INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/4885

8129401

LONGACRE, CLINTON DALE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT TEACHER TRAINING NEEDS

The University of Oklahoma ED.D. 1981

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT TEACHER TRAINING NEEDS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

CLINTON D. LONGACRE

Norman, Oklahoma

1981

AN ANALYSIS OF THE OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION

DEVELOPMENT TEACHER TRAINING NEEDS

APPROVED BY

Don S. Udell

Lloyd V. Karhoven

L. Dee Fink

Virginia B. Gillespie

Thomas H. Gallaher

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the researchers parents, Carl Andrew and Ora Mae Longacre, with complete love and appreciation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Donald S. Udell, the Chairman of his Dissertation Committee, for his encouragement and invaluable counsel in this comprehensive study. Gratitude is also expressed to the members of the Doctoral Committee, Dr. L. Dee Fink, Dr. Thomas H. Gallaher, Dr. Virginia B. Gillespie, and Dr. Lloyd J. Korhonen.

In addition, appreciation is expressed to Ms. Pauline Stockdale for her hours of meticulous typing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
DEDICATION		iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iv
LIST OF TABLES		vii
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Introductory Statement	1
	Need for the Study	5
	Statement of the Problem	8
	Definition of Terms	8
	Limitations of the Study	11
	Basic Assumptions	11
	Organization of the Study	11
II.	REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	13
III.	METHODOLOGY	26
	Population of the Study	26
	Instrumentation	26
	Data Acquisition	29
	Treatment of the Data	29
	Summary of Methodology	30
IV.	FINDINGS	31
	Introduction	31
	General Institution Information	32
	Maximum, Medium, Minimum Security Institution Findings	34
	Community Treatment Center Findings	73
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	78
	Summary	78
	Conclusions and Recommendations	80
	Recommendations for Future Research	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY		102
REFERENCE LIST		105

Page

APPENDICES

A. QUESTIONNAIRE. 107
B. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE MAXIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS ABE/GED TEACHERS 122
C. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTERS ABE/GED TEACHERS 137
D. TEACHER RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS. 152

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Correctional Institutions and Number of ABE/GED Instructors.	27
2.	Institution Security Level and Gender.	33
3.	Inmates Incarcerated	33
4.	Problems Affecting Teachers Ability to Meet Inmates Education Needs	35
5.	Formal Staffing Held Upon Completion of ABE or GED Program	36
6.	Number of Inmates Given Academic Counseling Prior to the Selection of an Educational Program.	36
7.	The Extent Financial Gains from Working in Prison Industries Discourages Inmates from Attending Education Programs	37
8.	Basis of Operation for Educational Programs. . .	38
9.	Time an Inmate Enters the Education Program. . .	38
10.	Compulsory Education Programs.	40
11.	Personnel Directly Involved in Educational Placement of Inmates	40
12.	Factors Effecting Inmate Participation in Education Programs	42
13.	Concurrent Participation in Program Areas Allowed for Inmates.	43
14.	Number of Years Teaching ABE or GED Classes at the Institution Where Presently Located . . .	43
15.	Education Levels of Teachers	44
16.	State Certified Teachers	46
17.	Teachers by Program Area	46

Page

18. Teaching System Used in the Educational Program. 47

19. Instructors Permitted to Tutor Inmates Confined to Cells. 47

20. Present Involvement in Training Programs 47

21. Inservice Training Courses 48

22. Inservice Training Courses Offered 49

23. Training or Information Requested. 50

24. Evaluations of Educational Staff 51

25. Authority Responsible for Evaluation of Educational Staff. 51

26. Inmates Employed as Support or Teaching Staff. . 52

27. General Attitudes of Noneducational Personnel Toward the Education Programs. 53

28. Inmates Released From Other Duties in the Institution to Participate in the Education Program. 54

29. Problems or Conflicts Created by Education Release Time 54

30. Education Programs Available for Staff 55

31. Availability and Quality of Resources and Materials for Education Programs for Maximum, Medium, and Minimum Security Institutions ABE (N=26) 57

32. Availability and Quality of Resources and Materials for Education Programs for Maximum, Medium, and Minimum Security Institutions GED (N=26) 58

33. Availability and Quality of Resources and Materials for Education Programs for Community Treatment Centers ABE (N=11). 59

34. Availability and Quality of Resources and Materials for Education Programs for Community Treatment Centers GED (N=11). 60

Page

35. Availability and Adequacy of Study Space Provided for Out of Class Work 61

36. Library Facilities 61

37. Library Operation. 62

38. Tests Administered to Inmates Entering Oklahoma's Correctional System at LARC 64

39. Inmate Test Results/Scores Readily Available from LARC. 64

40. Educational Placement of Inmates 65

41. Monitoring and Evaluating Inmate Progress. . . . 66

42. Procedure Used to Inform Inmates of Educational Progress 66

43. Budget 67

44. Frequency of Program Evaluation Required by Funding Source. 68

45. Use of External Resources in Education Programs 69

46. Extent Education Programs Limited in Scope by Lack of Contact with Community Resources. . . 69

47. Inmate Education Records Attainable by External Personnel 70

48. Syllabus for Each Course Offering. 71

49. Specific Competencies and/or Objectives for Educational Programs 72

50. Standards Used in the Design of Objectives and/or Competencies. 72

51. System to Evaluate the Accomplishment of Education Objectives and Competencies. 73

AN ANALYSIS OF THE OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS ADULT BASIC EDUCATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT TEACHER TRAINING NEEDS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introductory Statement

The educational pursuits within correctional systems are very costly in both human and economic terms, and so the extent to which adult offenders should participate in educational programs is the subject of much debate and concern among educators and correctional officers. Correctional educators in particular deplore the low education level generally prevalent among inmates. S. D. Feldman (1974), for example, states that 90% of all inmates in our nation's prisons have not completed a high school education. Moreover, the Federal Bureau of Prisons estimates at least 50% of the adults in federal and state facilities can neither read nor write (Reagen et al., 1973). Albert C. Roberts (1973), Chairman, Department of Criminal Justice Studies, Coppin State College, points out that 85% of the inmates dropped out of school before their sixteenth birthday, primarily because they lacked motivation and were unable to work within the framework of the school system. He also notes that on a general achievement test inmates perform, on the average, two to three grade

levels below the actual number of school years they have completed.

It is stated in "Alternatives to Prison" that more than 95% of all those who are incarcerated will be released, and the national figure on recidivism ranges from an optimistic 40% to an alarming 80%. The estimated annual cost of crime in America is over five billion dollars. Economists, however, supply a far different figure: when the costs of incarceration, the justice system, juvenile crime, organized crime, white collar crime, the destruction of property, and welfare to families of inmates are totaled, the sum is an overwhelming 60 billion dollars per year (Perlstein & Phelps, 1975).

The National Prisoner Statistics Special Report (1976) on Oklahoma's state-operated correctional facilities indicates that 70% of the prisoners in Oklahoma had not completed high school, of whom one-fourth had terminated their formal schooling prior to completion of the eighth grade, and only four percent had attended college.

Judge Bohanan's report (Battle, 1978) called attention to the overcrowded conditions in the Oklahoma state correctional insititutions. Although steps have been taken to correct this situation, Oklahoma correctional institutions are still overcrowded. At the time of this writing, January 1981, there were nineteen institutions within the Oklahoma Department of Corrections housing a total of 4,558 men and women inmates. Using the National Prisoner Statistics Special Report on Oklahoma's state operated correctional facilities that 70% of all prisoners

had not finished high school, the State of Oklahoma has approximately 3,191 inmates without their high school degree. Such a large number may indicate that it is very important that the State Department of Corrections have teachers who not only are qualified and certified, but who also receive additional training.

The Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan (1976) details educational goals for the Oklahoma Correctional System. Educational goals include remedial education through college degree programs. These programs should provide not only for the acquisition and development of basic skills but also for the stimulation of individual interests and continuation of academic training. Education benefits offenders while they are incarcerated and provides them with knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for assuming economic, social, and civic responsibilities upon release.

Glenn M. Kendall (1973) discusses the point that those who work in correctional education deal almost entirely with men and women who have formed antisocial habits, attitudes, and ways of thinking and behaving. The correctional educator's job is to substitute improved habits, attitudes, and ways of thinking and behaving for self-destructive characteristics. Most student inmates have very poor images of themselves and the world around them. As a result, they are discouraged and expect little from themselves and others. Self-confidence, hope, and trust are utterly foreign concepts to prison inmates,

despite how self-assured they sometimes seem. Nevertheless, the Manual of Correctional Standards of the American Correctional Association (1977) insists that the primary function of the prison is to rehabilitate its inmates.

The Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan (1976) emphasizes that institutions must provide inmates with the skills and personal resources to encourage an early and successful return to the community. Finally, the American Correctional Association (1977) considers the following factors to be essential for effective operation of the correction system:

(1) Each institution should provide a certified, comprehensive, and continuous educational program that emphasizes literacy training and includes individualized programming and instruction from grade school through college level courses.

(2) Meeting the educational needs of inmates requires a thorough knowledge of those to be served. Close working relationships between educational and classification personnel are, therefore, essential. The process of developing curricula should include the educational needs and preferences from inmates, and a system should be developed to review the education program regularly.

(3) The institution should insure that educational programs are available to all inmates who can benefit from and/or who have an interest in such programs. Where enrollment in an education program must be restricted, justification for that restriction should be documented.

(4) Educational counseling should be provided to place inmates in educational programs most suited to their needs and abilities. Such counseling should provide inmates with assistance, encouragement, and assessment regarding their educational goals and should help insure that each inmate's curriculum is integrated insofar as possible with his job while in prison.

(5) A systematic approach to determine the personnel requirements for the educational programs is also important. The staff/inmate ratio is a significant factor influencing effectiveness in any teaching environment.

> Inmates require the same interaction and personal attention that students do in educational programs outside the institution. (pp. 76-77)

In effective correctional education programs, then, careful consideration should be given to the training needs of teachers. What types of inservice training programs or workshops need to be specially planned and implemented to fill the void of education and training programs for correctional educators? What are the personal and academic attributes of the most successful correctional educators? Are these attributes any different from those needed by any other effective teacher? What kinds of knowledge and skills should inservice training of correctional educators impart? These are just a few of the important issues which those concerned with training the correctional educator must address.

Need For The Study

Ninety-seven percent of the inmates who enter American prisons return to society. More than half of this number return to the community in less than two years (Carter et al., 1975). Research indicates that educational programs within the prison system are of limited depth. For this reason, it is imperative to upgrade the educational opportunities available to the inmate population so that those re-entering society can make as successful a transition as possible.

The poor quality of instruction and lack of specially trained teachers have been identified (Bell, 1979) as areas of critical importance by most authorities. (The special

needs and circumstances of inmates require specially trained teachers.) Teachers who have been specially trained, however, are few as a result of the scarcity of training programs designed for correctional educators. Furthermore, the difficulties experienced in teaching in corrections have forced many qualified staff out of the field. Openings are often filled by teachers and administrators who are inadequately trained or do not receive training to meet the specific educational needs of the prison population.

When teachers interviewed in Dr. Bell's (1979) study were asked to identify weaknesses in their educational programs, they most frequently cited the following: (1) staff training; (2) teaching methods; (3) apathetic inmate response; (4) physical and financial resource availability; and (5) relevance of correctional education to job market. (p. 5)

Roberts (1973) makes special reference to the fact that courses and workshops should be planned and implemented to fill the void of education and training programs for correctional educators. He advocates preservice training for all beginning teachers in correctional facilities. Roberts also believes that if recidivism is to be reduced to any marked extent through correctional education, then one of the significant agents of corrections--the prison educator--must be given continued in-service and special training.

The Oklahoma Department of Corrections has expressed concern for the effectiveness and overall operational aspects of its education program and is seeking improvements. The initial

effort in this area was consultation with Dr. Lane Murray (1980) of the Texas Department of Corrections. Based on some of the recommendations in Murray's report and other Department concerns, a full time educational coordinator's position was established. Other important recommendations include evaluation of all personnel to determine adequate professional preparation in current assignments and the requirement of additional university courses to correct deficiencies. It was also recommended that inservice training be provided with regularity to faculty and staff to strengthen their skills and encourage the exchange of ideas and successful teaching strategies. A major step in this process took place in recent months when the State Department of Corrections named Dr. Kathy Roberts as the State's first Department of Corrections Educational Coordinator.

Although the needs of the inmates are carefully studied at centers, such as the Lexington Assessment and Reception Center, the problem remains of providing staff development for instructors. One particularly vital area is the certification of such instructors, certification being the cornerstone of accreditation for penal institutions. Accreditation is the key to the continued enhancement of educational opportunities and, therefore, more effective rehabilitation opportunities for inmates.

This study will result in a current and comprehensive assessment of the teacher training needs of instructors of Adult Basic Education and General Education Development programs of institutionalized adults in the Oklahoma Department

of Corrections. Through this assessment a data base will be provided to create a plan to meet those training needs. This project will, therefore, serve as a model for meeting not only the current teacher training needs but also the future needs of the target group.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to identify staff development and inservice training needs of the instructors of Adult Basic Education and General Education Development programs in the Oklahoma Penal System. Recommendations for future staff development and inservice training will be made to the Department of Corrections Administrative personnel.

An attempt will be made to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a need for additional staff development and inservice training for those involved in the instruction of Adult Basic Education and General Education Development classes within the Department of Corrections?

2. What are the staff development and inservice training needs of those instructors?

Definition of Terms

1. Adult Basic Education (ABE).--Adult Basic Education is an instructional program for undereducated adults predicated upon those basic and specific skills essential to members of society. (Good, 1973, p. 16)

2. General Education Development (GED Test).--A comprehensive test used primarily to appraise the educational development of adults who have not completed their formal high school education; through achievement of satisfactory scores, adults may earn a high school equivalency certificate, qualify for admission to college or to more advanced educational or employment opportunities, or meet qualifications for admission to licensing examinations for certain occupations; tests are administered at official GED centers approved by state departments of education and through the U. S. Armed Forces Institute to military personnel on active duty. (Good, 1973, p. 598)

3. Maximum Security Prison.--Maximum security prison is frequently used to describe a correctional institution handling a high-risk inmate population. Typically, such an institution is enclosed by brick or stone walls from 18 to 25 feet high, augmented by guard and gun towers. Variations of this exist with double fences 12 feet high, screened by gun towers, but, in any event, extreme caution is taken to retain custody of the inmate population. In the extremes, walls combined with additional fences and barbed wire are used in some jurisdictions.

The institutional process occurs in an atmosphere in which inmates are housed in interior cell blocks which, ideally, house no more than one inmate per cell. The overwhelming majority of prisons built in the United States before World War I were of the maximum security type. Fewer maximum security institutions have been built since that time, possibly

because of the increasing evidence that most prisoners require far less security--and security costs are proportionately high to the degree of security provided. (Coffey, 1974, pp. 259-260)

4. Medium Security Prison.--The medium security institution often uses the double fence enclosures and retains many of the characteristics of a maximum security prison. Sometimes it utilizes the "Pennsylvania model," with up to 150 units of cell block buildings, and dormitory housing as a frequent compromise with the penitentiary philosophy of providing individual rooms.

In most instances, the medium security facility houses a larger proportion of a given jurisdiction's prison population than the maximum security institution. (Coffey, 1974, p. 260)

5. Minimum Security Prison.--The minimum security institution may or may not be fenced. Frequently, as much as 70 percent of the inmate population is housed in dormitories supervised on a minimal basis.

The minimum security institution is far less expensive than a maximum security institution not only in terms of construction but in terms of the number of personnel the administrator requires to direct the program.

Armed guards and other forms of restraint are customarily considered unnecessary--inmate supervision conducted by unarmed officers and treatment personnel. (Coffey, 1974, p. 260)

6. Community Treatment Center.--Oklahoma has nine community treatment centers which serve prerelease and work release

functions. These facilities house inmates who have been serving time in state institutions and who are within three to six months of their release by parole or discharge. (Benton, 1976, p. 25)

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to:

1. the Oklahoma Penal System.
2. those teachers employed by the Department of Corrections.
3. those teachers presently teaching in the Adult Basic Education and/or General Education Development programs as of January 1981.

Basic Assumptions

Questionnaires distributed to Adult Basic Education and General Education Development teachers used simple, straightforward terminology. It is assumed that the terminology used was within the participants' ability to comprehend.

It is assumed also that all responding gave accurate responses.

Organization of the Study

This study has been divided into five chapters. Chapter I is an introduction which outlines the need for the study, statement of the problem, definition of terms, limitations of the study, and basic assumptions. Chapter II presents the

review of literature related to this study. Chapter III presents the methodological procedures, instrumentation, acquisition of data, and the treatment of the data. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study. Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The review of literature includes the results of a survey of current periodicals, journals, and publications in the field of adult education related to the assessment of teacher training for adult education in general and, in specific, to the assessment of teacher training needs for instructors of institutionalized adults. The GIPSY system, which utilizes the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and the Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE), has been surveyed as well as Psychological Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts, and Review of Educational Research. Computerized literature searches of the National Center for Mental Health and the Bibliographic Retrieval Services (BRS) were conducted through Project SEEK (Sooner Exchange for Educational Knowledge).

In Institutional Treatment of Young Offenders, John Galvin (Roberts, 1973) speaks of the necessity to be literate in America today:

> Citizenship in a democracy requires an informed person trained to reach sound judgments. In modern America the role of citizen can be played competently only by the person who reads with understanding, listens with a critical ear, and is trained to think logically and with good concentration. The ignorant, scatter-brained, gullible, or irrational person cannot contribute his share to the successful working of a democracy. Indeed he can scarcely survive in our complex society.

> In modern America the ability to read, solve mathematical problems, speak, write, and think clearly is also necessary for a person to make a good living. The work we do becomes more technical all the time. We work less and less with our hands and increasingly with our minds. (p. 78)

Addressing the problem from the standpoint of an inmate facing a return to society, T. A. Ryan (1975), Research Professor, Adult Basic Education, University of Hawaii, says,

> In the face of ever-increasing acts of crime and violence, and in response to the widespread concern over the problem of crime in America, the development of effective programs to promote the protection of society and at the same time redirect the offender population into constructive roles must be accorded top priority. With an offender group largely lacking the basic skills of gaining and maintaining gainful employment, the need for adult basic education in the nation's correctional institutions is of paramount importance. Far too often released offenders revert to their previous patterns of criminal behavior when faced with the almost impossible task of finding and keeping employment in the free world. The offenders in the nation's correctional institutions for the most part lack basic skills necessary for functioning productively within the accepted norms of society. They have distorted value structures, are handicapped by deficits in communication and computation skills, usually lack interpersonal skills, and are without the educational credentials demanded by prospective employers. (p. i)

Ryan (1973) claims that,

> To afford an equal chance for civic, economic, and social participation to the large segment of the adult illiterate population in correctional institutions or on parole and probation status, adult basic and career-based adult education programs must be implemented on an all-out basis in the nation's jails, reformatories, penitentiaries, and post-release settings. (p. 3)

In a society, then, which assumes of its citizens the ability to read and to follow written instructions, it can be argued that, if the prison program is to contribute to the reintegration of released inmates into free society, every effort should be made to provide them with an education as

close to the level of a common school education as possible. Furthermore, of great importance is the fact that substantial proportions of the prison population are essentially illiterate in the English language. The importance of overcoming this handicap cannot be overestimated if former inmates are to be able to function as members of society. Among the residents of correctional institutions who are functionally literate, however, a substantial number, even though native-born Americans, are nonreaders. As a consequence, it would be justifiable to require all prisoners of normal intelligence to attend school virtually on a full-time basis until they have attained at least a seventh-grade level of proficiency in common school subjects (Carter et al., 1975). Chief Justice Burger, in 1971, said that "the percentage of inmates in all institutions who cannot read or write is staggering. The figures of literacy are enough to make one wish that every sentence imposed could include a provision that would grant release when the prisoner had learned to read and write." (Helfrich, 1973, p. 49)

Daniel Glaser, Professor of Sociology, University of Southern California, states, "It is well established that deficiencies in reading ability and in accompanying verbal fluency are reflected in performance on intelligence tests. Deficiency in reading ability, then, seems to be a key problem, for it is this deficiency which increasingly differentiates those who drop out from those who complete high school." (Carter et al., 1972, p. 320)

The proof that programs designed to rehabilitate through education can be successful is attested to by the experiment of Warden John C. Watkins, Draper Correction Center in Elmore, Alabama. (Draper is a maximum security state prison for youthful offenders, mostly between the ages of sixteen and twenty-seven, who are serving sentences ranging from a few years for theft, to life imprisonment for murder.) Warden Watkins, a sociologist, assisted by Dr. John McKee, a psychologist, set up a program designed to break up the convict structure and establish a different kind of atmosphere in which the emphasis was placed on reconstructing the individual's personality and on education to fit the prisoner for a better life. Instead of blaming prisoners for failure, they tried to enlist the inmates' cooperation in making a scientific study of what went wrong in their lives and what was needed to effect changes.

They have reported that in five years, seventy-five inmates obtained high school diplomas; thirteen paroled inmates have entered college on scholarships for exprisoners, and one of them is eligible for Phi Beta Kappa. Twenty-five percent of the students voluntarily postponed their parole to finish their education programs, and only seven percent of the prison school enrollment became dropouts. About sixty-five percent of the students have been given early parole dates. (Menninger, 1966)

The Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education has stated in its Inmate Training Report:

> It is the consensus of the training staff that many of the men that have been and are in training have an inadequate educational base for going very far in a vocational program due to their lack of being able to read and comprehend. We agree that a basic education program providing basic and related education two to three hours per day would enable the men to achieve a higher degree of skill. It is recommended that funding a basic education program receive top priority. (Benton, 1976, p. 68)

The National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, recognizing the scope of Oklahoma's institutional educational programs, recommends individualization and further expansion of such programs. In education programs, a designation of specific goals and learning activities should be incorporated into the plan for the offenders' total program. For the greatest success, offenders and their decision-making team should work together to design individualized programs. (Benton, 1976)

The last decade has brought a proliferation of models, instruments, and strategies for assessing educational needs in various institutional settings and levels. Needs assessments have become accepted as an integral part of educational planning and evaluation. They are used for short range curricular or institutional changes and long range master plans. They also are used in setting goals and priorities for institutions in this rapidly changing age.

It is in this context that Witkin (1977) groups the various models in instruments for assessing needs. They are goal rating procedures; methods for gathering performance and other data on existing conditions; discrepancy survey questionnaires; complete kits for school use; futuring techniques;

specialized techniques; regional and state models; community occupation needs assessments; and communication focused methods.

Witkin states, "The most commonly used method of determining the present status of conditions prevailing in institutions is to survey different components to obtain perceptions of existing conditions." (p. 6)

In light of this information, the book Assessing School/College/Community Needs (Houston et al., 1978) was reviewed. Chapter 5, "Collecting Data on Current Conditions," was of particular value primarily for its discussion of assessing current conditions involving, people, programs, and organizations. The steps in the data collection process include designing and planning the data collection; identifying data sources; selecting and/or developing instruments; collecting data; analyzing data; and developing some criteria for evaluating the assessment system.

