible for educational programs in all prisons, similar to several state-wide school districts providing educational services to all of the prisons within a state’s jurisdiction. Such a structure would allow some coordination in the development of programs and the implementation of ones found effective. It could lead to more effective selection and training of teachers. But its primary thrust would be to make programs more independent of local prison administration except for day-to-day operations. In this way, it would help in establishing an identity for the school separate from that of the prison such that the prisoners would perceive the teachers as being from ‘outside,’ somewhat in the way they view the instructors in the [college] Program. This requirement is a prerequisite for the establishment of conditions that facilitate learning in a prison setting. . . (Ayers, 1978, p.4).

So the Ayers/Duguid/Ross and Fabiano model anticipated, the correctional school district, just as MacCormick had earlier anticipated the correctional education bureau.

The Council of Europe/Nordic Model

The Council of Europe’s recommendations on prison education have been closely allied with the European Prison Education Association (EPEA). They became linked in 1989 at the international conference on Prison Education at Wadham College, Oxford University. That conference was largely an initiative by Gerald Norme and Stephen Duguid. Many participants were in regular correspondence with Duguid and eager to foster an international approach.

Working on a model already established in America (the Correctional Education Association [CEA]), they were keen to do something similar, and suggested the idea of setting up an organization that would also help to turn the aspirations of the

new Council of Europe report 'Education in Prison,' into a working reality. Among other important recommendations, that report had identified a need for contact by prison educators across national boundaries. Under an ancient copper beech tree, this idea was explored by a group of five—Pam Bedford from England, Gayle Gassner (then President of the CEA), Henning Jorgensen of Denmark, Asbjorn Langas of Norway and Kevin Warner of Ireland. A larger, hurried meeting in a garden gave enthusiastic backing to the project. (Rocks, 2003, first page).

The Recommendations of the Council of Europe (R[89]), which have been at the center of EPEA activities ever since that meeting under the copper beech, follow:

1. All prisoners shall have access to education, which is envisaged as consisting of classroom subjects, vocational education, creative and cultural activities, physical education and sports, social education and library facilities;
2. Education for prisoners should be like the education provided for similar age groups in the outside world, and the range of learning opportunities for prisoners should be as wide as possible;
3. Education in prison shall aim to develop the whole person bearing in mind his or her social, economic and cultural context;
4. All those involved in the administration of the prison system and the management of prisons should facilitate and support education as much as possible;
5. Education should have no less a status that work within the prison regime and prisoners should not lose out financially or otherwise by taking part in education;
6. Every effort should be made to encourage the prisoner to participate actively in all aspects of education;
7. Development programmes should be provided to ensure that prison educators adopt appropriate adult education methods;
8. Special education should be given to those prisoners with particular difficulties and especially those with reading or writing problems.
9. Vocational education should aim at the wider development of the individual, as well as being sensitive to trends in the labor market;
10. Prisoners should have direct access to a well-stocked library at least once per week;
11. Physical education and sports for prisoners should be emphasised and encouraged;
12. Creative and cultural activities should be given a significant role because these activities have particular potential to enable prisoners to develop and express themselves;

13. Social education should include practical elements that enable the prisoner to manage daily life within the prison, with a view to facilitating the return to society;
14. Wherever possible, prisoners should be allowed to participate in education outside prison;
15. Where education has to take place within the prison, the outside community should be involved as fully as possible;
16. Measures should be taken to enable prisoners to continue their education after release;
17. The funds, equipment and teaching staff needed to enable prisoners to receive appropriate education should be made available. (Nordic Council. . ., 2005, pp. 132-134).

The Council of Europe's Recommendations do not carry the force of law—they are recommendations—but most European nations seek to diminish the gap between their current prison education capabilities and the Council's Recommendations. Some nations have further to go in this than others. From the current writers' outsider point of view, it appears the nations which have been most successful in applying the Recommendations have been the Nordic nations, Ireland, and the Netherlands. The EPEA has been steadfast in its advocacy of the Recommendations and remarkably successful. EPEA has emerged as one of the most important prison education professionalization organizations, with international conferences every other year. At its 2007 conference in Dublin, Ireland, the EPEA recognized its three "wise elders," members who have been most dedicated in advocating the Recommendations: Torfinn Langelid (Norway), Kevin Warner (Ireland), and Svenlav Svensson (Sweden). The alignments between the nine identified elements and the Council of Europe's Recommendations are shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Alignment—Nine Elements and the Council of Europe’s Recommendations