Further evidence of the success of educational programs is found in interviews conducted in the eight state institutions in Pennsylvania. In an effort to realize in an educational program the objectives of developing specific salable skills and developing skills leading to the completion of the General Education Development, offenders who had enrolled in adult basic education, general education development, and vocational courses in Pennsylvania's institutions were evaluated concerning their attitudes toward the quality of instruction and educational services offered. Most student offenders are

in the 16-to-30 age range, have a 10th grade education, are single, and are serving sentences under five years for their first offense. Conclusions derived from the evaluation were:

> In most cases student offenders have positive views about the importance of education to future jobs.
>
> The major reasons why offenders enroll in educational programs are that the programs fit their future plans, interests, previous experiences, and requirements for a high school diploma. (Lewis & Boyle, 1976, p. 6)

Strong Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Education Development (GED) programs are important within the correctional setting. The Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan (Benton, 1976) points out that such programs should provide for the acquisition and development of remedial skills, as well as stimulate individual interests and encourage continuation of academic training. Education not only benefits offenders within the confines of the prison but, it is hoped, equips them with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to adjust to their economic, social, and civic responsibilities upon release. In addition, educational training can significantly contribute to the development of the offender's positive self-concept, and thereby enhance society's acceptance of the ex-offender.

Having pointed out the ideal nature of General Education Development programs for correctional education, John J. Marsh (1973), Research Specialist, Correctional Education Association, cites its applicability to the varying levels of educational achievement of those incarcerated despite, on the average, the relatively short length of their commitment. Because General

Education Development programs can be short term, they are well suited, then, to the needs of the average adult inmate, whose period of incarceration is usually between 17 and 24 months.

Rehabilitation should be implicit in the sentence of every offender unless ordered otherwise by the sentencing court especially since the average time served in the Oklahoma State Institutions is 24 months. (Benton, 1976)

In setting up educational rehabilitation programs, educators find that accreditation is a problem in the Oklahoma Correctional Institutions. The Oklahoma State Reformatory (Granite), for instance, is currently the only institution with an accredited Kindergarten through 12 program: none of the other institutions are accredited or have a high school program. There are other programs and services that cannot be offered in institutions without accreditation. Currently unable to give the GED test, many institutions cannot offer programs until enough inmates are ready to test. Usually someone must be brought in from the outside, or the inmates must be taken to a testing location, such as the University of Oklahoma. For the purpose of accreditation, a school district must be formed. If one institution can be accredited, so should all of them. Although most of the teachers in the institutions are certified, to obtain accreditation, however, all teachers must be certified.

Because a large number of social offenders are educationally disadvantaged, a circumstance which has been seen as contributing heavily to the cause of criminal behavior, education, therefore, has become a key in the rehabilitation of offenders.

It is not simply education as a foundation for successful living but education as a means of rehabilitation. It has been recognized that the provision of proper motivation to learn is perhaps the most difficult feature in the operation of institutional schools. To transform failures into successes, or to assist them in transforming themselves, is not easy (Roberts, 1973).

Research for Better Schools (1977) includes the following characteristics as ideals in a basic education program in corrections:

> Uninterrupted class attendance, pre-instruction diagnosis, individual instruction keyed to behavioral objectives, a learning plan for each student developed by both instructor and inmate, innovative materials, up to date student records, academic counseling oriented to post release, and an attractive learning area. (p. 26)

Kendall (1973) lists five requirements necessary in correctional education:

> 1. Its first and most important job is motivation. One way to motivate an inmate is to demonstrate fairly quickly that he can benefit from the program if he will apply himself. Inmates have not learned to postpone their desires to work towards goals other than immediate ones.
>
> 2. Correctional education must be experimental. Because of the special needs of most inmates, a carbon copy of public education is not adequate.
>
> 3. Correctional education must keep pace with life outside the prison. That is, it must prepare inmates for the problems they will face upon their release.
>
> 4. Correctional education must change the inmate's ways of thinking about himself and others, and develop better social attitudes and habits.

> 5. The final basic element which puts "correction" in correctional education is the realization that it is part of a larger many-sided institutional program and the teacher must be an effective member of the larger team. Correctional education cannot disclaim responsibility for social education or rehabilitation, both direct or indirect, but neither should it try to do the whole job. By joining hands with other disciplines and departments to develop the most effective total climate for learning and rehabilitation and programs which will help each inmate learn to struggle successfully for a better life, correctional education can make its best contribution to the inmate, to the institution, and to the society to which it is responsible. (pp. 101-103)

Charles J. Eckenrode (1973) cites six principles which he belives should underlie the institutional education program:

> 1. Educational activity must be meaningful to the learner.
>
> 2. Correctional education must be offered in short, attainable, and measurable segments.
>
> 3. There must be reinforcement of learning. The feeling of satisfaction at having done something recognizably worthwhile may be the first such achievement in an inmate's life.
>
> 4. There must be balance in the total correctional program in which education is but a part--a meaningful part. We must realize that we are treating a whole person in the total atmosphere of an institution.
>
> 5. The institutional educational program must be an accredited one, perhaps even provided by the state educational agency.
>
> 6. Above all, there must be a substantial interpersonal relationship established between the teacher and the student. One of the findings reported by Dr. Dan Glaser, in "The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System," is that inmates who made good in the free community after their release from the institution attributed their success largely to the positive and constructive interpersonal relationships they had experienced with their work detail supervisors and their quarters supervisors. (p. 78)

The following points are listed as essential for education programs in the Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions (1977):

1. There is a certified, comprehensive, and continuous education program for inmates that extends through the high school level.

2. There is a system for insuring that the education program continues to meet the needs of the inmate population.

3. Educational opportunities are available to all inmates except where there is substantial evidence to justify otherwise.

4. Educational counseling is provided so that inmates are placed in that phase of an educational program most suited to their needs and abilities.

5. There is a systematic approach to determine the personnel requirements for the educational programs to insure that all inmates have access to staff and services.

6. There is an annual evaluation to measure the effectiveness of the educational programs against stated performance objectives.

7. There is a system whereby the education programs are assessed against stated objectives by qualified individuals, professional groups, and trade associations; this assessment is done at least every three years.

8. Educational supervisors and instructors are licensed or accredited by the state or jurisdiction in which the institution is located.

9. Inmates working as teachers or in other certified professions receive training and supervision.

10. The educational program is supported by specialized equipment, including, at a minimum, classrooms, teaching carrels, audio-visual materials and facilities, chalkboards, and administrative space.

11. The educational program allows for flexibile scheduling, which permits inmates to enter at any time and to proceed at their own learning pace.

12. The institution uses community educational programs for selected inmates.

13. The educational program includes instruction in functional social skills.

14. Vocational training programs are integrated with academic programs and are relevant to the vocational needs of inmates and to employment opportunities in the community.

15. The institution provides comprehensive library services. (pp. 77-79)

In his study, Bell (1979) notes that inmates are often put at a disadvantage when enrolling in an education program. Frequently, they are embarking upon a venture at which they have previously failed. The financial rewards for participation in education programs within the infra-structure of the prison are often lower than those for any of the alternative activities he could choose. Furthermore, the availability of education programs may be restricted to the evenings when more attractive alternatives are available. Then, too, the inmates' efforts in a program are not always reinforced by peer groups. In spite of these negative forces, inmates may be coerced, albeit subtly, into attending class by the suggestion that such attendance will look good on parole or commutation applications.

Hostility of administrators and guards towards inmates who are getting a second chance for education, a second chance that has been denied to many guards, is a recurrent problem. Hostility among correction officials and teachers is another barrier to the provision of a quality education. The competing interests of treatment and punishment catch inmates in a

philosophical struggle over which they have no control (National Correctional Education Evaluation Project, 1977).

In the State of Oklahoma, there has been very little standardization of the objectives and specific goals for attaining effective correctional education programming. Filling the education void which exists in nearly all institutionalized persons is a big order. It is even a larger order to try to copy the traditional public school system, the system in which the inmates have already failed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population of the Study

The population of this study included all 48 ABE/GED teachers employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections assigned to teach in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) and/or General Education Development (GED) programs. Since the number of ABE/GED teachers in the state correctional system is small, the entire population was surveyed. Fourteen of the 19 state correctional institutions had ABE/GED programs available for the inmates. Listings of the correctional institutions and of the number of ABE/GED teachers at each institution are shown in Table 1. The 14 correctional institutions were grouped into two classifications: group one included the nine maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions with 32 ABE/GED teachers, and group two, five community treatment centers with 16 ABE/GED teachers.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire to identify the staff development needs and inservice training needs of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections ABE and GED instructors was developed as a consequence of reviewing the literature relating to a general

TABLE 1

CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND NUMBER OF ABE/GED INSTRUCTORS

Name of Institution	Security Level of Institution	Number of ABE/GED Instructors
Conner Correctional Center	Medium	4
Joseph Harp Correctional Center	Medium	4
Howard C. McLeod Correctional Center	Minimum	2
Jess Dunn Correctional Center	Minimum	0
Lexington Assessment and Reception Center	Medium	4
Mabel Bassett Correctional Center	Medium	1
Oklahoma State Penitentiary for Women; for Men; Trustee Unit (McAlester)	Maximum	4
Oklahoma State Reformatory (Granite)	Maximum	8
Ouachita Correctional Center	Minimum	3
Stringtown Correctional Center	Medium	2
Clara Waters Community Treatment Center	CTC	2
Enid Community Treatment Center	CTC	7
Horace Mann Women's and Men's Community Treatment Center	CTC	5
Kate Bernard Community Treatment Center	CTC	0
Lawton Community Treatment Center	CTC	0
McAlester Community Treatment Center	CTC	0
Muskogee Community Treatment Center	CTC	1
Oklahoma City Community Treatment Center	CTC	1
Tulsa Community Treatment Center	CTC	0
Total Population		48

assessment of adult education and, specifically, to the assessment of teacher training needs for instructors or institutionalized adults. Questions were selected to provide a detailed, descriptive, and analytical picture of these needs.

The review of the literature and the meetings with members of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections educational staff provided a tentative instrument, the validity of which was established by a panel of experts. They reviewed items in the questionnaire developed from the available literature and correctional education staff input. A pilot study was conducted to establish reliability of the survey instrument; and the respondents selected for the pilot study were the educational coordinators for the respective state correctional institutions.

The final survey instrument consists of five sections. Section One of the questionnaire contains questions regarding general human and physical aspects of each institution. Section Two deals with personal information and training of the teachers. Section Three includes general program information. Section Four deals specifically with information concerning the Adult Basic Education program. Section Five contains questions relating specifically to the General Education Development program. (A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix A.)

Data Acquisition

The data collection consisted of two parts:

A. The first phase was comprised of site visitations as a pre-survey measure to explain to Department of Corrections officials, particularly the educational directors, the purpose of the survey and its general contents, and to coordinate the administration of the instrument.

B. The second phase of data acquisition consisted of site visitations to each participating correctional institution to conduct the survey with the target group. A copy of the questionnaire was delivered to all ABE/GED teachers at every participating institution. In the event a teacher was absent on the scheduled survey date, a questionnaire and self-addressed, stamped envelope were left with the education director of the institution. Each questionnaire was coded so the teachers who failed to return a questionnaire within one week could receive a follow up telephone call. In all, 48 questionnaires were returned, representing a 100 percent response.

Treatment of the Data

The data obtained from the 48 questionnaires were audited; and the responses, tabulated. Each question was placed in one of eight categories to make possible the appropriate analysis of the collected data. The eight categories are:

1. General institution information
2. Inmate educational interest
3. Inmate educational placement
4. Human resources:
    a. Educational staff
    b. Inmates
    c. Other institutional personnel
5. Physical resources:
    a. Facilities in general
    b. Library
    c. Educational materials and equipment
    d. Tests and records
6. Financial resources
7. External resources
8. Course design information

The results are also grouped according to institution security level (as described in the Population of the Study) in the tables and appendices. The results are reported by number of responses and by percentages of the responses.

Summary of Methodology

The survey method was used to collect data from the ABE/GED teachers in the Oklahoma correctional system. The results served as a basis to draw conclusions and make recommendations to the Oklahoma State Department of Corrections and the Oklahoma State Department of Education.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This study presents data collected from the ABE/GED teachers who, employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, were assigned to teach in the Adult Basic Education and General Education Development programs. Questionnaires were returned by 100% of the 48 ABE and GED teachers. All teachers, however, did not respond to every question; therefore, the number of responses for each question is presented and denoted by the letter N.

Differences in the natures of the Community Treatment Centers and the Maximum, Medium, and Minimum Security institutions prompted this writer to report the findings separately. All narration for the Maximum, Medium, and Minimum Security institutions precedes the appropriate tables. The narration for the Community Treatment Centers follows, and reference in the narration is made to the appropriate tables. The Maximum, Medium, and Minimum security institutions are denoted MMM and the Community Treatment Centers are denoted CTC in the tables. All percentages presented are rounded to the nearest whole number. The respondents were permitted to check more than one answer on some questions, therefore, the number and percentage

of answers listed on some tables will total more than 100 percent.

Inmate educational programs involve eight areas of major concern: first, general institution information; second, the inmates' interest in the educational programs; third, the factors involved in the inmates' educational placement; fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh, the human, physical, financial, and external resources, respectively, to meet the educational needs of the inmates; and the eighth area of concern involves course design information.

General Institution Information

The number of state correctional institutions is presented by security level and gender in Table 2. The number of inmates incarcerated, as of January 1981, in the state correctional institutions is presented by security level and gender in Table 3.

The average age of the inmate population, the average length of time served in each institution, and the unique or specialized purpose of each institution is listed in Appendix D, pages 153 and 154.

Jess Dunn, a minimum security institution, was in the process of developing an ABE/GED program; however, at the time of this writing, January 1981, no program existed. Also, Kate Bernard, Lawton, McAlester, and Tulsa Community Treatment Centers did not have an ABE or GED program at that time.

TABLE 2

INSTITUTION SECURITY LEVEL AND GENDER

Type of Institution	Number of Institutions Housing Males		Housing Females		Coed	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Maximum Security	1	5	0	0	1	5
Medium Security	4	21	1	5	0	0
Minimum Security	3	16	0	0	0	0
Community Treatment Center (CTC)	6	32	2	11	1	5

TABLE 3

INMATES INCARCERATED

Type of Institution	Inmates Incarcerated Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%
Maximum Security	1451	30	63	1
Medium Security	1755	36	68	1
Minimum Security	814	17	0	0
Community Treatment Center (CTC)	538	11	217	4
Total	4558			

Maximum, Medium, Minimum Security Institution Findings

Inmate Educational Interest

The interest of inmates in educational programs designed specifically for them was explored by questions which pertained to student motivation, incentives, formal staffings, academic counseling, financial factors, and inmate transfers from one institution to another.

Low motivation among students was reported by 76% of the teachers to be a problem (Table 4), while 78% of the teachers (Table 4) reported that lack of incentives for the inmates' participation in education programs affected adversely the ability of teachers to meet the needs of the inmates. Further examination of the problems caused by low motivation and lack of incentives revealed the following considerations:

1. The availability of formal staffings held for inmates upon completion of the ABE and GED programs was explored in the questionnaire. A low 39% of the ABE teachers and 62% of the GED teachers hold a formal staffing for inmates to formulate recommendations for further educational or alternative placement within the institution (Table 5).

2. Data collected concerning the number of inmates given academic counseling prior to the selection of an educational program showed that of the teachers supplying such data, a low 41% reported that each inmate received this type of counseling (Table 6).

TABLE 4

PROBLEMS AFFECTING TEACHERS ABILITY TO MEET INMATES EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
MMM (N=32) CTC (N=16)

Issues	Teacher Responses: Not A Problem (1) MMM N	MMM %	CTC N	CTC %	(2) MMM N	MMM %	CTC N	CTC %	(3) MMM N	MMM %	CTC N	CTC %	(4) MMM N	MMM %	CTC N	CTC %	Problem (5) MMM N	MMM %	CTC N	CTC %	No Answer MMM N	MMM %	CTC N	CTC %
Conflicts with Custody	10	31	5	31	8	25	5	31	6	19	0	0	5	16	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	6	38
Conflicts over Maintenance of Institution (e.g. Inmates' job)	12	38	2	13	7	22	0	0	7	22	4	25	4	13	3	19	2	6	1	6	0	0	6	38
Lack of Adequate Liaison with Treatment Staff	15	47	5	31	9	28	1	6	5	16	3	19	2	16	1	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	6	38
Conflicts with Other Institutional Programs for Inmates (Religious, Recreational, etc.)	12	38	2	13	7	22	0	0	7	22	4	25	6	19	2	13	0	0	1	6	0	0	7	44
Lack of Qualified Teachers	18	56	7	44	6	19	1	6	4	13	0	0	2	6	0	0	2	6	1	6	0	0	7	44
Lack of Supplementary Staff (Educational Counselors, Psychologists, etc.)	16	50	4	25	8	25	1	6	3	9	2	13	1	3	1	6	3	9	1	6	1	3	7	44
Lack of Educational "Hardware" (Videocassettes, Tapes, etc.)	6	19	4	25	7	22	2	13	9	28	1	6	4	13	0	0	6	19	3	19	0	0	6	38
Lack of Educational "Software" (Workbooks, Texts, etc.)	8	25	5	31	4	13	2	13	12	38	3	19	2	6	0	0	6	19	1	6	0	0	5	31
Lack of Inservice Training for Staff	12	38	4	25	4	13	3	19	6	19	1	6	6	19	1	6	3	9	0	0	1	3	7	44
Lack of Instructional Material Related to Inmates' Needs	7	22	3	19	6	19	0	0	8	25	3	19	8	25	1	6	2	6	3	19	1	3	6	38
Lack of Adequate Books, Tools, & Other Educational Materials	7	22	2	13	8	25	2	13	6	19	2	13	9	28	1	6	2	6	3	19	0	0	6	38
Lack of Study Areas Conducive to Good Learning	6	19	3	19	6	19	3	19	4	13	3	19	8	25	1	6	8	25	1	6	0	0	5	31
Inadequate Library Facilities	8	25	3	19	6	19	2	13	8	25	3	19	7	22	0	0	3	9	3	19	0	0	5	31
Low Student Motivation	2	6	0	0	6	19	2	13	5	16	2	13	7	22	2	13	12	38	6	38	0	0	4	25
Lack of Adequate Funding	2	6	3	19	7	22	1	6	13	41	3	19	5	16	0	0	5	16	2	13	0	0	7	44
Lack of Administrative Support	11	34	5	31	8	25	4	25	4	13	2	13	5	16	1	6	4	13	0	0	0	0	4	25
Lack of Incentives for Inmate Participation	2	6	1	6	5	16	3	19	7	22	4	25	7	22	1	6	11	34	2	13	0	0	5	31
Lack of Educational Follow-up with Parole & Post-Release Agencies	5	16	0	0	7	22	3	19	9	28	2	13	4	13	2	13	7	22	2	13	0	0	7	44

TABLE 5

FORMAL STAFFING HELD UPON COMPLETION OF ABE OR GED PROGRAM

Formal Staffing Held	Teacher Responses MMM (N=26) ABE N	%	GED N	%	CTC (N=11) ABE N	%	GED N	%
Yes	10	39	16	62	0	0	1	9
No	15	58	10	39	6	55	6	55
No Answer	1	4	0	0	5	46	4	36

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF INMATES GIVEN ACADEMIC COUNSELING PRIOR TO THE SELECTION OF AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Number Given Counseling	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
All of them	13	41	0	0
Most of them	11	34	0	0
Very few of them	4	13	1	6
None of them	2	6	0	0
No Answer	2	6	15	94

3. The financial gains from working in prison industries was listed by 84% of the teachers as having some to no effect when considered as a discouraging factor in attending education programs (Table 7). Note, however, only nine percent had gathered data from interviews of inmates or questionnaires to support their statements. (See Appendix D, page 163, for their methods of data collection.)

TABLE 7

THE EXTENT FINANCIAL GAINS FROM WORKING IN PRISON INDUSTRIES DISCOURAGES INMATES FROM ATTENDING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Extent of Discouragement	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Very much	6	19	1	6
Some	12	38	2	13
Very little	10	31	1	6
Not at all	4	13	2	13
No answer	0	0	10	63

4. A high percentage (ABE, 89%; GED, 96%) of the teachers' educational programs operate on a continuing basis. The teachers (ABE, 96%; GED, 100%) stated that an inmate could enter the education program at any time. A summary is provided in Tables 8 and 9.

TABLE 8

BASIS OF OPERATION FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Basis of Operation	Teacher Responses MMM (N=26) ABE N	%	GED N	%	CTC (N=11) ABE N	%	GED N	%
Semester Basis	2	8	2	8	5	46	3	27
On-Going Basis	23	89	25	96	3	27	4	36
Day School	8	31	7	27	0	0	1	9
Night School	3	12	4	15	8	73	7	64
No Answer	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	9

TABLE 9

TIME AN INMATE ENTERS THE EDUCATION PROGRAM

A Student Enters The Program	Teacher Responses MMM (N=26) ABE N	%	GED N	%	CTC (N=11) ABE N	%	GED N	%
Anytime	25	96	26	100	10	91	10	91
Beginning of Semester	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0
No Answer	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9

5. Note also that as inmates are transferred from one institution to another, their education program will be greatly interrupted. Each institution presently has its own plan of education, a fact which apparently means that there is no consistency in the Oklahoma Department of Corrections education plan. This lack of consistency would seem to be a deterrent to the inmates' interest in education. Earlier in this paper it has been noted that inmate motivation and lack of incentives are problems. The present situation, then, does not encourage positive motivation factors, but adds negative deterrents to the education of inmates.

Inmate Educational Placement

In dealing with the subject of inmate educational placement, the teachers were asked which educational programs are compulsory; 28% responded that an ABE program was required, while 19% indicated that a GED program was compulsory. (See Table 10 for a listing of compulsory education programs.)

The teachers surveyed were also asked to specify those individuals who are directly involved in the decision to place inmates in educational programs. The teachers identified the following persons, listed in order of the frequency of their citation: inmates themselves, 84%; educational representatives, 72%; treatment staff, 47%; other, 28%; and security staff, 25%. (See Table 11 for the complete breakdown of the data and

Appendix D, page 165, for a complete listing of others involved in the decision process.)

TABLE 10

COMPULSORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

	Teachers Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Education Programs	N	%	N	%
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	9	28	1	6
General Education Development (GED)	6	19	3	19
Vocational Education	5	16	0	0
Specified Grade Equivalency	7	22	0	0
None	13	40	6	38
Other	3	19	0	0
No Answer	0	0	7	44

TABLE 11

PERSONNEL DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT OF INMATES

	Teachers Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Personnel	N	%	N	%
Security Staff	8	25	3	19
Treatment Staff	15	47	6	38
Inmate	27	84	6	38
Educational Representative	23	72	4	25
Other	9	28	0	0
No Answer	1	3	8	50

The teachers were then asked to rate those factors which determine whether inmates will participate in an educational program. The factors were rated on a four point scale ranging from Very Important to Not Important. Table 12 illustrates the percentage of instructors citing these factors as influencing inmate involvement in educational programs. Note that the factor receiving the highest rating was Parole Board Recommendations: 84% of the teachers stated that Parole Board Recommendations were either an Important or Very Important factor in determining whether inmates become involved in educational programs. In fact, it was rated higher than inmate's interest or court recommendations.

Of the teachers surveyed, 44% stated that no alternative placements or services are available if an inmate, who has been referred for educational placement, cannot be adequately placed in existing program offerings (e.g., because of extremely low level of achievement and/or serious learning disability).

Most of the teachers (ABE, 85%; GED, 81%) indicated that inmates are allowed to mix their education programs with work assignments. Half the ABE teachers and 42% of the GED teachers allow participation in the Vocational Education program. Table 13 reflects other concurrent programs which are allowed.

Human Resources

Educational staff. The data shows that 54% of the teachers have been teaching ABE or GED classes for three years or less at the institutions where they are presently employed. See Table 14 for a complete breakdown of the number of years teachers have

TABLE 12

FACTORS EFFECTING INMATE PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS
MMM (N=32) CTC (N=16)

	Teacher Responses																			
	Very Important				Important				Moderately Important				Not Important				No Answer			
	MMM		CTC		MMM		CTC		MMM		CTC		MMM		CTC		MMM		CTC	
Factor	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Recommendations of Counselor	8	25	7	44	13	41	3	19	8	25	1	6	1	3	0	0	2	6	5	31
Test Results	8	25	1	6	6	19	5	31	10	31	1	6	5	16	0	0	3	9	9	56
Years in School Prior to Incarceration	2	6	5	31	11	34	4	25	6	19	1	6	11	34	0	0	2	6	6	38
Inmate Interest	18	56	8	50	6	19	0	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	50
Court Recommendations	10	31	3	19	6	19	3	19	10	31	1	6	3	9	0	0	3	9	9	56
Parole Board Recommendations	18	56	3	19	9	28	3	19	1	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	9	56
Other	5	16	3	19	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 13

CONCURRENT PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM AREAS ALLOWED FOR INMATES

Program Areas of Allowed Participation	Teacher Responses MMM (N=26) ABE N	%	GED N	%	CTC (N=11) ABE N	%	GED N	%
Vocational Education	13	50	11	42	3	27	3	27
Work Assignment	22	85	21	81	4	36	5	46
Social Education	8	31	8	31	0	0	2	18
Post Secondary Education	0	0	8	31	0	0	0	0
None of These	2	8	1	4	0	0	0	0
No Answer	0	0	0	0	7	64	6	55

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING ABE OR GED CLASSES AT THE INSTITUTION WHERE PRESENTLY LOCATED

Number of Years	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Less Than 1 Year	5	16	7	44
1 - 2 Years	4	13	5	31
2 - 3 Years	8	25	1	6
3 - 4 Years	1	3	0	0
4 - 5 Years	1	3	1	6
5 - 6 Years	2	6	0	0
6 - 7 Years	3	9	0	0
7 - 8 Years	1	3	1	6
More than 8 Years	6	19	0	0
No Answer	1	3	1	6

been teaching at their present institutions. Appendix D, page 155, outlines by institution the number of years each individual has been teaching ABE and/or GED classes.

Only one teacher reported being a part-time ABE-GED teacher; however, that person had other educational responsibilities in the institution. The other teachers indicated they are employed full-time as ABE/GED instructors.

The questionnaire asked for the teachers' present level of educational achievement. The teachers' responses showed that 57% have their Bachelor's Degree and 47% have their Master's Degree. Table 15 provides a review of the educational level of the ABE/GED teachers.

TABLE 15

EDUCATION LEVELS OF TEACHERS

Present Level of Educational Achievement	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
12th Grade	0	0	0	0
12th Grade +	0	0	0	0
Vocational Technical Training	0	0	0	0
1-2 Years of College	0	0	0	0
Associate of Arts Degree	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's Degree	5	16	1	6
Bachelor's Degree +	13	41	5	31
Master's Degree	3	9	1	6
Master's Degree +	11	34	8	50
Doctorate	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
No Answer	0	0	1	6

Table 16 and Appendix D, page 158, outline the teachers' areas of specialization and the state certification they presently hold. Appendix D, page 163, shows the number of inmates currently participating in each person's class at each institution. While 16% teach ABE classes only and 16% teach GED classes only, 66% teach both ABE and GED classes (Table 17). The information regarding the teaching system (individualized programmed instruction, classroom instruction, both, other) that best describes the teacher's program is summarized in Table 18. A combination of classroom and individual program instruction is utilized by 46% of the ABE teachers and 58% of the GED teachers. Using individualized program instruction are 31% of the ABE teachers and 27% of the GED teachers; 23% of the ABE teachers and 12% of the GED teachers use classroom instruction exclusively (Table 18), whereas 63% of the teachers stated that they were permitted to work tutorially with inmates confined to their cells for behavioral or safety reasons (Table 19).

The teachers were also asked to respond to a number of questions concerning training. When asked whether they are presently involved in any training programs not sponsored by the Department of Corrections (such as at a college or university), 63% stated they were not (Table 20). The teachers responding yes were asked to specify the type of training in which they are involved. (See Appendix D, page 158, for the array of their answers.)

TABLE 16

STATE CERTIFIED TEACHERS

Area of Certification	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Elementary Education	7	22	7	44
Adult Basic Education	2	6	0	0
Secondary Education:				
General	23	72	6	38
Specific Subject Area	8	25	3	19
Guidance	2	6	1	6
Special Certification:				
Reading	3	9	1	6
Special Education	1	3	1	6
Learning Disabilities	0	0	0	0
Educative Mentally Retarded	0	0	0	0
Speech Therapy	0	0	0	0
Social Restoration	0	0	0	0
Other	6	19	3	19
No Answer	0	0	1	6

TABLE 17

TEACHERS BY PROGRAM AREA

Educational Programs	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
ABE Programs Only	5	16	3	19
GED Programs Only	5	16	3	19
Both ABE and GED Programs	21	66	8	50
No Answer	1	3	2	13

TABLE 18

TEACHING SYSTEM USED IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
Teaching System	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Individualized Program Instruction	8	31	7	27	2	18	4	36
Classroom Instruction	6	23	3	12	2	18	0	0
Both of the Above	12	46	15	58	7	64	7	64
Other	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0

TABLE 19

INSTRUCTORS PERMITTED TO TUTOR INMATES CONFINED TO CELLS

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Permitted	N	%	N	%
Yes	20	63	0	0
No	12	38	4	25
No Answer	0	0	12	75

TABLE 20

PRESENT INVOLVEMENT IN TRAINING PROGRAMS

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=32)				CTC (N=16)			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
Training	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Training Programs Sponsored by DOC	10	31	22	69	0	0	16	100
Training Programs Not Sponsored by DOC	12	37	20	63	5	31	11	69

When teachers were asked whether they are presently involved in any training programs sponsored by the Department of Corrections, 69% stated they were not (Table 20). Of those who responded yes, half cited they were involved in 80 hours of training per year. (See Appendix D, page 159, for a complete list of the answers specified by those answering yes.) Appendix D, page 159, lists the answers to the question to determine, in the past five years, those Department of Corrections sponsored training programs in which teachers participated.

The question was asked whether inservice training courses were available. Of the responding teachers, 59% stated that inservice training courses were mandatory (Table 21). In response to the question of how often regular evaluations of educational staff are conducted, a wide variety of answers were given, with no particular frequency mode standing out. (See Table 22 and Appendix D, page 164.) A lack of inservice training for staff was considered a problem affecting teachers' ability to meet inmates' educational needs by 47% of the responding teachers (Table 4).

TABLE 21

INSERVICE TRAINING COURSES

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Requirements	N	%	N	%
Mandatory	19	59	2	13
Optional	8	25	1	6
Not Available	5	16	1	6
No Answer	0	0	12	75

TABLE 22

INSERVICE TRAINING COURSES OFFERED

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Frequency	N	%	N	%
Weekly	4	13	1	6
Monthly	4	13	0	0
Annually	4	13	1	6
Other	18	56	0	0
No Answer	2	6	14	88

The provision of teaching methods, with 69% of the teachers requesting training or information in this area, was the most requested training need followed by textbooks, equipment and educational materials designed to meet special needs, which were requested by 63% of the teachers. Other training or information needs receiving a high percentage of requests were individual programmed instruction, 56%; the use of counseling and supportive services, 53%; and both recruitment/selection procedures and utilization of community resources, 41%. A complete listing of training and information needs is found in Table 23 and Appendix D, page 161.

On the subject of evaluation, 84% of the teachers indicated they were evaluated annually (Table 24), and 91% of the teachers were evaluated by their supervisors (Table 25).

A lack of qualified teachers was stated by 25% of the teachers as a problem affecting teachers' ability to meet inmates' educational needs (Table 4).

TABLE 23

TRAINING OR INFORMATION REQUESTED

Training Needs	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Writing Educational Goals and Principles	12	38	2	13
Job Market Assessment	11	34	2	13
Utilization of Community Resources	13	41	5	31
Recruitment/Selection Procedures	13	41	2	13
The Use of Counseling and Supportive Services	17	53	4	25
Teaching Methods	22	69	6	38
Pre- and Post-Testing Procedures	10	31	3	19
Individual Programmed Instruction	18	56	3	19
Classroom Instruction	9	28	2	13
The Student Evaluation Process	7	22	4	25
Teacher Centered Objectives/Competencies	9	28	1	6
Content Centered Objectives/Competencies	7	22	1	6
Student Centered Objectives/Competencies	12	38	3	19
How to Write a Syllabus	8	25	0	0
Textbooks, Equipment and Educational Materials Designed to Meet Special Needs	20	63	7	44
Program and Student Evaluation	12	38	3	19
Others	5	16	1	6

TABLE 24

EVALUATIONS OF EDUCATIONAL STAFF

Frequency of Evaluation	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Annually	27	84	2	13
Monthly	1	3	0	0
Not Conducted	2	6	3	19
Other	6	19	0	0
No Answer	1	3	11	69

TABLE 25

AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE FOR EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL STAFF

Authority Responsible	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
External Personnel	7	22	2	13
Supervisors	29	91	1	6
Peers	4	13	0	0
Inmates	1	3	0	0
Other	6	19	1	6
No Answer	1	3	12	75

Regarding training, 100% of the teachers requested additional training; the 32 teachers made 205 specific training requests. That figure averages out to more than six requests per teacher. (See Appendix B, page 126, for the number of specific training requests by institution.)

Inmates

Inmates are employed by 69% of the teachers as support staff in their education programs. Of those teachers using inmates, 55% use them as teacher aids; 50%, as tutors; 23% as monitors of equipment. None of the teachers, however, use inmates to teach classes (Table 26).

TABLE 26

INMATES EMPLOYED AS SUPPORT OR TEACHING STAFF

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Inmates Employed	N	%	N	%
Yes	22	69	3	19
No	10	31	7	44
No Answer	0	0	6	38
If yes, responsibilities given to inmates MMM (N=22); CTC (N=3)				
Teacher Aides	12	55	1	33
Assigned Tutoring	11	50	2	67
Monitoring Equipment	5	23	0	0
Classroom Teaching	0	0	1	33
Other	6	27	0	0
No Answer	3	14	0	0

Other Institutional Personnel

Teacher ratings of the general attitudes of noneducational personnel toward the education program showed that 32% of the teachers found security to be either nonsupportive or hostile. Nearly one-fifth of the teachers, moreover, claimed that administrative staff was either nonsupportive or hostile. The summary

of teachers' responses to the general attitudes of the administrative, security, and treatment staff is provided in Table 27.

TABLE 27

GENERAL ATTITUDES OF NONEDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL TOWARD THE EDUCATION PROGRAMS
MMM (N=32) CTC (N=16)

	Teacher Ratings											
	Security Staff				Treatment Staff				Administration			
	MMM		CTC		MMM		CTC		MMM		CTC	
Attitude	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Extremely Supportive	3	9	3	19	7	22	4	25	6	19	7	44
Moderately Supportive	18	56	6	38	21	66	5	31	20	63	2	13
Not Supportive	6	19	0	0	3	9	0	0	5	16	0	0
Hostile	4	13	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	0
No Answer	1	3	7	44	0	0	7	44	0	0	7	44

A majority (59%) of the teachers reported that the inmate is always released from work assignments to attend classes. Furthermore, 34% of the teachers reported conditional release for educational purposes, while a small number (6%) reported that an inmate is never released from work assignments (Table 28). This released time was cited as a cause of conflict between work supervisors and educators by a majority (56%) of the teachers, while 34% reported that it created problems between security and educators. Other conflicting relationships are summarized in Table 29. However, 41% of the teachers stated that formal administrative policy or process has been established to resolve such problems.

TABLE 28

INMATES RELEASED FROM OTHER DUTIES IN THE INSTITUTION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EDUCATION PROGRAM

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Frequency	N	%	N	%
Always	19	59	1	6
Sometimes (On Condition)	11	34	6	38
Never	2	6	1	6
No Answer	0	0	8	50

TABLE 29

PROBLEMS OR CONFLICTS CREATED BY EDUCATION RELEASE TIME

	Teacher Responses			
Problems or Conflicts	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Between	N	%	N	%
Security and Education Staffs	11	34	0	0
Treatment and Education Staffs	1	3	1	6
Work Supervisors and Education Staffs	18	56	0	0
Does Not Apply	11	34	5	31
Administration and Education Staffs	1	3	0	0
No Answer	1	3	10	63

The availability of educational programs for institutional staff was explored in the questionnaire. A minority of teachers (38%) indicated no educational offerings were available for the institutional staff; 13% had separate classes for staff, while 53% had classes which both staff and inmates attended (Table 30).

TABLE 30

EDUCATION PROGRAMS AVAILABLE FOR STAFF

Education Programs Available	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Institutional Staff Combined in Classes with Inmates	17	53	0	0
Separate Classes for Institutional Staff	4	13	1	6
No Classes Available for Institutional Staff	12	38	5	31
No Answer	0	0	10	63

The percentage of teachers who believe these issues are problems affecting their ability to meet inmates' educational needs is briefly summarized here: conflicts with custody, 44%; lack of administrative support, 42%; conflicts over maintenance of institution (e.g., inmates' jobs), 41%; conflicts with other institutional programs for inmates, 41%; lack of adequate liaison with treatment of staff, 35%; and lack of supplementary staff (e.g., educational counselors, psychologists), 21%. A complete list of issues and ratings is found in Table 4.

Physical Resources

Facilities in General

The teachers were asked to rate the availability and quality of classroom space and furnishings; half the ABE and GED teachers found the availability of classroom space and furnishings sufficient to meet the needs of all classes. Furthermore, 38% found the classroom space modern and high in quality, and 42% believe the classroom furnishings to be both

modern and high in quality. Tables 31, 32, 33, and 34 illustrate the complete teacher ratings on this subject.

In response to questions concerning the availability and adequacy of study space provided for out of class work, 75% of the teachers stated that such space either was not available or was available only on a limited basis, and 72% rated the study space provided for out of class work as not conducive to studying. All ratings of these questions are reported in Table 35. Lack of study areas conducive to good learning was rated by 63% of the teachers (Table 4) as a problem affecting teachers' ability to meet inmates' educational needs.

Library

Library concerns were also addressed in the questionnaire, on which 69% rated the library facilities in their institution as adequate, whereas 25% rated their libraries poor. None of the teachers, however, gave their library an excellent rating (Table 36).

In terms of space, 69% of the teachers found their library adequate, and in terms of time 78% believed their library to be adequate to meet the needs and goals of their educational programs; 100% of the teachers stated that all volumes in the library are available to inmates (Table 37). The teachers surveyed were also asked to specify the number of volumes they have in their institutional library. Their responses are listed in

TABLE 31

AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY OF RESOURCES AND MATERIALS FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR MAXIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS ABE (N=26)

	Teacher Ratings															
	Availability								Quality							
	(1) Sufficient to Meet the Needs of All Classes		(2) Available in Limited Quantity		(3) Definitely insufficient		No Answer		(1) Modern and of High Quality		(2) Adequate But Needs Improvement		(3) Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs		No Answer	
Item	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	10	39	12	46	2	8	2	8	10	39	14	54	0	0	2	8
Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	5	19	7	27	13	50	1	4	3	12	12	46	9	35	2	8
Educational Films and Filmstrips	4	15	7	27	13	50	2	8	3	12	10	39	10	39	3	12
Audiovisual Equipment	5	19	10	39	9	35	2	8	3	12	11	42	9	35	3	12
Classroom Space	11	42	5	19	8	31	2	8	9	35	6	23	8	31	3	12
Desks, Chairs, and other Classroom Furniture	12	46	8	31	4	15	2	8	11	42	8	31	4	15	3	12

TABLE 32

AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY OF RESOURCES AND MATERIALS FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR MAXIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS GED (N=26)

	Teacher Ratings															
	Availability								Quality							
	(1) Sufficient to Meet the Needs of All Classes		(2) Available in Limited Quantity		(3) Definitely insufficient		No Answer		(1) Modern and of High Quality		(2) Adequate But Needs Improvement		(3) Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs		No Answer	
Item	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	10	39	14	54	2	8	0	0	11	42	13	50	2	8	0	0
Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	5	19	7	27	14	54	0	0	3	12	10	39	13	50	0	0
Educational Films and Filmstrips	5	19	7	27	14	54	0	0	3	12	9	35	14	54	0	0
Audiovisual Equipment	6	23	11	42	9	35	0	0	4	15	12	46	10	39	0	0
Classroom Space	15	58	5	19	6	23	0	0	11	42	7	27	8	31	0	0
Desks, Chairs, and other Classroom Furniture	14	54	9	35	3	12	0	0	11	42	11	42	4	15	0	0

TABLE 33

AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY OF RESOURCES AND MATERIALS FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTERS ABE (N=11)

	Teacher Ratings															
	Availability								Quality							
	(1) Sufficient to Meet the Needs of All Classes		(2) Available in Limited Quantity		(3) Definitely insufficient		No Answer		(1) Modern and of High Quality		(2) Adequate But Needs Improvement		(3) Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs		No Answer	
Item	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	7	64	3	27	0	0	1	9	5	46	1	9	3	27	2	18
Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	2	18	2	18	6	55	1	9	1	9	2	18	6	55	2	18
Educational Films and Filmstrips	2	18	1	9	7	64	1	9	1	9	1	9	7	64	2	18
Audiovisual Equipment	2	18	1	9	7	64	1	9	1	9	1	9	7	64	2	18
Classroom Space	7	64	2	18	1	9	1	9	5	46	3	27	1	9	2	18
Desks, Chairs, and other Classroom Furniture	6	55	3	27	1	9	1	9	5	46	3	27	1	9	2	18

TABLE 34

AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY OF RESOURCES AND MATERIALS FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTERS GED (N=11)

	Teacher Ratings															
	Availability								Quality							
	(1) Sufficient to Meet the Needs of All Classes		(2) Available in Limited Quantity		(3) Definitely insufficient		No Answer		(1) Modern and of High Quality		(2) Adequate But Needs Improvement		(3) Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs		No Answer	
Item	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Textbooks	8	73	2	18	0	0	1	9	6	55	1	9	2	18	2	18
Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	1	9	2	18	7	64	1	9	0	0	1	9	7	64	3	27
Educational Films and Filmstrips	2	18	0	0	8	73	1	9	1	9	0	0	8	73	2	18
Audiovisual Equipment	3	27	0	0	7	64	1	9	2	18	0	0	7	64	2	18
Classroom Space	8	73	2	18	0	0	1	9	6	64	3	27	0	0	2	18
Desks, Chairs, and other Classroom Furniture	8	73	2	18	0	0	1	9	5	46	4	36	0	0	2	18

TABLE 35

AVAILABILITY AND ADEQUACY OF STUDY SPACE PROVIDED FOR OUT OF CLASS WORK

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Availability	N	%	N	%
Available	8	25	3	19
Available on a Limited Basis	19	59	5	31
Not Available	5	16	1	6
No Answer	0	0	7	44
Adequacy				
Conducive to Studying	9	28	3	19
Not Conducive to Studying	23	72	5	31
No Answer	0	0	8	50

TABLE 36

LIBRARY FACILITIES

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Rating	N	%	N	%
Excellent	0	0	2	13
Adequate	22	69	3	19
Poor	8	25	3	19
Between Poor and Adequate	2	6	0	0
No Answer	0	0	8	50

Appendix D, page 154. Data gathered showed that 63% of the teachers have arrangements for interlibrary loans with public/private libraries (Table 37). Note that 56% of the teachers rated inadequate library facilities as a problem affecting their ability to meet inmates' educational needs (Table 4).

TABLE 37

LIBRARY OPERATION

	Teacher Reponses											
	MMM (N=32)						CTC (N=16)					
	Yes		No		No Answer		Yes		No		No Answer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Is Library Space Adequate	22	69	10	31	0	0	8	50	1	6	7	44
Is Library Availability in Terms of Time Adequate	25	78	7	22	0	0	3	19	6	38	7	44
Are All Volumes Available to Inmate Students	32	100	0	0	0	0	6	38	1	6	9	56
Are Arrangements for Interlibrary Loans with Public/Private Libraries in Operation	20	63	9	28	3	19	3	19	6	38	7	44

Educational Materials and Equipment

The teachers surveyed were asked to rate the availability and quality of various educational hardware and software items. A majority rated the availability of textbooks as being limited in quantity to definitely insufficient, and the quality to be

adequate but needing improvement to poor quality and not meeting needs. Of the teachers responding, 75% to 77% identified the availability of such items as charts, graphs, globes, maps, education films, filmstrips, and audiovisual equipment as being definitely insufficient to available in limited quantity, and 77% to 84% of the teachers found the quality of those items to be poor and not meeting needs to adequate but needing improvement. The full range of responses is reported in Tables 31 and 32.

The teachers indicated that problems affecting their ability to meet inmates' educational nees are a lack of educational hardware, 60%; a lack of educational software, 63%; and a lack of instructional materials related to specific inmate needs, 69% (Table 4).

It was reported that although 77% of the ABE teachers use materials designed for adult illiterates and low level readers, many of the materials used are child related, not adult related.

Tests and Records

Teachers were asked to list the tests that are administered to inmates upon entering Oklahoma's Correctional System at Lexington Assessment and Reception Center (LARC). Although they listed a variety of methods, the most commonly cited were the California Achievement Test (44%) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (31%). However, 34% stated they are not aware of what tests are administered at LARC. A complete listing of their responses is given in Table 38 and Appendix D, page 161. Since a number of tests are administered to aide in the inmates' educational

placement, one question attempted to determine whether their student's testing results/scores were available to them; 78% indicated that results were readily available to the teachers (Table 39).

TABLE 38

TESTS ADMINISTERED TO INMATES ENTERING OKLAHOMA'S CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM AT LARC

Tests Administered	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Stanford Achievement Test	3	9	1	6
California Achievement Test	14	44	0	0
Tests of Adult Basic Education	10	31	1	6
Wechsler Intelligence Test	3	9	0	0
Stanford Binet Intelligence Test	6	19	0	0
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory	6	19	1	6
I am not aware of what tests are administered	11	34	7	44
Others	3	9	4	25
No Answer	0	0	5	32

TABLE 39

INMATE TEST RESULTS/SCORES READILY AVAILABLE FROM LARC

Test Results Readily Available	Teacher Responses MMM (N=32) N	%	CTC (N=16) N	%
Yes	25	78	6	38
No	5	16	3	19
No Answer	2	6	7	44

The teachers were asked to specify additional tests administered by their institution which are of assistance to them in their classrooms. Appendix D, page 161, lists their answers; the California Achievement Test (CAT) and the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) were most frequently cited by the teachers.

Achievement tests are the leading criteria (ABE, 85%; GED, 77%) used for the placement of inmates in the education programs, while a small number of teachers reported using intelligence tests for placement (ABE, 8%; GED, 19%). Table 40 provides a listing of criteria used for placement. See Appendix D, pages 167 and 169 for teachers' cut-off points when a student's grade level is used for placement.