<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Addressed in</u>	<u>Implied in</u>	<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Addressed in</u>	<u>Implied in</u>	<u>Program Element</u>	<u>Addressed in</u>	<u>Implied in</u>
1 <u>Pedagogy/ Andragogy</u>	Recos. 7	Recos. 2, 3	4 <u>Cultural Education</u>	Recos. 1, 3, 12	Recos. 2, 6, 10	7 <u>Technology</u>	Not Applicable	Recos. 2, 7, 9, 17
2 <u>Vocational Education</u>	Recos. 1, 9	Recos. 2, 3, 6, 13, 17	5 <u>Shared Responsibility</u>	Recos. 14, 16	Recos. 2, 5	8 <u>Library</u>	Recos. 1, 10	Recos. 2, 6, 12, 14
3 <u>Social Education</u>	Recos. 1, 13	Recos. 2, 3, 6, 15	6 <u>Inclusion</u>	Reco. 8	Recos. 2, 3, 7, 12, 17	9 <u>Administrative Config.</u>	Recos. 4, 17	Recos. 14, 15

In summary, the Council of Europe’s Recommendations cover the entire scope of the nine elements and constitute a version of the one program that has been the subject of this chapter.

Two of these elements warrant special recognition because they are on the leading edge of prison education: shared responsibility and administrative configuration. The European aspiration for normalization is central with regard to shared responsibility. For example,

... the Nordic countries are united in the aspiration of ‘normalizing’ prison education—by that they mean consistency between services ‘inside’ and ‘outside.’ They believe inmates should participate in community education programs that are not in the prison, and they frequently make good on that belief. Further, though this point is not emphasized in the book [on *Nordic Prison Education*], they take a stand against ‘hotel services’—inmates, for the most part, do their own cooking (knives and other utensils are available), laundering, etc. (Gehring, 2005, p. 1).

Recommendations 14 and 15 express the normalization theme. Recommendation 14 enables prisoners to enroll in education programs in the free communities, and Recommendation 15 enables outside community members to participate in prison education programs.

The European Council’s Recommendations do not advocate specifically for any particular system of administrative configuration. However, Recommendation 4 states explicitly all prison administrators “should facilitate and support education as much as possible,” and the right to education is addressed in Recommendation 1. From the North American perspective, these Recommendations are both appropriate and cover “new ground.” Nevertheless, those provisions have also been addressed sporadically in North America, as will be evident in the next section.

Integral Correctional Education Models

[Integral] organizations overcome institutional constraints not by implementing a more advanced, efficacious, or powerful administrative structure, but through personal intervention by the leader, whoever that might be . . . [The] . . . various systems are interconnected and balanced. The effect is much like when teachers use an interdisciplinary approach to help students learn simultaneously in several academic disciplines, but even more profound. Integral denotes a deep system of confluence (subjective, objective, social, and cultural), a synthesis that transcends constraints by focusing on real needs. . . . some integral correctional education leaders were known for training prisoners in the use of guns so they could perform law enforcement duties in the outside communities when invited, or so inmates could substitute for vacationing correctional officers. To attract outside community members into institutions for visits they used service projects, drama performances, facility tours, and compelling lectures. Inmates at . . . [integral] institutions generally elected leaders who actually managed all aspects of the prisons—housing, discipline, industries, recreation, etc.; often extending to the authority over the institutional budget and to the hiring and firing of institutional staff. (Gehring, 2007, p. 10).

Integral correctional education has been experienced in the great democratic experiments in our field. For example, it was operational at William George's Junior Republic (beginning in 1895); at Thomas Mott Osborne's Mutual Welfare League at New York State's Auburn and Sing Sing Prisons, and at the U.S. Naval Prison in Portsmouth, New Hampshire (1913-1926); at Anton Makarenko's Gorky Colonies in the Soviet Union (1922-1938); it was also part of the institutional milieu in Herr Von Obermaier's jail in Bavaria, Germany, in Colonel Montesino's Valencia Prison in Spain (both of which were in the 1850s), and at Frederick A. Demetz's famous Mettray juvenile facility in France (1840-1937), as well as at other institutions. (Gehring and Eggleston, 2006).

All of the nine elements have applied in integral education, though variations in emphases have been prevalent because of chronological and geographical distances. They used the pedagogy/andragogy continuum but did not apply that term. They each had social education, vocational skills development, and libraries. Cultural education was present but varied. Special and bilingual education have been common, though without using those terms. Integral education "breaks down the walls" much more efficiently than might be possible through the internet, but technological applications made use of simple equipment rather than high technology. For example, Makarenko used dynamite occasionally for dramatic effect in his Soviet prisons, in plays that had military themes; Osborne borrowed cars from New York aristocrats to send prisoners outside to find escapees; several integral education leaders armed the prisoners and had them trained in how to use rifles; others used prison industries to produce equipment needed by outside communities; and so forth. The shared responsibility element has been highly visible in integral programs, mostly through direct democracy but also through the spirit of reciprocity. Administrative configuration has not been controversial since integral leaders operate on a higher or deeper threshold than suggested by many of the routine dimensions of everyday management.