TABLE 40

EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT OF INMATES

	Teacher Response							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
Placement Criteria	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Achievement Tests	22	85	20	77	1	9	3	27
Intelligence Tests	2	8	5	19	0	0	0	0
Grade Level	10	39	14	54	7	64	6	55
Interviews	14	54	14	54	6	55	5	46
No Answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9

Inmates' educational progress is monitored and evaluated by various techniques. Of the responding teachers, over 90% reported they use pre-tests and post-tests to monitor and evaluate inmates' educational progress. Other techniques used in

relation to monitoring and evaluating inmates programs are cited in Table 41.

TABLE 41

MONITORING AND EVALUATING INMATE PROGRESS

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
Technique	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Use of Pre and Post Test	25	96	24	92	7	64	9	82
Staff Meetings	6	23	8	31	0	0	0	0
Written Reports from Teachers	11	42	13	50	0	0	0	0
Interviews with Educational Counselor	7	27	7	27	2	18	2	18
Other	1	4	2	8	1	9	1	9
No Answer	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9

A majority of the teachers use conference (ABE, 77%; GED, 69%) and written evaluations (ABE, 50%; GED, 58%) to inform inmates of their educational progress. However, grades are used by 27% of the ABE teachers and 35% of the GED teachers. See Table 42 for a complete listing.

TABLE 42

PROCEDURE USED TO INFORM INMATES OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
System	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grades	7	27	9	35	2	18	3	27
Conferences	20	77	18	69	6	55	5	46
Written Evaluation	13	50	15	58	1	9	2	18
Other	5	19	4	15	2	18	3	27
No Answer	0	0	0	0	3	27	2	18

Financial Resources

The issue of finances was explored in the questionnaire. When asked what percent of the total institution's budget is given to education, 54% of the teachers did not answer. Moreover, 44% of the teachers did not answer when the question was asked concerning their annual budget for educational programs (Appendix D, pages 166 and 167). They were then asked whether this amount of money was generous, adequate, or inadequate. Eighty-four percent of the teachers answered the question, of whom 56% considered the amount inadequate. See Table 43 for the complete listing of the numbers and percentages of teachers responding. Seventy-three percent of the teachers indicated that lack of adequate funding was a problem that affected their ability to meet the inmates' learning needs (Table 4).

TABLE 43

BUDGET

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Rating	N	%	N	%
Generous	0	0	0	0
Adequate	7	22	0	0
Inadequate	18	56	2	13
Between Adequate and Inadequate	2	6	0	0
No Answer	5	16	14	88

A majority (ABE, 58%; GED, 65%) of the teachers reported their funding source required that a program evaluation be done once a year, while some (19%, ABE; 12%, GED) indicated no program evaluation was required. A complete listing of requirements is summarized in Table 44.

TABLE 44

FREQUENCY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION REQUIRED BY FUNDING SOURCE

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
Frequency	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Once a Year	15	58	17	65	2	18	2	18
Twice a Year	2	8	2	8	0	0	0	0
More Than Twice a Year	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0
Not a Requirement	5	19	3	12	7	64	2	18
Other	1	4	3	12	0	0	0	0
No Answer	3	12	0	0	2	18	7	64

External Resources (Human, Physical, and Financial)

Questions were asked generally about community resources which are not specified in terms of human, physical, or financial resources. A low nine percent of the teachers indicated they regularly use external resources in their education programs, while 56% stated they use external resources occasionally, and 34% claimed they never use external resources (Table 45). Almost a mirroring effect took place when the question was asked concerning the extent teachers felt their education programs were limited in scope by lack of contact with community resources.

TABLE 45

USE OF EXTERNAL RESOURCES IN EDUCATION PROGRAMS

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Frequency of Use	N	%	N	%
Regular	3	9	0	0
Occasional	18	56	8	50
Never	11	34	2	13
No Answer	0	0	6	38

TABLE 46

EXTENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS LIMITED IN SCOPE BY LACK OF CONTACT WITH COMMUNITY RESOURCES

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=16)	
Degree of Limitation	N	%	N	%
Not Limited	3	9	4	25
Moderately Limited	16	50	4	25
Very Limited	12	38	1	6
No Answer	1	3	7	44

Table 48 includes data concerning the availability of inmates' educational records by sources outside the education program. Ninety percent of the teachers indicated that the inmates' educational records were available to the parole board. More than 60% stated that the records were available to those persons working in post release education and vocational training programs. Only 40% of the teachers indicated that the inmates' educational records were available to post release employers. It should be noted, however, that 68% of

the teachers reported that a lack of educational follow-up with parole and post release agencies was a problem affecting their ability to meet inmates' educational needs (Table 4).

TABLE 47

INMATE EDUCATION RECORDS ATTAINABLE BY EXTERNAL PERSONNEL

	Teacher Responses			
	MMM (N=32)		CTC (N=6)	
Records Available To	N	%	N	%
Parole Board	27	90	4	67
Post Release Employer	12	40	3	50
Post Release Vocational Training Program	19	63	3	50
Post Release Education Program	20	67	4	67

Course Design Information

Methods which teachers use to disseminate information about the educational opportunities were explored; of the 32 teachers, 59% have a handbook or catalogue which describes available courses and programs. Among the institutions using handbooks, 63% distributed them to all inmates, while 32% distributed them only to those interested in education. A low percentage (31%) of the ABE teachers and (35%) of the GED teachers have a syllabus for each course that is offered. Information regarding the percentage of institutions which reported having course syllabi is shown in Table 48.

TABLE 48

SYLLABUS FOR EACH COURSE OFFERING

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	8	31	9	35	4	36	4	36
No	15	58	14	54	4	36	4	36
No Answer	3	12	3	12	3	27	3	27

Teachers were asked whether they had a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for their education programs. Table 49 reflects the percentages of the teachers who make these lists available to other teachers (ABE, 95%; GED, 93%), to students (ABE, 68%; GED, 86%), and to counselors (ABE, 53%; GED, 29%). The standards used in the design of these competencies and objectives are identified in Table 50. More than half the teachers indicated their objectives were student and/or content centered. A low four percent of the ABE teachers and 12% of the GED teachers reported that their objectives were teacher centered.

The information relating to the way in which teachers evaluate course effectiveness is outlined in Table 51. Regarding methods employed to determine whether program objectives have been met, Standardized Tests (ABE, 81%; GED, 65%) were used most frequently by teachers. The teachers were asked whether the information gained about the inmates through their participation in education programs has appropriate influence with respect to

TABLE 49

SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES AND/OR OBJECTIVES FOR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
Teachers Having A List	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	19	73	14	54	2	18	4	36
No	6	23	9	35	9	82	3	27
No Answer	1	4	3	12	0	0	4	36

	MMM				CTC			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
If Yes, the list is made available to:	(N=19) N	%	(N=14) N	%	(N=2) N	%	(N=4) N	%
Teachers	18	95	13	93	2	100	4	100
Students	13	68	12	86	1	50	3	75
Counselors	10	53	4	29	0	0	2	50
Others	2	11	4	29	0	0	1	25

TABLE 50

STANDARDS USED IN THE DESIGN OF OBJECTIVES AND/OR COMPETENCIES

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher-Centered	1	4	3	12	2	18	1	9
Content-Centered	14	54	11	42	2	18	3	27
Student-Centered	15	58	13	50	3	27	3	27
No Answer	7	27	9	35	7	64	6	55

the inmates' total institutional profile and record of adjustment. The teachers' opinion on the subject was almost an even split: 53%, yes; and 47%, no.

TABLE 51

SYSTEM TO EVALUATE THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF EDUCATION OBJECTIVES AND COMPETENCIES

	Teacher Responses							
	MMM (N=26)				CTC (N=11)			
	ABE		GED		ABE		GED	
Evaluation System	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Standardized Tests	21	81	17	65	1	9	2	18
Criteria-Based Test (Teacher Made)	8	31	7	27	2	18	2	18
Observation	9	35	9	35	4	36	5	46
Work Sample	8	31	7	27	2	18	1	9
Other	2	8	2	8	1	9	1	9
No Answer	3	12	5	19	5	46	5	46

Community Treatment Center Findings

The State of Oklahoma has nine community treatment centers, of which, at the time the survey was conducted, January 1981, four (Kate Bernard, Lawton, McAlester, and Tulsa) did not have an ABE or a GED program. Of the sixteen ABE/GED teachers serving the community treatment centers, seven were at the Enid Community Treatment Center, and five were at Horrace Mann Community Treatment Center.

In reading the findings of the community treatment centers, the reader will not be referred to all the tables; however, all tables do reflect the statistics for both the community treatment centers and the maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions.

Inmate Educational Interest and Placement

The teachers expressed concern that low student motivation is a problem at the community treatment centers (Table 4). However, concerning inmate educational interest and placement, only one teacher reported that inmates are given educational counseling prior to their placement in an educational program (Table 6). One teacher indicated that a formal staffing is held for the proper educational placement of the inmate at the end of an inmate's program (Table 5). Although teachers are concerned about low student motivation, there is no indication that the teachers or the Department of Corrections are working to enhance the inmates' interest in the educational program at the community treatment centers. Concerning compulsory education, one teacher reported that participation in an ABE program was required, and three teachers stated that the GED program was compulsory (Table 10).

Human Resources

One finding of primary concern is the fact that the questionnaire showed that only three of the sixteen teachers have been teaching ABE or GED classes at the community treatment centers for more than two years (Table 14). All but one of the ABE/GED teachers are part-time teachers at the community treatment centers.

The teachers are well educated, with 56% having a master's degree (Table 15). However, they seem to know very little about any aspect of the inmates and their needs, the community treat-

ment centers, and the Department of Corrections. To add to this problem, none of the teachers at the community treatment centers are involved in training by the Department of Corrections (Table 20).

Teaching methods, educational materials, community resources, use of counseling and supportive services, and the student evaluation process headed the teachers' list for needed information and/or training (Table 23, Appendix D, page 161). Low student motivation was considered to be a serious problem by the teachers (Table 4). Only two of the teachers at the community treatment centers reported that they are evaluated, and evaluation is done only once a year (Table 24). Concerning conflicts or problems created by educational release time for the inmates, 94% of the teachers either indicated that it did not apply to their situation or did not answer the question (Table 29).

All the teachers at the community treatment centers who responded to the question concerning the general attitude of security, treatment, and administrative staff toward the educational programs indicated that these staff members were moderately to extremely supportive. However, it should be noted that 44% of the teachers did not answer this question (Table 27).

Physical Resources

A majority of the teachers in the community treatment centers stated that the classrooms and furnishings were modern and of high quality. A majority also stated that the availability

of equipment such as charts, graphs, globes, maps, educational films and filmstrips, and audiovisual equipment are definitely insufficient and reported the quality to be poor and inadequate to meet needs (Tables 33 and 34).

Only two teachers rated their library to be excellent, and only three instructors indicated that they have arrangements for interlibrary loans with public or private libraries in operation at the time of the survey (Table 36). Half the teachers rated their library space adequate, but only three rated the library availability in terms of time to be adequate (Table 37).

The teachers seem to have very little knowledge concerning the tests that are administered to inmates by the Department of Corrections at LARC (Table 38). Six teachers reported that the inmates' test results from LARC were readily available to them (Table 39). Educational placement of the inmates in the community treatment centers is done almost exclusively by grade level and personal interviews with inmates in both the ABE and GED programs (Table 40).

Monitoring and evaluating inmate progress are done almost exclusively by the use of pre-tests and post-tests and by interviews with educational counselors (Table 41). A high majority of the inmates are informed of their educational progress by grades and conferences (Table 42).

Financial Resources

Eighty-eight percent of the teachers did not answer when questioned about the budget. However, the 12% that did respond,

stated that the budget was inadequate (Table 43). When questioned about the frequency of a program evaluation required by the funding source, two teachers stated that an evaluation was done once a year; the other teachers reported that an evaluation was not required, or they did not answer at all (Table 44).

External Resources

None of the teachers use external (human, physical or financial) resources on a regular basis, although half the teachers did state they use external resources occasionally (Table 45). One teacher felt very limited, and four felt moderately limited, when questioned concerning the extent their education programs were limited in scope by lack of contact with community resources (Table 46).

Course Design Information

Concerning the matter of course syllabi, four teachers reported they have a syllabus for each course (Table 48). Two ABE and four GED teachers stated they have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the education program (Table 49).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study, which was conducted to identify staff development and inservice training needs of instructors of Adult Basic Education and General Education Development programs in the Oklahoma Penal System, attempted to answer two questions. First, is there a need for additional staff development and inservice training for those involved in the instruction of ABE and GED classes within the Department of Corrections? The results of the study clearly indicated a need for additional staff development and inservice training. Second, what are the staff development and inservice training needs of those instructors? The study determined and has delineated those staff development and inservice training needs.

The study was limited to the Oklahoma Penal System, those teachers employed by the Department of Corrections, and those teachers presently teaching in the Adult Basic Education and/or General Education Development programs. The population of this study included all 48 ABE/GED teachers employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections assigned to teach in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) and/or General Education Development (GED) programs. Fourteen of the 19 state correctional institutions provided ABE/GED programs for the inmates. The 14 correctional

institutions were grouped into two classifications: group one included nine maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions with 32 ABE/GED teachers; and group two, five community treatment centers with 16 ABE/GED teachers.

A questionnaire to identify the staff development needs and inservice training needs of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections ABE and GED instructors was developed as a consequence of reviewing the literature related to a general assessment of adult education, and specifically, to the assessment of teacher training needs for the instructors of institutionalized adults.

The data collection consisted of two parts: the first phase was comprised of site visitations as a pre-survey measure to explain to Department of Corrections officials, particularly the educational directors, the purpose of the survey and its general contents, and to coordinate the administration of the instrument. The second phase of data acquisition consisted of site visitations to each participating correctional institution to conduct the survey with the ABE/GED teachers. In all, 48 questionnaires were returned, representing a 100 percent response.

The data obtained from the 48 questionnaires were audited; and the responses, tabulated. The questions were arranged in eight categories to make possible the appropriate analysis of the collected data. The eight categories are general institutional information, inmate educational interest, inmate educational placement, human resources, physical resources, financial

resources, external resources, and course design information.

The study resulted in a current and comprehensive assessment of the staff development needs and teacher training needs of instructors of Adult Basic Education and General Education Development programs of institutionalized adults in the Oklahoma Department of Corrections.

Conclusions and Recommendations

For the purpose of presenting conclusions and making recommendations, the correctional institutions were grouped into two classifications. Group one included nine maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions with 32 ABE/GED teachers. Group two included five community treatment centers with 16 ABE/GED teachers. However, unless specially noted, all conclusions and recommendations are made for the maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions and the community treatment centers. The maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions will be denoted (MMM). The community treatment centers will be denoted (CTC).

The format for the conclusions and recommendations will be to present the conclusions first, with the recommendations immediately following.

General Institution Information

Conclusion:

Teachers do not have a full understanding of the total purpose of the institution in which they teach or the Department

of Corrections in general. Teachers at the same institution gave a wide range of answers when considering such factors as the length of time inmates spend in the institution in which they are teaching or the unique or specialized purpose of their particular institution. A clear conception of these factors is needed by the teachers to help insure better educational planning to make possible stronger inmate interest and placement in educational programs, class design, and the improved use of human, physical, and financial resources. A clear conception of these factors would also help insure more effective institutionwide staff relationships.

Recommendation:

An orientation detailing all aspects of the institution is recommended for educational personnel at all institutions. More specifically, it is recommended that an orientation for teachers be conducted detailing the following:

1. the overall purpose of the Department of Corrections.
2. the overall purpose of each particular correctional institution.
3. educations role in the Department of Corrections.
4. educations role in each correctional institution.
5. the teachers role in the Department of Corrections.
6. the teachers role in the education program in each correctional institution.

Conclusion:

The Oklahoma State Reformatory (Granite) is currently the only institution with an accredited Kindergarten through Twelfth grade program. Each institution presently has its own plan of education, a fact which apparently means that there is no consistency in the Oklahoma Department of Corrections education plan. This lack of consistency would seem to be a deterrent to the inmates' interest in education. The present situation, then, does not encourage positive motivation factors, but adds negative deterrents to the education of inmates.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that: (1) the Oklahoma State Department of Corrections be established as a Kindergarten through Twelfth grade school district; (2) each correctional institution would provide a K-12 and/or provide a General Education Development program in place of grades nine through twelve; and (3) each correctional institution would be part of the school district. There would be a standard program with a uniform set of educational materials used by each correctional institution. This would allow the inmates to continue their educational program without interruption when transferred from one correctional institution to another.

Inmate Interest in Educational Programs

Conclusion:

There is evidence to suggest that low student motivation and lack of incentives for inmate participation in education

programs are problems. The teachers must realize that frequently when inmates enroll in an educational program they are undertaking a project at which the inmates have formerly been unsuccessful.

Recommendation:

Staff training is needed to insure that teachers understand the basics in general motivational principles and general adult education principles. Once this training is completed, further training is recommended for the staff in motivational techniques dealing with the specific needs of inmates.

It is recommended that the Department of Corrections provide incentives for inmates participating in an educational program. For example, the successful completion of an academic program or successful progression in an educational program would be counted as good time. This good time would provide the inmate a reduced time in incarceration.

It was found in some Oklahoma correctional institutions that inmates enrolled in education programs still had to maintain their regular full time jobs. Such procedures act as a deterrent to education involvement. It is recommended that an inmate successfully involved in education classes receive a reduction in their regular job hours.

Conclusion:

The inmates' incentive could be effected by the fact that the monetary rewards for taking part in educational programs are

generally lower than for other enterprises inmates could select, such as working in prison industries.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that a monetary plan be developed which would enable inmates who are gainfully employed and receiving monetary remuneration for their work to also be monetarily rewarded for successfully completing educational programs. For example, instead of an inmate working eight hours a day at a particular job, the inmate would work four hours a day and attend school four hours a day. The inmate would be monetarily rewarded for the work done on their job and for successfully completing their education program.

Conclusion:

The teachers placed considerable importance on parole board recommendations as an incentive for inmate participation in educational programs.

Recommendation:

Upon incarceration at LARC, each inmate is given a battery of tests. Once that battery of tests is given and other diagnosis made, the inmates are then assigned to a particular correctional institution in the state. Upon arrival at that institution, the inmates are given other tests. The researcher recommends that the state make a ruling that after those tests have been interpreted, if an inmate is judged capable of attaining the GED, that inmate would not be eligible for parole until he/she had completed the GED program.

It is important to note, "only if the inmate is judged capable of completing the GED program", then it would be a requirement for parole. This would provide an excellent incentive for inmates to take part in education programs.

Conclusion:

There is a need for high quality and exhaustive educational diagnosis (tests, staffings, etc.), academic counseling, and educational follow-up with parole and post-release agencies for every inmate.

Recommendation:

Considering this need of the students, the teachers must be provided internal information concerning educational diagnosis, be provided training in academic counseling, and have the tools for effectively utilizing external human, physical, and financial resources. The researcher is not suggesting that teachers get into any kind of counseling other than academic counseling. However, it is suggested that the teachers receive more information in terms of academic counseling.

Inmate Placement in Educational Programs

Conclusion:

A number of methods are used for inmate placement in educational programs. Educational programs in some institutions are compulsory. In other institutions, however, information is collected from a variety of sources before placement decisions are made.

Recommendation:

It was found through the survey instrument that teachers needed orientation and training specifically related to inmate placement in education programs. It was also evident through the survey instrument that teachers needed to have greater access to test records, especially those tests which are administered at LARC. Therefore, the following two specific recommendations are made:

1. teachers be given orientation and training in the use of tests and records that are available to them, both inhouse and from LARC. Included in that inservice training would be the interpretation of test scores and the overall test battery.
2. teachers would be given inservice training which would help them to better understand their relationship with other institutional staff members involved with the placement of inmates within the educational program.

Conclusion (CTC's Only):

Inmates in the Oklahoma Community Treatment Centers are generally there for the last three to six months of their incarceration. In light of this fact, perhaps the best process for dealing with the inmates at this stage of their incarceration is to involve them in the local adult education program. This step would provide the inmates opportunities to become involved in important socialization processes.

Recommendation (CTC's Only):

At the time the research was conducted, it was found that only five of the nine Community Treatment Centers had ABE or GED programs in operation. It is the recommendation of the researcher that all Community Treatment Centers have some type of educational programming in operation. Even though inmates may only be housed at the CTC's for a few months, it is highly recommended that all be involved in some type of active educational programming. Especially those who do not have a high school diploma or a GED certificate.

It is recommended, whenever possible, that inmates be provided the opportunity to further their education by taking part in local adult education programs. If it is not possible to provide an ABE or GED program at a specific CTC, every attempt possible should be made to have such a program offered through a local adult education program.

Conclusion:

It was found that computer terminals and/or talk back television terminals existed in almost every institution in the Department of Corrections. However, there was a real lack of use of the computer terminals and talk back television terminals. The potential for the use of such equipment is great and needs to be developed more fully.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that talk back television terminals be placed in every institution within the Department of Corrections, including all CTC's.

It is also recommended that inmates, especially those at CTC's and minimum security institutions be given the opportunity to participate in educational programs at flexible times. Example, if an inmate is in a CTC and is working a morning/afternoon job, then educational programs through talk back television would be made available during evening hours; likewise, if an inmate is working an afternoon/evening job, then the talk back television program would be made available during morning hours. This would eliminate the dependency upon a local school district offering an ABE/GED program which may be very limited in terms of evening hours only or available only one or two evenings a week. This would also eliminate bringing instructors to the institution for course offerings.

It is recommended that computer terminals within the institutions be used for programmed educational use. Tapes could be made which would provide for a local storage of GED programming. The tapes could then be used by inmates at any time, rather than to wait for a live instructor to teach classes within the institution. Canned educational programs could be utilized which would enable self directed learning by inmates.

Conclusion (CTC's Only):

It is imperative that the local adult education teachers that have inmates in their classes have an understanding of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, local community treatment center, and inmates. Teachers need to know the Department of Corrections' philosophy, mission, goals, objectives, policies, procedures, rules, and regulations concerning the inmates. It

is necessary for the teachers to have this information if they are to do the best job possible with the inmates.

Recommendation (CTC's Only):

It is recommended that the local adult education teachers used by the Department of Corrections have an orientation and continuing inservice training detailing the specific aspects of working with inmates, the local community treatment center, and the Oklahoma Department of Corrections generally.

Human Resources

Educational Staff

Conclusion:

It was found through the results of the survey that 63 percent of the instructors in the Department of Corrections educational program have been employed less than three years. Which indicates a need for continual inservice training and staff development programs.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Coordinator of Educational Programs for the Department of Corrections work with an institution of higher education to develop advanced degrees and/or formalized training programs for teachers within the Department of Corrections. It is recommended that a Master's Degree program within the adult education curriculum with emphasis in other areas be developed, which would be presented through talk back television. These formalized programs would be given to

all institutions, so, the teachers could utilize these courses as their schedules allow. It has been identified that many of the teachers who are teaching in the Department of Corrections educational programs have had very little experience working with adults. Therefore, it is important to provide them training in working with adults.

Conclusion:

The data collected concerning training indicated that there is confusion about the training offered by the Department of Corrections. The teachers, employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, are well qualified to teach. However, the staffs at most institutions have not stabilized, as indicated by the low number of years teachers have been at their respective institutions. Thus, a real need exists for specialized training to prepare them with the special skills needed to work with an adult student population and specifically with an adult student that is incarcerated and in general, educationally disadvantaged.

Recommendation:

The Department of Corrections needs to establish a clear training philosophy. The mission, goals, objectives, policies, and procedures need to be identified and established. Special consideration should be given to the resources needed (human, physical, and financial), leadership, and an effective evaluation process.

The data provided and needs identified in this study should be utilized as a starting point for establishing a master plan of action.

Other Institutional Personnel

Conclusion (MMM Only):

There was evidence that conflict between educational and noneducational personnel within the correctional institutions exists. Problems with security were the highest in number, followed by problems with administrative staff. Problems are evident in such areas as inmates' release time for educational programs and the priorities placed on resources provided for education programs.

Conclusion (CTC's Only):

There was no evidence that conflict between the educational and noneducational personnel in the community treatment centers existed. However, there was a need for better communication and coordination between the educational and noneducational personnel.

Recommendation:

Effective communication methods in dealing with the various factions of the correctional institutions need attention. Increasing communication among education, security, and administrative personnel definitely needs to be stressed. Institution procedures that heighten communication between all institutional

staff and institutional educators is recommended. This communication should be set up formally, but should have sufficient flexibility to allow for the specific professional responsibilities of each area involved. The effort must be a carefully integrated process.

Conclusion:

A high number of teachers indicated their institutions do not offer educational programs to their staff. Educational programs offered to inmates were marked by a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the noneducational staff for the efforts of the teachers. This negative attitude could have a damaging effect on the educational efforts.

Recommendation:

The same educational opportunities available to inmates need to be made available to all institutional personnel within the Department of Corrections. Such an effort might help to ease some of the resentment of other institutional staff toward educational programs for inmates.

Physical Resources

Facilities in General

Conclusion:

The State Department of Corrections needs to recognize that, since only certain correctional institutions have adequate educational space, proper educational facilities must be made

available to the teachers if any advancement of the general education level within the prison system is to take place.

Recommendation:

Bring all educational facilities up to American Correctional Association standards.

Library

Conclusion:

A majority of the teachers indicated that inadequate library facilities are a problem effecting their ability to meet inmates' educational needs. However, a large number of the teachers are not utilizing inter-library loans from either public or private libraries. None of the teachers gave their libraries an excellent rating; therefore, all libraries could, and should, be improved.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that every library in the correctional system have linkage to external public and private libraries. These additional resources should be utilized to the maximum until all the libraries in the correctional system receive an excellent rating.

Educational Materials and Equipment

Conclusion:

The lack of educational materials and equipment seems to be a leading problem of the teachers. There is a widely reported

lack of educational materials and equipment in the institutions. However, the teachers do not seem to know of materials which are available or the process to obtain the needed resources which are appropriate and effective for the adult inmate population. Therefore, antiquated materials and equipment which are not conducive to effective education is used in much of the instruction. The frequent reiteration of the need for more and better educational materials and equipment by teachers, in both the questionnaire responses and the site visits, establishes this need as a fundamental problem in the area of physical resources.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the teachers receive an extensive introduction to those new educational products on the market today which are appropriate for incarcerated adult students. As previously stated, there is a need for educators to have a working knowledge of their budget, and how to use their budget. The teachers need to be orientated to the Department of Corrections procedures for obtaining the needed materials. Workshops should be provided for the teachers to learn effective methods for developing materials that would be appropriate for the specific clientele they are educating.

Tests and Records

Conclusion:

The data collected concerning tests and record keeping indicated there is a great deal of confusion and ambiguity in

the testing and record keeping system. Although a high percentage of teachers indicated the students' test results are readily available to them, teachers do not seem to be aware of the tests that are administered to inmates at LARC. A great deal of emphasis is placed on the value of tests that are administered to the inmates upon entering Oklahoma's Correctional System at LARC. For that reason, proper knowledge of the tests given at LARC as well as the proper interpretation and use of the tests by the teachers is imperative.

Recommendation:

In light of the time, money, and effort spent on the tests given to inmates, it is recommended that an exhaustive orientation and inservice training program be given to every teacher in the correction system concerning:

1. the tests administered at LARC;
2. the time when tests are administered;
3. the purpose of particular tests administered;
4. the proper interpretation and utilization of the scores on administered tests.

Measurements need to be taken to insure that inmate tests and educational records follow inmates immediately from institution to institution as inmates are transferred throughout the system.

Financial Resources

Conclusion:

The lack of answers given on the questionnaire by teachers concerning financial questions and the wide array of answers given by teachers that did answer indicates a deficiency in the communication between institution administrators and the teachers on the matter of finances. Although there was a lack of knowledge concerning educational financing, a high number of teachers made it clear that the funding they had is inadequate.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that inservice training be provided for all teachers concerning financial resources. Exhaustive training is needed in this area concerning such factors as the budget, external funding sources, and program evaluations as they relate to the budget.

External Resources (Human, Physical, Financial)

Conclusion:

The separation of prisons from the community by architectural design and by geographic location means that those community resources that are normally available to education systems are seldom used by most teachers in the correctional setting. A study of the data shows that there is a clear need for further development of the use of external resources in correctional education. The limited avenue to external resources is an issue related to correctional educational programs.

Recommendation:

The identification and analysis of the use of community resources (human, physical, and financial) for correctional education programs is recommended, to be followed by an orientation and inservice training in the use of external resources. Given the intrinsic confines of the correctional setting, a process needs to be established to indicate the most efficient methods of identifying, linking, and utilizing these external resources.

Class Design Information

Conclusion:

The information acquired generally shows that there is a need for specificity in designing courses. Aspects of this topic incorporate course competencies, objectives, syllabi, and the evaluation of course effectiveness. A substantial portion of teachers surveyed indicated they do not have specific lists of competencies and/or objectives; and only about one-third of the teachers reported that they have course syllabi.

Recommendation:

There is a need for on-going evaluation of the course competencies, objectives, and syllabi within the ABE and GED program areas, so as to insure that the needed specifics of each area are not only explicitly interpreted but also given proper attention in the planning of courses.

Summary

The researcher was encouraged by the amount of information generated by this study. In reality, so much information was gathered that it was found to be virtually impossible to draw all conclusions and make all the recommendations that could be made. The researcher recommends to any reader studying this report, that they carefully look at the findings section of this study and analyze the responses given by the participants in the survey. Carefully analyze the questions asked and the information presented by the tables, and draw conclusions and make recommendations for themselves. A statement of caution to anyone reading this report, is not to allow yourself to read only the conclusions and recommendations section and feel that this is all the information that can be drawn from this study. Again, this study was highly successful in the amount of information that was gathered and produced a wealth of information from which much planning can be done over the next several years.

The reader should also keep in mind that after going through the findings section and conclusions and recommendations section, that the researcher attempted to maintain a division between the maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions on one side and the community treatment centers on the other. In the attempt to maintain that division, it was quickly identified that even though some conclusions and recommendations could be geared specifically toward one of those two divisions, most of the information found tended to be blanket statements

pertaining to the entire system. For example, it was important for the researcher to point out the need for a system-wide K-12 educational program. It was important that the researcher point out that there is a need for greater utilization of computer terminals and talk back television, not only for inmates, but for the educational inservice training and development of the educational staff. The researcher quickly identified that not only was there under utilization of this expensive equipment by inmates, but virtually no usage of this equipment by the educational staff and institutional staff in general.

Another important finding which is system wide, is the fact that there needs to be greater standardization of materials used in the education programs. The researcher, through visitation at the various institutions, observed that there is a great disparity in the types of materials used. In many institutions materials were not even available for basic subjects, such as reading and mathematics. Along with recommendations which were made for the correctional system in general, several recommendations were made which pertained only to the maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions and community treatment centers.

In summarizing this study, three statements should be left with the reader:

1. This study represents 100 percent input from all educational staff members within the Department of Corrections.
2. This study was the first study of its kind in the State of Oklahoma which specifically dealt with the educational program. It was not meant to be a complete study in and

of itself, rather it was meant to specifically deal with the educational training needs of the ABE and GED teachers only. Some statements were made which were general in nature, however, please keep in mind that the researcher desired to deal specifically with training needs of the educators only.

3. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this study go beyond the scope and liminations of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. The results of this study should be made available to the Oklahoma Legislature, the State of Oklahoma Adult Basic Education Section, and to various federal, state, and private agencies for additional funding and support.

Recommendations for Further Research

The suggestions for further research are:

1. Conduct a study concerning the attitudes of noneducational personnel toward the educators and the educational programs in the Oklahoma correctional system.

2. Conduct a study concerning the attitudes of inmates toward the educators and the educational programs in the Oklahoma correctional system.

3. Conduct a study to assess the quality of instruction in the Oklahoma Penal System.

4. Conduct a study to determine if there are special curricular needs for teachers who plan to enter correctional education and to assess the need for a correctional education

curriculum at an Oklahoma college or university.

5. Conduct a study in the juvenile section of the Department of Corrections to assess the teacher training needs in that setting.

6. Design and implement a longitudinal study of ABE/GED teachers in state correctional institutions in order to evaluate teacher longevity and their attitudes and effectiveness concerning inmates, noneducational staff, and use of resources.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

Helfich, J. E. "One Effort to Upgrade Literacy in the Correctional Population." The Prison Journal, 1973.

March, J. J. "GED Testing in State Penal Institutions: A Survey of Selected Practices." Correctional Education, January 1973.

Witkin, B. R. "Needs Assessment Kits, Models, and Tools." Educational Technology, November 1977.

Books

Carter, R. M., Glaser, G., & Wilkins, L. T. Correctional Institutions. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1972.

Carter, R. M., McGee, R. A., & Nelson, E. K. Corrections in America. New York: J. B. Lipponcott Company, 1975.

Coffey, A. R. Administration of Criminal Justice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Eckenrode, C. J. "Education's Contributions to Institutional Treatment Modules." In Roberts, A. R., Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, IL: Charles E. Thomas, 1973.

Good, C. V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill, 1973.

Houston, R. W., Faseler, L., White, S. C., Sanders, P., Senter, J., & Butts, W. Assessing School/College/Community/Needs. The Center for Urban Education, University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1978.

Kendall, G. M. "What Makes Correctional Education Correctional?" In Roberts, A. R., Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, IL: Charles E. Thomas Publishers, 1973.

Menninger, K., M.D. The Crime of Punishment. New York: The Viking Press, 1966.

Perlstein, G. R., & Phelps, T. R. Alternatives to Prison - Community Based Corrections, A Reader. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1975.

Reagen, M. V., Stoughton, D. M., Smith, T. E., & Davis, J. C. School Behind Bars - A Descriptive Overview of Correctional Education in the American Prison System (abridged ed.). Syracuse: Syracuse University Research Corporation, Policy Institute, 1973.

Roberts, A. R. Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, IL: Charles E. Thomas Publishers, 1973.

Roberts, A. R., & Coffey, O. D. A State of the Art Survey for a Correctional Education Network. College Park, MD: American Correctional Association, September 1976.

Ryan, T. A. Education for Adults in Correctional Institutions: A Book of Readings. Honolulu: Education Research and Development Center, University of Hawaii, 1975.

Ryan, T. A. Experimental Training Program in Adult Basic Education in Corrections. Honolulu: Education Research and Development Center, University of Hawaii, 1972.

Miscellaneous Citations

American Psychological Association. Publications Manual, 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Publications Sales, 1974.

Bell, R., Conard, E., Laffey, T., Lutz, J. G., Miller, P. V. R., Simon, C., Stakelon, A. E., & Wilson, N. J. Correctional Education Programs for Inmates. U.S. Department of Justice. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, June 1979.

Benton, W. F. Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan. National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, 1976.

Bobby Battle et al., a class action, Plaintiffs, United States of America, Plaintiff-Intervenor, v. Park Anderson, his successor Richard Crips, Warden, Oklahoma State Penitentiary, McAlester, Oklahoma, and his successor, J. M. Sunderland, Warden, Oklahoma State Reformatory, Granite, Oklahoma, and his successor, Department of Corrections, F. Warrenn Benton, Director, his successor, and the current State Board of Corrections, Frank E. Carey, Jr., President, Leroy W. Kirk, Patricia Montgomery, Gary M. Cook, Chester T. Curtin, Seth Millington, William Thompson, as members, and their successors, Defendents. Civ. A. No. 72-95. United States District Court, E. D. Oklahoma. Sept. 8, 1976. Order Sept. 11, 1978.

Census of Prisoners in State Correctional Facilities. National Prisoner Statistics Special Report. U.S. Department of Justice. No. SD-NPS-SR-3, December 1976.

Correctional Education Programs for Inmates: The Issues. National Correctional Education Evaluation Project. School of Education, Leigh University, 1977.

Feldman, S. D. Trends in Offender Vocational and Education Programs: A Literature Search. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Offender Education in Community Colleges Project, October 1974.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service. Expenditure and Employment Data from the Criminal Justice System. Washington, D.C.: SD-EE No. 3, 1970.

Lewis, J. P., & Boyle, R. Evaluation of 1975-76 Vocational and Basic Education Programs in the Eight Pennsylvania State Correctional Institutions. Office of Corrections Education. Pennsylvania State Department of Education, Harrisburg, 1976.

Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions. Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. American Correctional Association, 1977.

Murray, L. "Report to Oklahoma Department of Corrections." Oklahoma Department of Corrections, 1980.

Research for Better Schools. In Correctional Education Programs for Inmates: The Issues. National Correctional Educational Evaluation Project. School of Education, Leigh University, January 1977.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Report on Corrections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

REFERENCE LIST

Periodicals

Helfich, J. E. "One Effort to Upgrade Literacy in the Correctional Population." The Prison Journal, 1973, pp. 46-54.

Witkin, B. R. "Needs Assessment Kits, Models, and Tools," Educational Technology, November 1977, pp. 5-12.

Books

Carter, R. M., Glaser, G., & Wilkins, L. T. Correctional Institutions. Philadelphia: J. B. Lipponcott Company, 1972, p. 320.

Coffey, A. R. Administration of Criminal Justice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974, pp. 259-260.

Eckenrode, C. J. "Education's Contributions to Institutional Treatment Modules." In Roberts, A. R., Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, IL: Charles E. Thomas, 1973, p. 78.

Good, C. V. (ed.). Dictionary of Education (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill, 1973, p. 16.

Ibid., p. 598.

Kendall, G. M. "What Makes Correctional Education Correctional?" In Roberts, A. R., Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, IL: Charles E. Thomas Publishers, 1973, pp. 101-103.

Roberts, A. R. Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, IL: Charles E. Thomas Publishers, 1973, p. 78.

Ryan, T. A. Education for Adults in Correctional Institutions: A Book of Readings. Honolulu: Education Research and Development Center, University of Hawaii, 1975, p. i.

Ryan, T. A. Experimental Training Program in Adult Basic Education in Corrections. Honolulu: Education Research and Development Center, University of Hawaii, 1972, p. 3.

Miscellaneous Citations

Bell, R., Conard, E., Laffey, T., Lutz, J. G., Miller, P. V. R., Simon, C., Stakelon, A. E., & Wilson, N. J. Correctional Education Programs for Inmates. U. S. Department of Justice. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, June 1979, p. 5.

Benton, W. F. Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan. National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, 1976, p. 68.

Lewis, J. P., & Boyle, R. Evaluations of 1975-76 Vocational and Basic Education Programs in the Eight Pennsylvania State Correctional Institutions. Office of Corrections Education. Pennsylvania State Department of Education, Harrisburg, 1976, p. 6.

Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions. Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. American Correctional Association, 1977, pp. 76-79.

Research for Better Schools. In Correctional Education Programs for Inmates: The Issues. National Correctional Educational Evaluation Project. School of Education, Leigh University, January 1977, p. 26.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I

General Information

1. Respondent's Name: _____

   Teaching Responsibility: _____
   (subject area)

   ABE _____
   GED _____
   Both _____

2. Institution Name: _____

3. Security Level of Institution:

   Maximum _____
   Medium _____
   Minimum _____
   CTC _____

4. Number of Inmates Incarcerated: _____

5. Institution Houses: Males _____
   Females _____
   Both _____

6. Average age of inmate population is _____ years of age.
   (your best guess)

7. What is the average length of time served in this institution?
   _____ (your best guess)

8. Does this institution serve any unique or specialized purpose? (You may check more than one.)

   Diagnostic Center _____
   Pre-Release Center _____
   Young Offenders _____
   Other (please specify) _____
   Strict Custody _____
   Behavior/Emotional Problems _____

9. Approximately how many volumes do you have in your institutional library? _____

10. Are all these volumes available to inmate students?

    Yes _____ No _____

11. Is this availability in terms of space adequate to meet the needs and goals of your educational projects?

Yes _____ No _____

12. Is this availability in terms of time adequate to meet the needs and goals of your educational projects?

Yes _____ No _____

13. Do you have arrangements for interlibrary loans with public/private libraries?

Yes _____ No _____

14. How would you rate the library facilities in your institution?

Excellent _____ Adequate _____ Poor _____

15. How would you rate the availability of study space provided for out-of-class work?

Available _____
Available on a Limited Basis _____
Not Available _____

16. How would you rate the adequacy of study space provided for out-of-class work?

Conducive to Studying _____
Not Conducive to Studying _____

17. Do you use external resources (i.e., from the local community or industries) in your education programs?

Regularly _____ Occasionally _____ Never _____

18. To what extent are your education programs limited in scope by lack of contact with community resources and experiences?

Not Limited _____ Moderately Limited _____
Very Limited _____

19. What is the general attitude of other institutional personnel towards the educational programs?

Security		Treatment	
Extremely Supportive	_____	Extremely Supportive	_____
Moderately Supportive	_____	Moderately Supportive	_____
Not Supportive	_____	Not Supportive	_____
Hostile	_____	Hostile	_____

Administration	
Extremely Supportive	_____
Moderately Supportive	_____
Not Supportive	_____
Hostile	_____

20. Does a record of an inmate's educational progress go into a cumulative file?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, is the file available to the following, if requested? (You may check more than one.)

Parole Board _____
Post-Release Employers _____
Post-Release Education Programs _____
Post-Release Vocational Training Programs _____

21. In your opinion, does the information gained about the inmate through his/her participation in educational programs have appropriate influence with respect to the inmate's total institutional profile and record of adjustment?

Yes _____ No _____

22. If an inmate who is referred for educational placement cannot be adequately placed in existing program offerings (e.g., because of extremely low level of achievement and/or serious learning disability), are there alternative placements or services available?

Yes _____ No _____

Section II

Personal Information

1. How many years have you been teaching GED or ABE classes at the institution where you are presently located?

Less than 1 year	_____	5 - 6 years	_____
1 - 2 years	_____	6 - 7 years	_____
2 - 3 years	_____	7 - 8 years	_____
3 - 4 years	_____	more than 8 years	_____
4 - 5 years	_____		

2. How many years have you been teaching GED and ABE classes?

   Years _____

3. (a) Are you employed by the Department of Corrections as a GED or ABE instructor?

   Full-Time _____ Part-Time _____

   (b) If part-time, what are your other responsibilities?

   _____

   _____

4. What is your present level of educational achievement?

_____	12th Grade	_____	Bachelor Degree +
_____	12th Grade +	_____	Masters Degree
_____	Vocational-Technical Training	_____	Masters Degree +
		_____	Doctorate
_____	1-2 Years of College	_____	Other (please specify)
_____	Associate of Arts Degree	_____	
_____	Bachelor Degree		

5. What were/are your areas of specialization? Please indicate all appropriate areas: _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

6. What state certification do you presently hold?

   _____ Elementary Education
   _____ Adult Basic Education
   _____ Secondary Education General
   _____ Specific Subject Area
   _____ Guidance
   Specialist Certification
   _____ Special Education
   _____ Learning Disabilities
   _____ Educative Mentally Retarded
   _____ Speech Therapy
   _____ Social Restoration
   _____ Other (list) _____
   _____ Reading

7. Are you presently involved in any training program outside the Department of Corrections (not sponsored by the Department) such as University, College, Vo-Tech, etc.?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, please specify: _____

_____

8. Are you presently involved in any training programs sponsored by the Department of Corrections?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, please specify: _____

_____

9. What Department of Corrections sponsored training programs have you participated in? (In the past five years.)

_____

_____

10. Please check any of the following program aspects of which you would like to have additional training or information:

_____ (a) Writing Educational Goals and Principles
_____ (b) Job Market Assessment
_____ (c) Utilization of Community Resources
_____ (d) Recruitment/Selection Procedures
_____ (e) The Use of Counseling and Supportive Services
_____ (f) Teaching Methods
_____ (g) Pre- and Post-Testing Procedures
_____ (h) Individual Programmed Instruction
_____ (i) Classroom Instruction
_____ (j) The Student Evaluation Process
_____ (k) Teacher Centered Objectives/Competencies
_____ (l) Content Centered Objectives/Competencies
_____ (m) Student Centered Objectives/Competencies
_____ (n) How to Write a Syllabus
_____ (o) Textbooks, Equipment and Education Materials Designed to Meet Special Needs
_____ (p) Program and Student Evaluation
_____ (q) Others (please specify): _____

_____

_____

Section III

Program Information

1. Does the education program at your institution have a handbook or catalog describing available courses and programs?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If Yes, is this handbook or catalog given to:

   _____ All Inmates
   _____ Only Inmates Interested in Education
   _____ No Answer

2. What tests are administered to inmates upon entering Oklahoma's Correctional System (LARC)?

   _____ Stanford Achievement Test
   _____ California Achievement Test
   _____ Tests of Adult Basic Education
   _____ Wechsler Intelligence Test
   _____ Stanford Binet Intelligence Test
   _____ Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
   _____ I am not aware of what tests are administered
   _____ Others (please specify): _____

   _____

   Are your students' test results/scores readily available to you?

   Yes _____ No _____

3. What additional tests are administered by your institution which is of assistance to you in your classroom situation? Please specify. _____

   _____

   _____

4. Do you have access to inmate educational records as they pertain to previous educational levels of attainment such as completion of 8th grade, GED completion, college entry, etc.?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If No, do you think this information would be beneficial to you as a GED or ABE instructor?

   Yes _____ No _____

5. How many inmates are currently participating in your classes?

   _____ Inmates

6. Are instructors permitted to work tutorially with inmates confined to their cells for behavioral or safety reasons?

   Yes _____ No _____

7. Which parts of your education program are compulsory? (You may check more than one.)

_____ Adult Basic Education (ABE)
_____ GED Program
_____ Vocational Education
_____ None
_____ Specified Grade Equivalency
_____ Other

8. Is the inmate released from other duties in the institution to participate in the education program during the course of the regular work day?

Always _____ Sometimes _____ (On Condition) Never _____

9. Has this "released" time created any problems or conflicts between (you may check more than one):

_____ Administration and Education Staffs
_____ Security and Education Staffs
_____ Treatment and Education Staffs
_____ Work Supervisors and Education Staffs
_____ Does Not Apply

10. Has any formal administrative policy or process been established to resolve such problems?

Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply _____

11. To what extent do you believe the financial gains from working in prison industries discourages inmates from attending education programs?

_____ Very Much
_____ Some
_____ Very Little
_____ Not At All

12. Have any data been gathered from inmate interviews or questionnaires to support the above?

Yes _____ No _____ Does Not Apply _____

If Yes, please specify: _____

_____

13. How many of the inmates are given academic and/or vocational counseling prior to the selection of an educational or vocational training program?