The role of personality is emphasized to the point that integral education cannot—or has not—been implemented systematically throughout a system. This is not because integral education is irrational; each its versions had a strong rational component. Rather, the intuitive (or

emotional, artistic, or spontaneous) dimension is relatively more developed in integral education than it was in the other three versions of the one program (those of Brockway/MacCormick, Ayers/Duguid/Ross and Fabiano, and Europe/Nordic). Close study of the 22 integral education versions indicates that the personality who led each version overcame, negotiated, or transformed the obstacles normally experienced in anti-education institutions. Other personalities who used non-integral approaches in the same settings after the founder left were not as successful. In short, while integral education fits precisely into the nine element program configuration discussed throughout this chapter, evidence suggests it has been successful largely because of the credibility of the leader and the aspiration of inmate students to live up to that person's high expectations.

Summary: Four Versions of One Program that has been Proven to Work

Figure 3, which continues on the next page, displays the four versions of the one program that have been introduced in this chapter, according to their nine common elements:

Figure 3: One Program, Four Versions

<u>Elements</u>	<u>Brockway/ MacCormick</u>	<u>Ayers/Duguid/ Ross and Fabiano</u>	<u>Council of Eur./ Nordic</u>	<u>Integral Education</u>
<u>Pedagogy/ Andragogy</u>	Adult education	Adult, postsecondary education	Adult education Methods	Peda/Andragogy continuum
<u>Vocational Education</u>	Vocational education	Degrees enhance career options	Vocational education	Marketable skills
<u>Social Education</u>	Social education	Learning in the social sciences	Social and economic context	Social education
<u>Cultural Education</u>	Cultural education	Learning in the humanities	Cultural context; creative activities	Dance, drama, humanities
<u>Shared Responsibility</u>	Principle of community organization	Just community (democracy)	Prisoners partici- pate in education outside prison	Reciprocity, Democracy
<u>Inclusion</u>	Education for the handicapped	Native American courses; ESL; pre-college/tutors	All prisoners have access	Special, Bilingual education
<u>Technology</u>	Film strips; 35 mm films	Computers; word processing	Rules 6, 17 imply and support technologies	Various equip- ment; no high tech. to date
<u>Library</u>	Library	Library	Library	Library
<u>Administrative Configuration</u>	Ready for bureau	Ready for correctional school district	Ready for integral education	Not relevant

Terms that have been Used to Describe Aspects of the One Program

Despite the nine commonalities of the one program in different places and times, different summaries have been applied by prison educators to emphasize aspects of the results. For example, today many emphasize teacher enthusiasm as the primary input, others emphasize the “attitudes, skills, and knowledge” reversal of the typical locals school formula; some focus on reciprocity and discuss the “teacher as student and student as teacher.” Pestalozzi, an important early Swiss prison educator summarized it all in his aspiration to psychologize education; England’s Elizabeth Fry emphasized literacy so one could read the Bible and be “saved.” The system that attracted Brockway has been called Reformatory Prison Discipline, the Irish System, education for citizenship or for social responsibility. The one program has been called “humanities and social sciences” in Canada, activities to help develop the New Soviet man in Russia, or adult education in Europe. California’s Kenyon Scudder emphasized “prisoners are people;” Osborne discussed “prisons and common sense.” The goal of prison education has been characterized as the way theory informs practice (David Werner), or as the effort to “inform their discretion” (Stephen Duguid). All these modes of expression are correct and portray aspects of the one program rather than their entirety. The point of all these various expressions is that, because of its neglect, the field of prison education still “is entirely new” (as Mary Carpenter phrased it). Alternatively, “the educational idea of it all” is compelling (Zebulon Brockway).

A Few Explanatory Notes

Three special notes may be necessary to further contextualize the one program. First, in addition to the standard What works? question, prison educators also tend to ask about recidivism. They believe a reduced recidivism rate can indicate prison education program effectiveness. While the underlying assumption of the recidivism question—that released prisoners should refrain from further crime—is of course accurate, there are insidious problems that confound the relationship between recidivism and program success. For example, without even considering relevant sociological and economic issues, (a) various systems have defined recidivism in totally different ways, (b) there have never been data treatment, collection, and reporting procedures that could be used across systems, and (c) despite these constraints, when good recidivism findings have been reported they have not been used to improve the programs. There are many other, related concerns about the recidivism research literature. For our current purposes it is probably sufficient to note the complexity of this issue. One should study the options seriously before using recidivism data to measure prison education program effectiveness.