_____ All of Them
_____ Most of Them
_____ Very Few of Them
_____ None of Them

14. Are classes provided in English as a second language?

Yes _____ No _____

15. Are education programs available for (you may check more than one):

_____ Institutional staff combined in classes with inmates
_____ Separate classes for institutional staff
_____ No classes available for institutional staff

16. Are inmates permitted to take books or materials back to their cells?

Yes _____ No _____

17. Are inservice training courses available?

_____ Mandatory
_____ Optional
_____ Not Available

18. How often are inservice training courses offered?

_____ Weekly
_____ Monthly
_____ Annually
____ Other (please specify)
_____

19. How often are regular evaluations of educational staff conducted?

_____ Annually
_____ Monthly
_____ Not Conducted
_____ Other (please specify)
_____

20. By whom are evaluations of educational staff conducted? (You may check more than one.)

_____ External Personnel
_____ Supervisors
_____ Peers
_____ Inmates
_____ Other (please specify)
_____

21. Are inmates employed as support or teaching staff in your education program?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, check which of the following responsibilities are given to inmates:

_____ Teacher Aides
_____ Assigned Tutoring
_____ Other (please specify)
_____ Monitoring Equipment
_____ Classroom Teaching
_____

22. How would you rate the following factors in the part they play in determining whether an inmate becomes involved in educational programs? (Circle one for each item.)

	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Not Important
Recommendations of Counselor	4	3	2	1
Test Results	4	3	2	1
Years in School Prior to Incarceration	4	3	2	1
Inmate Interest	4	3	2	1
Court Recommendations	4	3	2	1
Parole Board Recommendations	4	3	2	1
Other (please specify): _____	4	3	2	1

23. Which of the following are directly involved in the decision to place inmates in educational programs? (You may check more than one.)

_____ Security Staff
_____ Treatment Staff
_____ Inmate Himself
_____ Education Representative
_____ Other (please specify)
_____

24. What percent of the total institutional budget is given to education? _____%

25. What is your anual budget for educational programs? (Include internal and external funding sources.) _____

26. Do you consider this amount:

_____ Generous _____ Adequate _____ Inadequate

27. Using the scale to the right of each item, indicate how seriously the following items are problems with respect to your ability to meet inmates' learning needs.

	Not A Problem				Serious Problem
Conflicts with Custody	1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts over Maintenance of Institution (e.g., Inmates' Jobs)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Liaison with Treatment Staff	1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts with Other Institutional Programs for Inmates (Religious, Recreational, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Qualified Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Supplementary Staff (Educational Counselors, Psychologists, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational "Hardware" (Videocassettes, Tapes, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational "Software" (Workbooks, Texts, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Inservice Training for Staff	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Instructional Material Related to Inmates' Needs	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Books, Tools, & Other Educational Materials	1	2	3	4	5

	Not A Problem				Serious Problem
Lack of Study Areas Conducive to Good Learning	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate Library Facilities	1	2	3	4	5
Low Student Motivation	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Funding	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Administrative Support	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Incentives for Inmate Participation	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational Follow-up with Parole & Post-Release Agencies	1	2	3	4	5

Section IV

Adult Basic Education Programs (ABE)

1. What specific criteria are used for placement of an inmate in the ABE program? (You may check more than one.)

   _____ Achievement Tests
   _____ Intelligence Tests
   _____ Grade Level
   _____ Interviews

2. If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points: _____

   _____

3. Which of the following best describes the ABE program? Please check only one.

   _____ Individualized Programmed Instruction
   _____ Classroom Instruction
   _____ Both of These
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

4. How is an inmate's progress in the ABE program monitored and evaluated? (You may check more than one.)

   _____ Use of Pre- and Post-Tests
   _____ Staff Meetings
   _____ Written Reports from Teachers
   _____ Interviews with Educational Counselor
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

5. How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress? (You may check more than one.)

   _____ Grades
   _____ Conferences
   _____ Written Evaluations
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

6. Upon completion of the ABE program, is a formal staffing held for each inmate to formulate recommendations for further educational or alternative placement within the institution?

   Yes _____ No _____

7. If a student is enrolled in the ABE program, which of the following can he/she participate in simultaneously? (You may check more than one.)

   _____ Vocational Education
   _____ Work Assignment
   _____ Social Education
   _____ None of These

8. Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the ABE program?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If Yes, is this list made available to (you may check more than one):

   _____ Teachers _____ Students _____ Counselors
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

9. Are these objectives/competencies (you may check more than one):

_____ Teacher-Centered
_____ Content-Centered
_____ Student-Centered

10. What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/competencies have been met/achieved? (You may check more than one.)

_____ Standardized Tests
_____ Criterion-Based Tests (Teacher-made)
_____ Observation
_____ Work Sample
_____ Other (please specify) _____

11. Is there a syllabus for each ABE course being offered?

Yes _____ No _____

12. Does the ABE program operate on (you may check more than one):

_____ A Semester Basis
_____ Night School
_____ An On-Going Basis
_____ Day School

13. Can a student enter the program:

_____ At any time
_____ At the Beginning of a Semester
_____ Other (please specify) _____

14. How would you rate the availability and quality of the following items for the ABE program? (Circle one number under Availability and one under Quality for each item listed.)

Availability*				Quality**		
1	2	3	Textbooks	1	2	3
1	2	3	Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	1	2	3
1	2	3	Educational Films & Filmstrips	1	2	3
1	2	3	Audiovisual Equipment	1	2	3
1	2	3	Classroom Space	1	2	3
1	2	3	Desks, Chairs, & Other Classroom Furniture	1	2	3

*Availability
1-Sufficient to Meet Needs of All Classes
2-Available in Limited Quantity
3-Definitely Insufficient

**Quality
1-Modern & of High Quality
2-Adequate, But Needs Improvement
3-Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs

15. Do you use materials designed for adult illiterates and low level readers?

Yes _____ No _____

16. Does your funding source for the ABE program require that a program evaluation be done?

_____ Once a Year
_____ Twice a Year
_____ Other (please specify) _____
_____ More Than Twice a Year
_____ Not A Requirement

Section V

Secondary/GED Programs (SE/GED)

1. What specific criteria are used for placement of an inmate in the GED or Secondary program? (You may check more than one.)

   _____ Achievement Tests
   _____ Intelligence Tests
   _____ Grade Level
   _____ Interviews

2. If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points:

   _____

3. Which of the following best describes the GED or Secondary program? (Please check only one.)

   _____ Individualized Program Instruction
   _____ Classroom Instruction
   _____ Both of These
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

4. How is an inmate's progress in the GED or Secondary program monitored and evaluated? (You may check more than one.)

   _____ Use of Pre- and Post-Tests
   _____ Staff Meetings
   _____ Written Reports from Teachers
   _____ Interviews with Educational Counselor
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

5. How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress? (You may check more than one.)

   _____ Grades
   _____ Conferences
   _____ Written Evaluations
   _____ Other (please specify)
   _____

6. Upon completion of the GED or Secondary program, is a formal staffing held for each inmate to formulate recommendations for further educational or alternative placement within the institution?

   Yes _____ No _____

7. Please provide the following information about the GED test:

   GED Test is offered _____ GED Test is not offered _____

If the GED Test is offered, please answer the following:

Number of times the GED test is offered per year _____
Average number of inmates taking the exam per test_____
Based on the last two years, what percent of those inmates taking the GED test for the first time are able to pass? _____
What are the requirements for taking the GED test? (You may check more than one.)

_____ Class Attendance
_____ Grade Level
_____ Particular Courses
_____ Other (please specify)
_____

8. If a student is enrolled in the GED or Secondary program, which of the following can he/she participate in simultaneously? (You may check more than one.)

_____ Vocational Education
_____ Social Education
_____ Work Assignment
_____ Post Secondary Education
_____ None of These

9. Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the GED or Secondary program?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, is this list made available to (you may check more than one):

_____ Teachers
_____ Students
_____ Counselors
_____ Others (please specify)
_____

10. Are these objectives/competencies (you may check more than one):

_____ Teacher-Centered
_____ Content-Centered
_____ Student-Centered

11. What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/competencies have been met/achieved? (You may check more than one.)

_____ Standardized Tests
_____ Criterion-Based Tests (Teacher-made)
_____ Observation
_____ Work Sample
_____ Other (please specify)_____

12. Is there a syllabus for each GED or Secondary course being offered?

Yes _____ No _____

13. Does the Secondary or GED program operate on (you may check more than one):

_____ A Semester Basis
_____ Night School
_____ An On-Going Basis
_____ Day School

14. Can a student enter the program:

_____ At Any Time
_____ At the Beginning of a Semester
_____ Other (please specify)
_____

15. How would you rate the availability and quality of the following items for the Secondary/GED program? (Circle one number under availability and one under quality for each item listed.)

Availability*				Quality**		
1	2	3	Textbooks	1	2	3
1	2	3	Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	1	2	3
1	2	3	Educational Films & Filmstrips	1	2	3
1	2	3	Audiovisual Equipment	1	2	3
1	2	3	Classroom Space	1	2	3
1	2	3	Desks, Chairs, & Other Classroom Furniture	1	2	3

*Availability
1-Sufficient to Meet Needs of All Classes
2-Available in Limited Quantity
3-Definitely Insufficient

**Quality
1-Modern & of High Quality
2-Adequate, But Needs Improvement
3-Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs

16. Does your funding source for the Secondary/GED program require a program evaluation be done?

_____ Once A Year
_____ Twice A Year
_____ Other (please specify)_____
_____ More Than Twice a Year
_____ Not A Requirement

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE MAXIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS ABE/GED TEACHERS

MAXIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I

General Information

N = 32

1. Respondent's Name: _____

   Teaching Responsibility: _____
   (subject area)

   ABE 5 (16%)
   GED 5 (16%)
   Both 21 (66%) No Answer 1 (3%)

2. Institution Name: _____

3. Security Level of Institution:

   Maximum 12(38%)
   Medium 15(47%)
   Minimum 5(16%)
   CTC _____

4. Number of Inmates Incarcerated: _____ (See Appendix D)

5. Institution Houses: Males 7
   Females 1
   Both 1

6. Average age of inmate population is _____ years of age.
   (See Appendix D) (your best guess)

7. What is the average length of time served in this institution? (See Appendix D)
   _____ (your best guess)

8. Does this institution serve any unique or specialized purpose? (You may check more than one.)

   Diagnostic Center _____ Strict Custody _____
   Pre-Release Center _____ Behavior/Emotional
   Young Offenders _____ Problems _____
   Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)

9. Approximately how many volumes do you have in your institutional library? (See Appendix D)

10. Are all these volumes available to inmate students?

    Yes 32(100%) No _____

11. Is this availability in terms of space adequate to meet the needs and goals of your educational projects?

Yes 22(69%) No 10(31%)

12. Is this availability in terms of time adequate to meet the needs and goals of your educational projects?

Yes 25(78%) No 7(22%)

13. Do you have arrangements for interlibrary loans with public/private libraries?

Yes 20(63%) No 9(28%) No Answer 3(9%)

14. How would you rate the library facilities in your institution?

Excellent 22(69%) Adequate 2(6%) Poor 8(25%)

15. How would you rate the availability of study space provided for out-of-class work?

Available	8(25%)
Available on a Limited Basis	19(59%)
Not Available	5(16%)

16. How would you rate the adequacy of study space provided for out-of-class work?

Conducive to Studying	9(28%)
Not Conducive to Studying	23(72%)

17. Do you use external resources (i.e., from the local community or industries) in your education programs?

Regularly 3(9%) Occasionally 18(56%) Never 11(34%)

18. To what extent are your education programs limited in scope by lack of contact with community resources and experiences?

Not Limited 3(9%) Moderately Limited 16(50%)
Very Limited 12(38%) No Answer 1(3%)

19. What is the general attitude of other institutional personnel towards the educational programs?

Security		Treatment	
Extremely Supportive	3(9%)	Extremely Supportive	7(22%)
Moderately Supportive	18(56%)	Moderately Supportive	21(66%)
Not Supportive	6(19%)	Not Supportive	3(9%)
Hostile	4(13%)	Hostile	1(3%)

No Answer 1(3%)

Administration	
Extremely Supportive	6(19%)
Moderately Supportive	20(63%)
Not Supportive	5(16%)
Hostile	1(3%)

20. Does a record of an inmate's educational progress go into a cumulative file?

Yes 30(94%) No 2(6%)

If yes, is the file available to the following, if requested? (You may check more than one.)

Parole Board	27(90%)	Post-Release Vocational Training Programs	19(63%)
Post-Release Employers	12(40%)		
Post-Release Education Programs	20(67%)	N = 30	

21. In your opinion, does the information gained about the inmate through his/her participation in educational programs have appropriate influence with respect to the inmate's total institutional profile and record of adjustment?

Yes 17(53%) No 15(47%)

22. If an inmate who is referred for educational placement cannot be adequately placed in existing program offerings (e.g., because of extremely low level of achievement and/or serious learning disability), are there alternative placements or services available?

Yes 18(56%) No 14(44%)

Section II

Personal Information

N = 32

1. How many years have you been teaching GED or ABE classes at the institution where you are presently located?

Less than 1 year	5(16%)	5 - 6 years	2(6%)
1 - 2 years	4(13%)	6 - 7 years	3(9%)
2 - 3 years	8(25%)	7 - 8 years	1(3%)
3 - 4 years	1(3%)	more than 8 years	6(19%)
4 - 5 years	1(3%)	No Answer	1(3%)

2. How many years have you been teaching GED and ABE classes?

Years (See Appendix D)

3. (a) Are you employed by the Department of Corrections as a GED or ABE instructor?

Full-Time 30(94%) No Answer 1(3%) Part-Time 1(3%)

(b) If part-time, what are your other responsibilities?

(See Appendix D)

4. What is your present level of educational achievement?

_____	12th Grade	13(41%)	Bachelor Degree +
_____	12th Grade +	3(9%)	Masters Degree
_____	Vocational-Technical Training	11(34%)	Masters Degree +
_____	1-2 Years of College	0	Doctorate
_____	Associate of Arts Degree	_____	Other (please specify)
5(16%)	Bachelor Degree	_____	

5. What were/are your areas of specialization? Please indicate all appropriate areas:

No Answer 1(3%)

(See Appendix D)

6. What state certification do you presently hold?

7(22%)	Elementary Education
2(6%)	Adult Basic Education
23(72%)	Secondary Education General
8(25%)	Specific Subject Area
2(6%)	Guidance
	Specialist Certification
1(3%)	Special Education
_____	Learning Disabilities
_____	Educative Mentally Retarded
_____	Speech Therapy
_____	Social Restoration
6(19%)	Other (list) (See Appendix D)
3(9%)	Reading

7. Are you presently involved in any training program outside the Department of Corrections (not sponsored by the Department) such as University, College, Vo-Tech, etc.?

Yes 12(37%) No 20(63%)

If Yes, please specify: (See Appendix D)

8. Are you presently involved in any training programs sponsored by the Department of Corrections?

Yes 10(31%) No 22(69%)

If Yes, please specify: (See Appendix D)

9. What Department of Corrections sponsored training programs have you participated in? (In the past five years.)

No Answer 5(16%)
(See Appendix D)

10. Please check any of the following program aspects of which you would like to have additional training or information:

12(38%)	(a)	Writing Educational Goals and Principles
11(34%)	(b)	Job Market Assessment
13(41%)	(c)	Utilization of Community Resources
13(41%)	(d)	Recruitment/Selection Procedures
17(53%)	(e)	The Use of Counseling and Supportive Services
22(69%)	(f)	Teaching Methods
10(31%)	(g)	Pre- and Post-Testing Procedures
18(56%)	(h)	Individual Programmed Instruction
9(28%)	(i)	Classroom Instruction
7(22%)	(j)	The Student Evaluation Process
9(28%)	(k)	Teacher Centered Objectives/Competencies
7(22%)	(l)	Content Centered Objectives/Competencies
12(38%)	(m)	Student Centered Objectives/Competencies
8(25%)	(n)	How to Write a Syllabus
20(63%)	(o)	Textbooks, Equipment and Education Materials Designed to Meet Special Needs
12(38%)	(p)	Program and Student Evaluation
5(16%)	(q)	Others (please specify): (See Appendix D)

NUMBER REQUESTING TRAINING BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Number of Training Programs Requested by Each Teacher
C	7, 8, 3, 3
H	10, 17, 2, 7
McL	6, 10
LARC	7, 11, 8, 2
McA	15, 1, 15, 15
B	1
G	6, 2, 3, 7, 4, 2, 3, 7
O	3, 5, 8
S	3, 2

32 Teachers Requesting Training

Section III

Program Information

N = 32

1. Does the education program at your institution have a handbook or catalog describing available courses and programs?

   Yes 19(59%) No 13(41%)

   If Yes, is this handbook or catalog given to: N = 19

   12(63%) All Inmates
   6(32%) Only Inmates Interested in Education
   1(5%) No Answer

2. What tests are administered to inmates upon entering Oklahoma's Correctional System (LARC)?

   3(9%) Stanford Achievement Test
   14(44%) California Achievement Test
   10(31%) Tests of Adult Basic Education
   3(9%) Wechsler Intelligence Test
   6(19%) Stanford Binet Intelligence Test
   6(19%) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
   11(34%) I am not aware of what tests are administered
   3(9%) Others (please specify): (See Appendix D)

   Are your students' test results/scores readily available to you?

   Yes 25(78%) No 5(16%) No Answer 2(6%)

3. What additional tests are administered by your institution which is of assistance to you in your classroom situation? Please specify.

   No Answer 6(19%)
   (See Appendix D)

4. Do you have access to inmate educational records as they pertain to previous educational levels of attainment such as completion of 8th grade, GED completion, college entry, etc.?

   Yes 27(84%) No 5(16%)

   If No, do you think this information would be beneficial to you as a GED or ABE instructor? N = 5

   Yes 4(80%) No 1(20%)

5. How many inmates are currently participating in your classes?

   _____ Inmates (See Appendix D)

6. Are instructors permitted to work tutorially with inmates confined to their cells for behavioral or safety reasons?

   Yes 20(63%) No 12(38%)

7. Which parts of your education program are compulsory? (You may check more than one.)

9(28%) Adult Basic Education (ABE)
6(19%) GED Program
5(16%) Vocational Education
13(41%) None
7(22%) Specified Grade Equivalency
3(9%) Other

8. Is the inmate released from other duties in the institution to participate in the education program during the course of the regular work day?

Always 19(59%) Sometimes 11(34%) (On Condition) Never 2(6%)

9. Has this "released" time created any problems or conflicts between (you may check more than one):

1(3%) Administration and Education Staffs
11(34%) Security and Education Staffs
1(3%) Treatment and Education Staffs
18(56%) Work Supervisors and Education Staffs
11(34%) Does Not Apply
1(3%) No Answer

10. Has any formal administrative policy or process been established to resolve such problems?

Yes 13(41%) No 9(28%) Does Not Apply 7(22%) No Answer 3(9%)

11. To what extent do you believe the financial gains from working in prison industries discourages inmates from attending education programs?

6(19%) Very Much
12(38%) Some
10(31%) Very Little
4(13%) Not At All

12. Have any data been gathered from inmate interviews or questionnaires to support the above?

Yes 3(9%) No 23(72%) Does Not Apply 3(9%) No Answer 3(9%)

If Yes, please specify: (See Appendix D)

13. How many of the inmates are given academic and/or vocational counseling prior to the selection of an educational or vocational training program?

13(41%) All of Them
11(34%) Most of Them
4(13%) Very Few of Them
2(6%) None of Them
2(6%) No Answer

14. Are classes provided in English as a second language?

Yes 2(6%) No 29(91%) No Answer 1(3%)

15. Are Education programs available for (you may check more than one):

17(53%) Institutional staff combined in classes with inmates
4(13%) Separate classes for institutional staff
12(38%) No classes available for institutional staff

16. Are inmates permitted to take books or materials back to their cells?

Yes 29(91%) No 3(9%)

17. Are inservice training courses available?

19(59%)Mandatory
8(25%)Optional
5(16%)Not Available

18. How often are inservice training courses offered?

4(13%)Weekly
4(13%)Monthly
4(13%)Annually
18(56%)Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
2(6%) No Answer

19. How often are regular evaluations of educational staff conducted?

27(84%)Annually
1(3%) Monthly
2(6%) Not Conducted
6(19%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
1(3%) No Answer

20. By whom are evaluations of educational staff conducted? (You may check more than one.)

7(22%)External Personnel
29(91%)Supervisors
4(13%)Peers
1(3%) Inmates
6(19%)Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
1(3%) No Answer

21. Are inmates employed as support or teaching staff in your education program?

Yes 22(69%) No 10(31%)

If Yes, check which of the following responsibilities are given to inmates:

12(55%)Teacher Aides
11(50%)Assigned Tutoring
6(27%)Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
5(23%)Monitoring Equipment
_____ Classroom Teaching

22. How would you rate the following factors in the part they play in determining whether an inmate becomes involved in educational programs? (Circle one for each item.)

(See Table 12 for Responses.)	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Not Important
Recommendations of Counselor	4	3	2	1
Test Results	4	3	2	1
Years in School Prior to Incarceration	4	3	2	1
Inmate Interest	4	3	2	1
Court Recommendations	4	3	2	1
Parole Board Recommendations	4	3	2	1
Other (please specify): _____	4	3	2	1

23. Which of the following are directly involved in the decision to place inmates in educational programs? (You may check more than one.)

8(25%) Security Staff
15(47%) Treatment Staff
27(84%) Inmate Himself
1(3%) No Answer
23(72%) Education Representative
9(28%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)

24. What percent of the total institutional budget is given to education? _____% (See Appendix D) 17(53%) No Answer

25. What is your anual budget for educational programs? (Include internal and external funding sources.) (See Appendix D)

26. Do you consider this amount: 14(44%) No Answer

_____ Generous 7(22%) Adequate / Between 2(6%) 18(56%) Inadequate 5(16%) NA

27. Using the scale to the right of each item, indicate how seriously the following items are problems with respect to your ability to meet inmates' learning needs.

(See Table 4 for Responses)	Not A Problem				Serious Problem
Conflicts with Custody	1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts over Maintenance of Institution (e.g., Inmates' Jobs)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Liaison with Treatment Staff	1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts with Other Institutional Programs for Inmates (Religious, Recreational, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Qualified Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Supplementary Staff (Educational Counselors, Psychologists, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational "Hardware" (Videocassettes, Tapes, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational "Software" (Workbooks, Texts, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Inservice Training for Staff	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Instructional Material Related to Inmates' Needs	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Books, Tools, & Other Educational Materials	1	2	3	4	5

	Not A Problem				Serious Problem
Lack of Study Areas Conducive to Good Learning	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate Library Facilities	1	2	3	4	5
Low Student Motivation	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Funding	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Administrative Support	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Incentives for Inmate Participation	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational Follow-up with Parole & Post-Release Agencies	1	2	3	4	5

Section IV

Adult Basic Education Programs (ABE)

N = 26

1. What specific criteria are used for placement of an inmate in the ABE program? (You may check more than one.)

   22 (85%) Achievement Tests
   2 (8%) Intelligence Tests
   10 (39%) Grade Level
   14 (54%) Interviews

2. If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points: No Answer 9 (35%) (See Appendix D)

3. Which of the following best describes the ABE program? Please check only one.

   8 (31%) Individualized Programmed Instruction
   6 (23%) Classroom Instruction
   12 (46%) Both of These
   _____ Other (please specify) _____

4. How is an inmate's progress in the ABE program monitored and evaluated? (You may check more than one.)

   25 (96%) Use of Pre- and Post-Tests
   6 (23%) Staff Meetings
   11 (42%) Written Reports from Teachers
   7 (27%) Interviews with Educational Counselor
   1 (4%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)

5. How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress? (You may check more than one.) (See Appendix D)

   7 (27%) Grades
   20 (77%) Conferences
   13 (50%) Written Evaluations
   5 (19%) Other (please specify) (App. D)

6. Upon completion of the ABE program, is a formal staffing held for each inmate to formulate recommendations for further educational or alternative placement within the institution?

   Yes 10 (39%) No 15 (58%) No Answer 1 (4%)

7. If a student is enrolled in the ABE program, which of the following can he/she participate in simultaneously? (You may check more than one.)

   13 (50%) Vocational Education
   22 (85%) Work Assignment
   8 (31%) Social Education
   2 (8%) None of These

8. Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the ABE program?

   Yes 19 (73%) No 6 (23%) No Answer 1 (4%)

   If Yes, is this list made available to (you may check more than one):

   18 (95%) Teachers 13 (68%) Students 10 (53%) Counselors
   2 (11%) Others (please specify) (See Appendix D)

9. Are these objectives/competencies (you may check more than one):

1(4%) Teacher-Centered
14(54%) Content-Centered
15(58%) Student-Centered
7(27%) No Answer

10. What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/competencies have been met/achieved? (You may check more than one.)

21(81%) Standardized Tests
8(31%) Criterion-Based Tests (Teacher-made)
9(35%) Observation
8(31%) Work Sample
2(8%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
3(12%) No Answer

11. Is there a syllabus for each ABE course being offered?

Yes 8(31%) No 15(58%) No Answer 3(12%)

12. Does the ABE program operate on (you may check more than one):

2(8%) A Semester Basis
3(12%) Night School
1(4%) NA
23(89%) An On-Going Basis
8(31%) Day School

13. Can a student enter the program:

25(96%) At any time
1(4%) At the Beginning of a Semester
____ Other (please specify)____

14. How would you rate the availability and quality of the following items for the ABE program? (Circle one number under Availability and one under Quality for each item listed.)

Availability* (See Table 32 for Responses)				Quality**		
1	2	3	Textbooks	1	2	3
1	2	3	Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	1	2	3
1	2	3	Educational Films & Filmstrips	1	2	3
1	2	3	Audiovisual Equipment	1	2	3
1	2	3	Classroom Space	1	2	3
1	2	3	Desks, Chairs, & Other Classroom Furniture	1	2	3

*Availability
1-Sufficient to Meet Needs of All Classes
2-Available in Limited Quantity
3-Definitely Insufficient

**Quality
1-Modern & of High Quality
2-Adequate, But Needs Improvement
3-Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs

15. Do you use materials designed for adult illiterates and low level readers?

Yes 20(77%) No 3(12%) No Answer 1(4%) Some 2(8%)

16. Does your funding source for the ABE program require that a program evaluation be done?

15(58%) Once a Year
2(8%) Twice a Year
1(4%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
3(12%) No Answer
____ More Than Twice a Year
5(19%) Not A Requirement

Section V

Secondary/GED Programs (SE/GED)
N = 26

1. What specific criteria are used for placement of an inmate in the GED or Secondary program? (You may check more than one.)

   20(77%) Achievement Tests
   5(19%) Intelligence Tests
   14(54%) Grade Level
   14(54%) Interviews

2. If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points:
   No Answer 8(31%) (See Appendix D)

3. Which of the following best describes the GED or Secondary program? (Please check only one.)

   7(27%) Individualized Program Instruction
   3(12%) Classroom Instruction
   15(58%0Both of These
   1(4%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)

4. How is an inmate's progress in the GED or Secondary program monitored and evaluated? (You may check more than one.)

   24(92%) Use of Pre- and Post-Tests
   8(31%) Staff Meetings
   13(50%) Written Reports from Teachers
   7(27%) Interviews with Educational Counselor
   2(8%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)

5. How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress? (You may check more than one.)

   9(35%) Grades
   18(69%) Conferences
   15(58%) Written Evaluations
   4(15%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)

6. Upon completion of the GED or Secondary program, is a formal staffing held for each inmate to formulate recommendations for further educational or alternative placement within the institution?

   Yes 16(62%) No 10(39%)

7. Please provide the following information about the GED test:

   GED Test is offered 26(100%) GED Test is not offered ____

(See Appendix D)

If the GED Test is offered, please answer the following:

Number of times the GED test is offered per year _____
Average number of inmates taking the exam per test_____
Based on the last two years, what percent of those inmates taking the GED test for the first time are able to pass? _____
What are the requirements for taking the GED test? (You may check more than one.)

10(39%) Class Attendance
18(69%) Grade Level
5(19%) Particular Courses
14(54%) Other (please specify) _____

8. If a student is enrolled in the GED or Secondary program, which of the following can he/she participate in simultaneously? (You may check more than one.) 2(8%) No Answer

11(42%) Vocational Education
8(31%) Social Education
21(81%) Work Assignment
8(31%) Post Secondary Education
1(4%) None of These

9. Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the GED or Secondary program?

Yes 14(54%) No 9(35%) No Answer 3(12%)

If Yes, is this list made available to (you may check more than one): N = 14

13(93%) Teachers
12(86%) Students
4(29%) Counselors
4(29%) Others (please specify) (See Appendix D)

10. Are these objectives/competencies (you may check more than one):

3(12%) Teacher-Centered
11(42%) Content-Centered
13(50%) Student-Centered
9(35%) No Answer

11. What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/compentencies have been met/achieved? (You may check more than one.)

17(65%) Standardized Tests
7(27%) Criterion-Based Tests (Teacher-made)
2(8%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
9(35%) Observation
7(27%) Work Sample
5(19%) No Answer

12. Is there a syllabus for each GED or Secondary course being offered?

Yes 9(35%) No 14(54%) No Answer 3(12%)

13. Does the Secondary or GED program operate on (you may check more than one):

2(8%) A Semester Basis	25(96%) An On-Going Basis
4(15%) Night School	7(27%) Day School

14. Can a student enter the program:

26(100%) At Any Time	1(4%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
1(4%) At the Beginning of a Semester	

15. How would you rate the availability and quality of the following items for the Secondary/GED program? (Circle one number under availability and one under quality for each item listed.) (See Table 33 for Responses.)

Availability*				Quality**		
1	2	3	Textbooks	1	2	3
1	2	3	Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	1	2	3
1	2	3	Educational Films & Filmstrips	1	2	3
1	2	3	Audiovisual Equipment	1	2	3
1	2	3	Classroom Space	1	2	3
1	2	3	Desks, Chairs, & Other Classroom Furniture	1	2	3

*Availability
1-Sufficient to Meet Needs of All Classes
2-Available in Limited Quantity
3-Definitely Insufficient

**Quality
1-Modern & of High Quality
2-Adequate, But Needs Improvement
3-Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs

16. Does your funding source for the Secondary/GED program require a program evaluation be done?

17(65%) Once A Year	1(4%) More Than Twice a Year
2(8%) Twice A Year	3(12%) Not A Requirement
3(8%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)	

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM THE COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTERS ABE/GED TEACHERS

COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTERS

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
N = 16

Section I

General Information

1. Respondent's Name: _____

   Teaching Responsibility: _____
   (subject area)

   ABE 3(19%)
   GED 3(19%)
   Both 8(50%)
   No Answer 2(13%)

2. Institution Name: _____

3. Security Level of Institution:

   Maximum _____
   Medium _____
   Minimum _____
   CTC 16

4. Number of Inmates Incarcerated: _____ (See Appendix D)

5. Institution Houses: Males 3
   Females 1
   Both 1

6. Average age of inmate population is _____ years of age.
   (See Appendix D) (your best guess)

7. What is the average length of time served in this institution? (See Appendix D)
   _____ (your best guess)

8. Does this institution serve any unique or specialized purpose? (You may check more than one.)

   Diagnostic Center _____
   Pre-Release Center _____
   Young Offenders _____
   Strict Custody _____
   Behavior/Emotional Problems _____
   Other (please specify) (See Appendix D) _____

9. Approximately how many volumes do you have in your institutional library? No Answer 9(56%) (See Appendix D)

10. Are all these volumes available to inmate students?

    Yes 6(38%) No 1(6%) No Answer 9(56%)

11. Is this availability in terms of space adequate to meet the needs and goals of your educational projects?

Yes 8(50%) No 1(6%) No Answer 7(44%)

12. Is this availability in terms of time adequate to meet the needs and goals of your educational projects?

Yes 3(19%) No 6(38%) No Answer 7(44%)

13. Do you have arrangements for interlibrary loans with public/private libraries?

Yes 3(19%) No 6(38%) No Answer 7(44%)

14. How would you rate the library facilities in your institution? No Answer 8(50%)

Excellent 2(13%) Adequate 3(19%) Poor 3(19%)

15. How would you rate the availability of study space provided for out-of-class work?

Available 3(19%) No Answer 7(44%)
Available on a Limited Basis 5(31%)
Not Available 1(6%)

16. How would you rate the adequacy of study space provided for out-of-class work?

Conducive to Studying 3(19%) No Answer 8(50%)
Not Conducive to Studying 5(31%)

17. Do you use external resources (i.e., from the local community or industries) in your education programs? NA 6(38%)

Regularly 6(38%) Occasionally 8(50%) Never 2(13%)

18. To what extent are your education programs limited in scope by lack of contact with community resources and experiences?

Not Limited 4(25%) Moderately Limited 4(25%)
Very Limited 1(6%) No Answer 7(44%)

19. What is the general attitude of other institutional personnel towards the educational programs?

Security		Treatment	
Extremely Supportive	3(19%)	Extremely Supportive	4(25%)
Moderately Supportive	6(38%)	Moderately Supportive	5(31%)
Not Supportive	____	Not Supportive	____
Hostile	____	Hostile	____
No Answer	7(44%)	No Answer	7(44%)

Administration	
Extremely Supportive	7(44%)
Moderately Supportive	2(13%)
Not Supportive	____
Hostile	____
No Answer	7(44%)

20. Does a record of an inmate's educational progress go into a cumulative file?

Yes 6(38%) No 2(13%) No Answer 8(50%)

If yes, is the file available to the following, if requested? (You may check more than one.) N = 6

Parole Board	4(67%)	Post-Release Vocational Training Programs	3(50%)
Post-Release Employers	3(50%)	No Answer	3(50%)
Post-Release Education Programs	4(67%)		

21. In your opinion, does the information gained about the inmate through his/her participation in educational programs have appropriate influence with respect to the inmate's total institutional profile and record of adjustment?

Yes 7(44%) No 2(13%) No Answer 7(44%)

22. If an inmate who is referred for educational placement cannot be adequately placed in existing program offerings (e.g., because of extremely low level of achievement and/or serious learning disability), are there alternative placements or services available?

Yes 6(38%) No 3(19%) No Answer 7(44%)

Section II

Personal Information

N = 16

1. How many years have you been teaching GED or ABE classes at the institution where you are presently located?

Less than 1 year	7(44%)	5 - 6 years	____
1 - 2 years	5(31%)	6 - 7 years	____
2 - 3 years	1(6%)	7 - 8 years	1(6%)
3 - 4 years	____	more than 8 years	____
4 - 5 years	1(6%)	No Answer	1(6%)

2. How many years have you been teaching GED and ABE classes?

Years (See Appendix D) No Answer 3(19%)

3. (a) Are you employed by the Department of Corrections as a GED or ABE instructor?

Full-Time 1(6%) Volunteer 4(25%) NA 1(6%) Part-Time 10(63%)

(b) If part-time, what are your other responsibilities? (See Appendix D)

4. What is your present level of educational achievement?

____	12th Grade	5(31%)	Bachelor Degree +
____	12th Grade +	1(6%)	Masters Degree
____	Vocational-Technical Training	8(50%)	Masters Degree +
____	1-2 Years of College	____	Doctorate
____	Associate of Arts Degree	____	Other (please specify)
1(6%)	Bachelor Degree	1(6%)	No Answer

5. What were/are your areas of specialization? Please indicate all appropriate areas: (See Appendix D)

6. What state certification do you presently hold?

7(44%)	Elementary Education
____	Adult Basic Education
6(38%)	Secondary Education General
3(19%)	Specific Subject Area
1(6%)	Guidance
	Specialist Certification
1(6%)	Special Education
____	Learning Disabilities
____	Educative Mentally Retarded
____	Speech Therapy
____	Social Restoration
3(19%)	Other (list) (See Appendix D)
1(6%)	Reading
1(6%)	No Answer

7. Are you presently involved in any training program outside the Department of Corrections (not sponsored by the Department) such as University, College, Vo-Tech, etc.?

Yes 5(31%) No 11(69%)

If Yes, please specify: (See Appendix D)

8. Are you presently involved in any training programs sponsored by the Department of Corrections?

Yes _____ No 16(100%)

If Yes, please specify: _____

9. What Department of Corrections sponsored training programs have you participated in? (In the past five years.)

(See Appendix d) No Answer 13(81%)

10. Please check any of the following program aspects of which you would like to have additional training or information:

2(13%)	(a)	Writing Educational Goals and Principles
2(13%)	(b)	Job Market Assessment
5(31%)	(c)	Utilization of Community Resources
2(13%)	(d)	Recruitment/Selection Procedures
4(25%)	(e)	The Use of Counseling and Supportive Services
6(38%)	(f)	Teaching Methods
3(19%)	(g)	Pre- and Post-Testing Procedures
3(19%)	(h)	Individual Programmed Instruction
2(13%)	(i)	Classroom Instruction
4(25%)	(j)	The Student Evaluation Process
1(6%)	(k)	Teacher Centered Objectives/Competencies
1(6%)	(l)	Content Centered Objectives/Competencies
3(19%)	(m)	Student Centered Objectives/Competencies
_____	(n)	How to Write a Syllabus
7(44%)	(o)	Textbooks, Equipment and Education Materials Designed to Meet Special Needs
3(19%)	(p)	Program and Student Evaluation
1(6%)	(q)	Others (please specify): (See Appendix D)
3(19%)		No Answer

Section III

Program Information

1. Does the education program at your institution have a handbook or catalog describing available courses and programs?

   Yes 2(13%) No 7(44%) No Answer 7(44%)

   If Yes, is this handbook or catalog given to: N = 2

   1(50%) All Inmates _____ Only Inmates Interested
   _____ No Answer _____ in Education

2. What tests are administered to inmates upon entering Oklahoma's Correctional System (LARC)?

   1(6%) Stanford Achievement Test
   _____ California Achievement Test
   1(6%) Tests of Adult Basic Education
   _____ Wechsler Intelligence Test
   _____ Stanford Binet Intelligence Test
   1(6%) Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory
   11(69%) I am not aware of what tests are administered
   4(25%) Others (please specify): (See Appendix D)
   5(31%) No Answer

   Are your students' test results/scores readily available to you?

   Yes 6(38%) No 3(19%) No Answer 7(44%)

3. What additional tests are administered by your institution which is of assistance to you in your classroom situation? Please specify. No Answer 12(75%)
   (See Appendix D)

4. Do you have access to inmate educational records as they pertain to previous educational levels of attainment such as completion of 8th grade, GED completion, college entry, etc.?

   Yes 4(25%) No 8(50%) No Answer 4(25%)

   If No, do you think this information would be beneficial to you as a GED or ABE instructor?

   Yes 4(50%) No 2(25%) No Answer 2(25%)

5. How many inmates are currently participating in your classes?

   _____ Inmates (See Appendix D)

6. Are instructors permitted to work tutorially with inmates confined to their cells for behavioral or safety reasons?

   Yes _____ No 4(25%) No Answer 12(75%)

7. Which parts of your education program are compulsory? (You may check more than one.)

1(6%) Adult Basic Education (ABE)
3(19%) GED Program
_____ Vocational Education
6(38%) None
_____ Specified Grade Equivalency
_____ Other
7(44%) No Answer

8. Is the inmate released from other duties in the institution to participate in the education program during the course of the regular work day?

No Answer 8(50%)
Always 1(6%) Sometimes 6(38%) (On Condition) Never 1(6%)

9. Has this "released" time created any problems or conflicts between (you may check more than one):

_____ Administration and Education Staffs
_____ Security and Education Staffs
1(6%) Treatment and Education Staffs
_____ Work Supervisors and Education Staffs
5(31%) Does Not Apply 10(63%) No Answer

10. Has any formal administrative policy or process been established to resolve such problems?

Yes 2(13%) No _____ Does Not Apply 3(19%) NA 11(69%)

11. To what extent do you believe the financial gains from working in prison industries discourages inmates from attending education programs?

1(6%) Very Much
2(13%) Some
1(6%) Very Little
2(13%) Not At All
10(63%) No Answer

12. Have any data been gathered from inmate interviews or questionnaires to support the above?

Yes _____ No 3(19%) Does Not Apply 2(13%) NA 11(69%)

If Yes, please specify: _____

13. How many of the inmates are given academic and/or vocational counseling prior to the selection of an educational or vocational training program?

_____ All of Them
_____ Most of Them
1(6%) Very Few of Them
_____ None of Them
15(94%) No Answer

14. Are classes provided in English as a second language?

Yes 4(25%) No 7(44%) No Answer 5(31%)

15. Are education programs available for (you may check more than one):

_____ Institutional staff combined in classes with inmates
1(6%) Separate classes for institutional staff
5(31%) No classes available for institutional staff
10(63%) No Answer

16. Are inmates permitted to take books or materials back to their cells?

Yes 11(69%) No 1(6%) No Answer 4(25%)

17. Are inservice training courses available?

2(13%) Mandatory
1(6%) Optional
1(6%) Not Available
12(75%) No Answer

18. How often are inservice training courses offered?

1(6%) Weekly
____ Monthly
1(6%) Annually
____ Other (please specify) _____
14(88%) No Answer

19. How often are regular evaluations of educational staff conducted?

2(13%) Annually
____ Monthly
3(19%) Not Conducted
____ Other (please specify) _____
11(69%) No Answer

20. By whom are evaluations of educational staff conducted? (You may check more than one.)

2(13%) External Personnel
1(6%) Supervisors
____ Peers
____ Inmates
1(6%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
12(75%) No Answer

21. Are inmates employed as support or teaching staff in your education program?

Yes 3(19%) No 7(44%) No Answer 6(38%)

If Yes, check which of the following responsibilities are given to inmates: N = 3

1(33%) Teacher Aides
2(67%) Assigned Tutoring
____ Other (please specify) _____
____ Monitoring Equipment
1(33%) Classroom Teaching

22. How would you rate the following factors in the part they play in determining whether an inmate becomes involved in educational programs? (Circle one for each item.)

(See Table 12 and Appendix D)	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Not Important
Recommendations of Counselor	4	3	2	1
Test Results	4	3	2	1
Years in School Prior to Incarceration	4	3	2	1
Inmate Interest	4	3	2	1
Court Recommendations	4	3	2	1
Parole Board Recommendations	4	3	2	1
Other (please specify): _____	4	3	2	1

23. Which of the following are directly involved in the decision to place inmates in educational programs? (You may check more than one.)

3(19%) Security Staff	4(25%) Education Representative
6(38%) Treatment Staff	____ Other (please specify)
6(38%) Inmate Himself	8(50%) No Answer

24. What percent of the total institutional budget is given to education? _____% No Answer 12(75%) (See Appendix D)

25. What is your anual budget for educational programs? (Include internal and external funding sources.) No Answer 14(88%) (See Appendix D)

26. Do you consider this amount:

_____ Generous _____ Adequate 2(13%) Inadequate 14(88%) NA

27. Using the scale to the right of each item, indicate how seriously the following items are problems with respect to your ability to meet inmates' learning needs.

(See Table 4 for Responses)	Not A Problem				Serious Problem
Conflicts with Custody	1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts over Maintenance of Institution (e.g., Inmates' Jobs)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Liaison with Treatment Staff	1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts with Other Institutional Programs for Inmates (Religious, Recreational, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Qualified Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Supplementary Staff (Educational Counselors, Psychologists, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational "Hardware" (Videocassettes, Tapes, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational "Software" (Workbooks, Texts, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Inservice Training for Staff	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Instructional Material Related to Inmates' Needs	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Books, Tools, & Other Educational Materials	1	2	3	4	5

	Not A Problem				Serious Problem
Lack of Study Areas Conducive to Good Learning	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate Library Facilities	1	2	3	4	5
Low Student Motivation	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Adequate Funding	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Administrative Support	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Incentives for Inmate Participation	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of Educational Follow-up with Parole & Post-Release Agencies	1	2	3	4	5

Section IV

Adult Basic Education Programs (ABE)
N = 11

1. What specific criteria are used for placement of an inmate in the ABE program? (You may check more than one.)

   1(9%) Achievement Tests
   _____ Intelligence Tests
   7(64%) Grade Level
   6(55%) Interviews

2. If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points: No Answer 6(55%)
   (See Appendix D)

3. Which of the following best describes the ABE program? Please check only one.

   2(18%) Individualized Programmed Instruction
   2(18%) Classroom Instruction
   7(64%) Both of These
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

4. How is an inmate's progress in the ABE program monitored and evaluated? (You may check more than one.)

   7(64%) Use of Pre- and Post-Tests
   _____ Staff Meetings
   _____ Written Reports from Teachers
   2(18%) Interviews with Educational Counselor
   1(9%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
   1(9%) No Answer

5. How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress? (You may check more than one.) 3(27%) No Anser

   2(18%) Grades
   6(55%) Conferences
   1(9%) Written Evaluations
   2(18%) Other (please specify) (Appd D)

6. Upon completion of the ABE program, is a formal staffing held for each inmate to formulate recommendations for further educational or alternative placement within the institution?

   Yes _____ No 6(55%) No Answer 5(46%)

7. If a student is enrolled in the ABE program, which of the following can he/she participate in simultaneously? (You may check more than one.)

   7(64%) No Ansewr
   3(37%) Vocational Education
   _____ Social Education
   4(36%) Work Assignment
   _____ None of These

8. Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the ABE program?

   Yes 2(18%) No 9(82%)

   If Yes, is this list made available to (you may check more than one):

   2(100%) Teachers 1(50%) Students _____ Counselors
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

9. Are these objectives/competencies (you may check more than one):

2(18%) Teacher-Centered
2(18%) Content-Centered
3(27%) Student-Centered
7(64%) No Answer

10. What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/competencies have been met/achieved? (You may check more than one.)

1(9%) Standardized Tests
2(18%) Criterion-Based Tests (Teacher-made)
4(36%) Observation
5(46%) No Answer
2(18%) Work Sample
1(9%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)

11. Is there a syllabus for each ABE course being offered?

Yes 4(36%) No 4(36%) No Answer 3(27%)

12. Does the ABE program operate on (you may check more than one):

5(46%) A Semester Basis
8(73%) Night School
3(27%) An On-Going Basis
____ Day School

13. Can a student enter the program:

10(91%) At any time
____ At the Beginning of a Semester
____ Other (please specify)
No Answer 1(9%)

14. How would you rate the availability and quality of the following items for the ABE program? (Circle one number under Availability and one under Quality for each item listed.)