Second, the current authors feel intimately connected to the one program, and to the four versions of that program discussed herein. While the authors were never involved in the planning or implementation of the one program versions, they have both been involved in their chronicling. For example, one of the authors (a) experienced a profound transformation of his professional life the first time he read MacCormick’s book, (b) he provided protracted inservice for Duguid’s British Columbia program, and as a result, (c) was present at the Oxford conference where the EPEA was established; (d) he and his colleagues have been the primary chroniclers of what has been called in this chapter integral education. Both of the authors have built their respective research agendas on the benefits of the one program, as reflected in the nine identified elements.

Third and finally, the stark alignment of those nine elements is especially interesting, despite minor situational differences that accrued as a result of space and time. All nine elements apply over and over again, in each of the one program's versions or models. Within this parameter the greatest variance is in two specific elements. First, MacCormick really only "held the place" of what we have termed shared responsibility in his definitive 1931 book; he did this by focusing on the underlying theory rather than on actual everyday applications. The second departure is in the compound versions of the integral education model, but only in the element of administrative configuration. This variance accrues from the integral model's lack of reliance on any particular management scheme, since integral education transcends situational differences, and has worked almost without regard to specific administrative policies, through whatever form of organization is necessary or available. The overall alignment is indeed remarkable between the nine elements in the four versions, across vast differences of time and location.

Conclusion

Each version of the one program that works was forged by multiple founders over a protracted period: Brockway/MacCormick (1880s to 1940s), Ayres/Duguid/ Ross and Fabiano (1970s to 1990s), Council of Europe Prison Rules/Nordic Model (1989 to 2005), integral education (1850s to the present). Each version is as vital today in the literature as it was originally in institutional practice.

From one perspective the nine elements of the one program seem less than dramatic. With minor exceptions the nine elements, like headings of a job description under which our work could be described, are entirely consistent with what we experience daily in the field of prison education. Yet most practitioners know it would be useful to have all nine present in any single, balanced, well rounded program; most programs apply a reductionist approach, emphasizing one or a few of the elements of good practice. "The trick" is that all nine are required when persons are confined. Whenever access to education is constrained in any way everyone suffers, inside and outside of prison: victim, victimizer; student, teacher; administrator, employee, community.

In Europe the required balance is discussed under the phrases "adult education" and "normalization." In the United States the aspiration is discussed under the term "equal access." Several European nations have moved toward systematically addressing the need for balance; certainly there has been more recent progress in prison education there than in the U.S. Yet in both contexts there is more lipservice to the underlying principles than actual infrastructure. Prison education is notoriously understaffed, under resourced, and largely neglected by administrators, policy makers, and university researchers. No wonder institutional teachers often feel vulnerable.

Once prison educators feel confident about what works we should focus on implementing what works where we work, and on obtaining adequate resources. A bit of confidence might help us shift our professional paths from simple curiosity to a more secure focus on feasibility and planning. It would be timely for the communities we represent if the field of prison education could shed off the old hidden heritage vulnerability, to live up to our noble calling, to help students who are ready to improve their lives.

References

- Ayers, J. D. (1978). *Perspectives on education in prisons*. Victoria, British Columbia: University of Victoria.
- Brockway, Z. (1969/1912). *Fifty years of prison service: An autobiography*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.
- Carpenter, M. (1969/1864). *Our Convicts*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.
- Duguid, S. (July 23, 2007). Personal letter to Thom Gehring.
- Eggleston, C., and Gehring, T. (June, 1986). Correctional education paradigms in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Correctional Education*.
- Gehring, T. (2007). *Handbook for correctional education leaders*. San Bernardino: California State University.
- Gehring, T. (2005). Book review—Nordic Council of Ministers (2005). *Nordic prison education: A lifelong perspective*. San Bernardino: California State University, San Bernardino (unpublished review).
- Gehring, T., and Eggleston, C. (2006). *Correctional education chronology*. San Bernardino: California State University, San Bernardino.
- Gibb, J. (1978). *Trust: A new view of personal and organizational development*. Los Angeles: Astron.
- MacCormick, A. (1931). *The education of adult prisoners*. New York: The National Society of Penal Information.
- Muth, W., and Gehring, T. (March, 1986). The correctional education/prison reform link: 1913-1940 and conclusion. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 37(1).
- Muth, W., Gehring, T., Mayers, C., Puffer, M., and Kamusikiri, S. (2006). Janie Porter Barrett (1865-1948): Exemplary African American correctional educator. San Bernardino: California State University.
- Nordic Council of Ministers (2005). *Nordic prison education: A lifelong learning perspective*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Norden.
- Rocks, P. (May, 2003). History (of the European Prison Education Association). Obtained online at <http://www.epea.org/history.htm> on August 11, 2005.