(See Table 34 for Responses)

Availability*				Quality**		
1	2	3	Textbooks	1	2	3
1	2	3	Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	1	2	3
1	2	3	Educational Films & Filmstrips	1	2	3
1	2	3	Audiovisual Equipment	1	2	3
1	2	3	Classroom Space	1	2	3
1	2	3	Desks, Chairs, & Other Classroom Furniture	1	2	3

*Availability
1-Sufficient to Meet Needs of All Classes
2-Available in Limited Quantity
3-Definitely Insufficient

**Quality
1-Modern & of High Quality
2-Adequate, But Needs Improvement
3-Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs

15. Do you use materials designed for adult illiterates and low level readers?

Yes 7(64%) No 3(27%) No Answer 1(9%)

16. Does your funding source for the ABE program require that a program evaluation be done?

2(18%) Once a Year
____ Twice a Year
____ More Than Twice a Year
7(64%) Not A Requirement
____ Other (please specify) _____
2(18%) No Answer

Section V

Secondary/GED Programs (SE/GED)
N = 11

1. What specific criteria are used for placement of an inmate in the GED or Secondary program? (You may check more than one.)

   3(27%) Achievement Tests
   _____ Intelligence Tests
   6(55%) Grade Level
   5(46%) Interviews
   1(9%) No Answer

2. If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points:
   No Answer 7(64%) (See Appendix D)

3. Which of the following best describes the GED or Secondary program? (Please check only one.)

   4(36%) Individualized Program Instruction
   _____ Classroom Instruction
   7(64%) Both of These
   _____ Other (please specify)_____

4. How is an inmate's progress in the GED or Secondary program monitored and evaluated? (You may check more than one.)

   9(82%) Use of Pre- and Post-Tests
   _____ Staff Meetings
   _____ Written Reports from Teachers
   2(18%) Interviews with Educational Counselor
   1(9%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
   1(9%) No Answer

5. How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress? (You may check more than one.)

   3(27%) Grades
   5(46%) Conferences
   2(18%) Written Evaluations
   3(27%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
   2(18%) No Answer

6. Upon completion of the GED or Secondary program, is a formal staffing held for each inmate to formulate recommendations for further educational or alternative placement within the institution?

   Yes 1(9%) No 6(55%) No Answer 4(36%)

7. Please provide the following information about the GED test:

   GED Test is offered 7(64%) GED Test is not offered 1(9%)
   No Answer 3(27%)

(See Appendix D)

If the GED Test is offered, please answer the following:

Number of times the GED test is offered per year _____
Average number of inmates taking the exam per test_____
Based on the last two years, what percent of those inmates taking the GED test for the first time are able to pass? _____
What are the requirements for taking the GED test? (You may check more than one.)

4(57%) Class Attendance
2(29%) Grade Level
2(29%) Particular Courses
4(57%) Other (please specify) _____

8. If a student is enrolled in the GED or Secondary program, which of the following can he/she participate in simultaneously? (You may check more than one.) 6(55%) No Answer

3(27%) Vocational Education
2(18%) Social Education
5(46%) Work Assignment
_____ Post Secondary Education
_____ None of These

9. Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the GED or Secondary program?

Yes 4(36%) No 3(27%) No Answer 4(36%)

If Yes, is this list made available to (you may check more than one):

4(100%) Teachers
3(75%) Students
2(50%) Counselors
1(25%) Others (please specify) (See Appendix D)

10. Are these objectives/competencies (you may check more than one):

1(9%) Teacher-Centered
3(27%) Content-Centered
3(27%) Student-Centered
6(55%) No Answer

11. What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/competencies have been met/achieved? (You may check more than one.)

3(27%) Standardized Tests
2(18%) Criterion-Based Tests (Teacher-made)
1(9%) Other (please specify) (See Appendix D)
5(46%) Observation
1(9%) Work Sample
5(46%) No Answer

12. Is there a syllabus for each GED or Secondary course being offered?

Yes 4(36%) No 4(36%) No Answer 3(27%)

13. Does the Secondary or GED program operate on (you may check more than one):

3(27%) A Semester Basis
7(64%) Night School
1(9%) No Answer
4(36%) An On-Going Basis
1(9%) Day School

14. Can a student enter the program:

10(91%) At Any Time
_____ At the Beginning of a Semester
_____ Other (please specify) _____
1(9%) No Answer

15. How would you rate the availability and quality of the following items for the Secondary/GED program? (Circle one number under availability and one under quality for each item listed.) (See Table 35 for Responses)

Availability*				Quality**		
1	2	3	Textbooks	1	2	3
1	2	3	Charts, Graphs, Globes & Maps	1	2	3
1	2	3	Educational Films & Filmstrips	1	2	3
1	2	3	Audiovisual Equipment	1	2	3
1	2	3	Classroom Space	1	2	3
1	2	3	Desks, Chairs, & Other Classroom Furniture	1	2	3

*Availability
1-Sufficient to Meet Needs of All Classes
2-Available in Limited Quantity
3-Definitely Insufficient

**Quality
1-Modern & of High Quality
2-Adequate, But Needs Improvement
3-Poor Quality and Not Meeting Needs

16. Does your funding source for the Secondary/GED program require a program evaluation be done?

2(18%) Once A Year
_____ Twice A Year
_____ Other (please specify) _____
7(64%) No Answer
_____ More Than Twice a Year
2(18%) Not A Requirement

APPENDIX D

TEACHER RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

MAXIMUM, MEDIUM, MINIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

Code

C = Conner Correctional Center
H = Joseph Harp Correctional Center
McL = Howard C. McLeod Correctional Center
LARC = Lexington Assessment and Reception Center
B = Mabel Bassett Correctional Center
McA = Oklahoma State Penitentiary for Women, Men, Trustee Unit - McAlester
G = Oklahoma State Reformatory - Granite
O = Ouachita Correctional Center
S = Stringtown Correction Center

COMMUNITY TREATMENT CENTERS

Code

CW = Clara Waters Community Treatment Center
E = Enid Community Treatment Center
M = Horace Mann Women's and Men's Community Treatment Center
Mus = Muskogee Community Treatment Center
OKC = Oklahoma City Community Treatment Center

Other Codes

MMM = Maximum, Medium, Minimum Security Institutions
CTC = Community Treatment Centers
NA = No Answer

Section I

Question 4: Number of inmates incarcerated:

MMM

C = 430, 400, 400, 410
H = 400, 414, 400, 450
McL = 280, 280
LARC = 814, 240, 270, 400
McA = 1104, 1104, 1104, 1104
B = 70
G = 350, 343, 350, 380, 338, 350, No Answer 2
O = 262, 230, No Answer 1
S = 450, 500

CTC

CW = 70, No Answer 1
E = 3, No Answer 1
M = 90-100, 100, No Answer 3
Mus = 49
OKC = No Answer 1

Question 6: Average age of inmate population is ___ years of age.

MMM

C = 18-30, 28, 25, 35
H = 30, 20, 25, 24
McL = 35, 35
LARC = 25, 21, 25, 30
McA = 27, 27, 25, 28
B = 28
G = 23, 25, 20, 20, 21, 20, 21, 20
O = 22, 23, No Answer 1
S = 27, 35

CTC

CW = 25, 22
E = 30, 30, 35, 22, No Answer 3
M = 25, 22, 23, No Answer 2
Mus = 25
OKC = 25

Question 7: What is the average length of time served in this institution?

MMM

C = 2-8, 10, 3, 10-15 years
H = 25, 2-3, 10, 3 years
McL = 10, 2 years
LARC = 10, 5, 4, 4 years
McA = 5, 5, 25, 5 years

Section I

Question 7: What is the average length of time served in this institution?

MMM

B = 8 years
G = 2, 10, 7, 2, 3-5, 3-5, 5, 20 years
O = 8 months, 2.5 years, No Answer 1
S = 8, 15 years

CTC

CW = 2 years
CW = 8-10 months
E = 1 year
E = 6-12 months
E = 6 months
M = 6 months
Mus = 2 years
M = 1 year
M = 6-12 months

Question 8: Does this institution serve any unique or specialized purpose?
Other:

MMM

H = Pre-release program; substance abuse program
H = Sex Offender Program (SPU); JHCC is becoming more treatment oriented with 2 Ph.D. Psych., and 4 Master level Psych. and 1 drug abuse counselor
LARC = Diagnostic Center but not involved with Education Center
McA = Trusty - OSP - Male and Female
G = Educational
G = Training Center
O = Vocational Training Programs with GED and ABE
O = Vocational Education
S = Vocational School
S = Rehabilitation

CTC

M = Job training opportunities
M = Male - non-violent, usually first offenders - female, less stringent

Question 9: Approximately how many volumes do you have in your institutional library?

MMM

C = 8500, 8500, 8500, No Answer 1
H = 2300, 3000, 5000, No Answer 1

Section I

Question 9: Approximately how many volumes do you have in your institutional library?

MMM

McL = 3000, 3500
LARC = 3000, 3000, 1000, 4758
McA = 8000, 8000, 7500, 7500
B = 1500
G = 3500, 6000, 6500, 6500, 10,000, 6000, No Answer 2
O = 4500, 6000, No Answer 1
S = 4000, 5000

CTC

CW = 200, No Answer 1
E = No Answer 7
M = 2000, 3000, 4000, No Answer 2
Mus = None
OKC = Must get all books from Oklahoma City Public Schools

Section II

Question 2: How many years have you been teaching GED and ABE classes?

MMM

C = 5, 2, 4, 2
H = 2, 6, 5, 5
McL = 5, 1
LARC = 3, 1, 1, 7
McA = 3, 24, 14, 3
B = 2
G = 8, 9, 15, 18, 6, 3, 1, No Answer 1
O = 5, 6, 7
S = 3, 1

CTC

CW = one-half year
CW = 1+ years
E = 1 year
E = 7-8 years
E = 3+ years
E = 2 years
E = 1 year
M = 3 years
M = 3 years
M = 4 years
M = 1 year
Mus = 8 years
OKC = 5 years

Section II

Question 3.a: Are you employed by the Department of Corrections as a GED or ABE instructor?
b: If part-time, what are your other responsibilities?

MMM

H = I am presently at Special Programs Unit which is a Psychological Educational Unit established for inmates with emotional problems. (Undersocialized, immature, emotionally distressed.)
G = College program

CTC

CW = I am employed by OKC schools on a part-time basis.
CW = Employed by OKC Public Schools on a part-time basis.
E = Full time reading teacher for Enid Public Schools.
E = I'm employed by the Enid Public Schools.
E = None
M = My job as Coordinator of Volunteers and Volunteers Program includes coordinating and teaching these classes.
Mus = Employed by Muskogee City Schools
OKC = Work in the city schools of Oklahoma City

Question 5: What were/are your areas of specialization? Please indicate all appropriate areas.

MMM

C = Elementary, secondary, research and corrections
C = Language Arts, library, psychology
C = Math, history
C = Reading Specialist
H = Elementary education, history
H = B.A. Ed. 1969 - Social Studies, Art - both in Education: I have completed 26 hours in graduate work from OU towards a Master's in Reading Education, grades K-12. I am specialized in reading education - all areas - diagnosis, prescription and evaluation. I have OJT in English and math. I have 2½ years experience in Title I Education from the State Training School, Red Wing, Minnesota, teaching math and reading. I have 13 quarter hours graduate credit from the University of Winona, Minnesota. I have specialization in the Social Studies areas - American History, government, economics, sociology, geography, etc.
H = Math, science, Ph.D. - Education
H = B.A. - Social Studies - M.A. - Administration, additional courses in psychology, testing, counseling
McL = Communication, math
McL = School Administration, social studies, industrial arts, math, reading
LARC = Physical Education, math, social studies
LARC = Administration, history, science, physical education

Section II

Question 5: What were/are your areas of specialization? Please indicate all appropriate areas.

MMM

LARC = Reading, journalism, English, social studies, economics, business, world history, American history, general business, composition and literature, speech, drama, geography (Certified in 6 major areas - 17 minors)
B = English, speech, drama, sociology, psychology, business English, newspaper
McA = Math, physical education, health, social studies, business
McA = Business administration, math, social studies, psychology, counseling
McA = Social studies, physical education, health
McA = Reading, math, business, psychology - counseling, health and physical education
G = Secondary social studies (all areas), guidance and counseling, school administration
G = Elementary education (all elementary subjects), school counselor, lack 8 hours on Reading Specialist Certificate
G = All mathematics and sciences
G = Math, science, social studies
G = B.A. - Social Studies (2 years here)
M.Ed.- Special Education (13 years here)
G = Physical education, psychology
G = English, drama, speech, Educational Psychology, guidance
O = Counseling in the area of behavioral problems. Testing - utilizing the C.T.B. grade placement battery of tests. Psychological tests. My degree is a double major of psychology and sociology.
O = Counselor, ABE coordinator, GED coordinator
O = Physical Education, social studies
S = Science, math, counseling
S = Biology, chemistry, physical education
G = Social Studies and part-time work in the library

CTC

CW = Math, reading, music
CW = Elementary education, counseling and psychometry
E = Secondary, business, special education
E = Reading specialist, elementary, teaching certification
E = Elementary education, math, administration
E = Teacher 16 years (Enid) 7th and 8th grade math.
E = English and speech (secondary), speech pathology
E = Administrator - elementary principal, teaching - math and science
E = Elementary education

Section II

Question 5: What were/are your areas of specialization? Please indicate all appropriate areas.

CTC

M = Mathematics, science, religion/religious education
M = American history, world history, sociology
M = Tutoring, counseling
M = Science (chemistry), math, secondary education
M = Journalism and literature
Mus = Major math, major physical education
OKC = Math, English, history

Question 6: What state certification do you presently hold? Other:

MMM

C = Social Studies
H = Social Studies, Art
Reading - making application for certification ('81)
LARC = See #5 - Public School Administrator
G = Administration
G = Math
G = Social Studies (all)

CTC

E = Administration
E = Administration certificate
M = None in Oklahoma, Nebraska secondary education

Question 7: Are you presently involved in any training program outside the Department of Corrections (not sponsored by the Department) such as University, College, Vo-Tech, etc.?
If Yes, please specify.

MMM

C = Sales Associate
H = Working on Masters in reading education, K-12, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma
H = Essentially courses that can supplement my basic knowledge in motivation, psychology, abnormal personality development and testing for realistic overall goal achievement and planning for the inmate.
LARC = Enrolled in special education at OU
LARC = OU post master, ESL training, Deaf Ed Vocational Training
McA = Masters degree, inservice training, ABE Workshops, 40 hours per year
McA = Masters degree, inservice workshops (Adult Basic Education) 40-60 hours
G = Reading Specialist Program at SWOSU

Section II

Question 7: Are you presently involved in any training program outside the Department of Corrections (not sponsored by the Department) such as University, College, Vo-Tech, etc.?
If Yes, please specify.

MMM

G = Master of Corrections
G = National Emergency Medical Technician
O = Vo Tech

CTC

CW = Remedial reading teacher for elementary school children
E = Basic real estate course
E = Adult Education through Carver Center, Enid, Oklahoma (GED and ABE senior programs) Home bound
E = ABE and GED sponsored by Enid Public School
M = University of Tulsa and always avail myself of workshops, seminars, etc.

Question 8: Are your presently involved in any training programs sponsored by the Department of Corrections?

MMM

H = We have a 3-day workshop in February but nothing ongoing
McL = 80 hours annual training required
LARC = Management training, staff development coordinator, self-defense
B = Curriculum standardization
McA = 80 hours per year
McA = 80 hours per year pertaining to communications and general inmate contact
McA = Training program which covers a wide area, 80 hours of training, workshops
McA = 80 hours per year inservice training stressing better communications and understanding inmates
O = Workshops that are conducted by the Department of Corrections and Vocational Education
O = Support services

CTC

No Responses.

Question 9: What Department of Corrections sponsored training programs have you participated in? (In the past five years.)

MMM

C = Adult Basic Education Workshop - OSU, Southeastern, Durant; M.S. Program - OSU

Section II

Question 9: What Department of Corrections sponsored training programs have you participated in? (In the past five years.)

MMM

C = P.A.C.E. - 8 hours
C = P.A.C.E.
C = Attended seminars and workshops annually
H = Teacher Training, Correctional inservice for 2 weeks, self-defense, emotional hygiene
H = DOC Training Academy - August '78
H = None
McL = Several inservice workshops, ABE workshops
McL = 80 hour annual, 2 ABE workshops
LARC = Clerical training seminar, orientation, LAPE, Teacher inservice
LARC = Management teacher training, self-defense, peace officer certification, Laubach Literacy
B = Laubach Literacy Program, Adult Basic Education Workshops
McA = 80 hours and workshops
McA = Workshops and the above required 80 hour program
McA = Workshops
McA = Laubach Reading Workshop, Bilingual workshops, communication workshop, NEU - 60 hours
G = Teacher Training Workshop, case manager reception workshop, supervisory workshop
G = PACE Training, ABE Workshop
G = ABE workshop - 1 week meeting - August, 1980
G = ABE (Summer 1980)
G = 2 weeks DOC training (city), 2-day seminar (Lexington) 1 week DOC training (Edmond), several 1-day Title I meetings
G = in 1974 I took part in a one-week training program
G = I can't remember specifics - all they have offered for teachers
O = There are approximately 8 workshop meetings per year that are conducted by the Department of Corrections and 3 per year that are presented by Oklahoma State Vo-Tech. These programs, while not relating specifically to the ABE or GED programs, are very beneficial to the staff for general knowledge and upgrading.
S = EDL Reading Lab, ABE inservice training (SOSU)
S = ABE
G = ABE workshop

CTC

E = None
M = Cadet training at the Cadet Training Center at Taft
M = Orientation

Section II

Question 10: Please check any of the following program aspects on which you would like to have additional training or information.
Other:

MMM

C = Teacher Effectiveness Training
H = How to cope with non-support from administration plus frustration due to lack of cooperation among correctional staff
H = Human relation course on sensitivity training between staff - inmate; staff - staff (how to get along)
H = Testing procedures and interpretation (WAIS); student abilities and interests (strong cambett, ex. interest inventory), and basic information on the unique type of individual (personality type, characteristics, etc.) that come to prison
LARC = Writing/publishing our own texts geared to needs. APL training and implementation through State Education Department.

CTC

M = Ways to motivate

Section III

Question 2: What tests are administered to inmates upon entering Oklahoma's Correctional System (LARC)?
Others:

MMM

H = Culture-Fair
LARC = Culture-Fair
G = I am not certain of what changes may have been made since my orientation training.

CTC

CW = WRAT
E = Reading tests given by the reading teacher, GED test
E = GEBI pre- and post-tests
E = GEBI

Question 3: What additional tests are administered by your institution which is of assistance to you in your classroom situation?

MMM

C = TABE, Pre-GED, CAT
C = APL
C = TABE, CAT, Pre-GED, APL

Section III

Question 3: What additional tests are administered by your institution which is of assistance to you in your classroom situation?

MMM

C = Tests of Adult Basic Education, Pre-Post Criterian Referenced Test
H = WRAT
H = TABE = Tests of Adult Basic Education - levels E (gr. 0-5), M (gr. 2-9), D (gr. 5-12)
H = Pre-GED, GEPI
H = When an inmate comes to SPU he is given an MMPI, TABE (if he does have a GED or H.S. diploma); WRAT (if he does); WAIS (if we need one)
McL = TABE
McL = None
LARC = SORT, Steck-Vaughn, GED
LARC = GEPI
LARC = SORT for getting the student started in material before test scores are available - long time
B = None
McA = CAT
McA = CAT
McA = CAT
G = CAT - California Achievement Test and the Stanford Test of Academic Skills (used only for college scholarship screening)
G = California Achievement Tests
G = I administer my own diagnostic test for my subject area
G = Gates-McGinitie Reading Tests administered by me
My teacher-prepared math test administered by me
My teacher-prepared language test administered by me
G = California Achievement Test
G = California Achievement
O = The California Achievement Tests
O = California Achievement Tests
S = Culture Fair Intelligence

CTC

CW = WRAT is the only test available
E = GEPI
M = Level D - tests of Adult Basic Education
Mus = None

Section III

Question 5: How many inmates are currently participating in your classes?

MMM

C = 18, 16, 21, 54
H = 20, 60, 60, 60
McL = 32, 26
LARC = 17, 10, 55, 92
McA = 20-25, 20-25, 17, 35
B = 16
G = 27, 25, 24, 16, 25, 30, 23, 18
O = 47, 50, 37
S = 26, 27

CTC

CW = 26, 20
E = 3, 8, Several, 1, No Answer 3
M = 2, 20, 10-20, 15, No Answer 1
Mus = 15
OKC = 18

Question 12: Have any data been gathered from inmate interviews or questionnaires to support the above?

MMM

H = Although my situation is somewhat different, I have polled 76 men (2 months ago) at SPU and given a choice, over 90% would rather have a chance to work at the furniture factory at JHCC, than attend school. Most men are broke and draw gang pay of $3.25 monthly. The men who did want education, had a monthly income coming in from outside sources.
McL = They like the $20-$25 vs. $10. Also, some 7-day job schedules will not allow school participation.
LARC = Statements in ICC Committee
McA = Observation only
McA = Past observation only

Question 18: How often are inservice training courses offered? Other:

MMM

C = DOC requires 80 hours training per year
H = Whenever they become available
H = Not regularly
H = 80 hours per year
McL = No set interval
McL = Varies
LARC = Not yet on a regular basis
LARC = None
LARC = When we can; bi-yearly at least
LARC = Occasionally

Section III

Question 18: How often are inservice training courses offered?
Other:

MMM

B = Never
G = As scheduled by DOC
G = Occasionally
G = None
G = As decreed by DOC
G = Not often
G = Sporadically
O = Occasionally

CTC

No Response

Question 19: How often are regular evaluations of educational staff conducted?
Other:

MMM

McA = To begin this year
McA = To begin this year
McA = 1981
G = Annually
O = Semi-annually
S = Will be started soon

CTC

No Response

Question 20: By whom are evaluations of education staff conducted?
Other:

MMM

H = Witch-hunts by security
G = DOC
G = School superintendent
O = State vocational staff
O = Self
G = Unknown to me

CTC

CW = There isn't any evaluation

Section III

Question 21: Are inmates employed as support or teaching staff in your education program?

MMM

C = Educational runners
H = Teachers aid (typing)
G = Clerical
G = Clerical work
G = Grade tests, use ditto machine
G = Clerical duties

CTC

No Response

Question 22: How would you rate the following factors in the part they play in determining whether an inmate becomes involved in educational programs? Other:

MMM

C = Parents, friends, etc.
H = Orientation for all inmates; peer advertisements
McL = Work release on completion
LARC = Age
G = They go until they are 21 or graduate or get a GED. Educational programs here are involuntary until they are 21

CTC

CW = This class is required for all inmates that have not achieved a high school or GED degree
M = Peer interest
M = Parole Board Recommendations (seems very important to residents)

Question 23: Which of the following are directly involved in the decision to place inmates in educational programs?

MMM

C = ICC
C = Institutional Classification Committee
H = Central Classification Committee composed of various department reps
H = Any of those participating in classification meetings
LARC = Director of Programs/Case Manager
G = Optional programs
G = Administration
S = Counselors
G = Age, all under 21 are required to go to school

Section III

Question 23: Which of the following are directly involved in the decision to place inmates in educational programs?

CTC

No Response

Question 24: What percent of the total institutional budget is given to education?

MMM

C = 1 1/2 percent
C = Very little
H = 1/10th of a percent
H = One-one hundredth
H = Under 10%
McL = 5%
McL = 1%
LARC = Less than 1 percent
LARC = .7% - less than 1% budget - approximately $3 million - $12,000 to education
B = Estimated 5%
McA = Less than 1%
McA = Less than 1%
McA = One-tenth of a percent
McA = Less than 1%
G = 12%

CTC

CW = At this time 0%, but working toward approximately $1,000 per year by the DOC
M = Educational materials are obtained through the Tulsa Adult Education Services
M = Not enough
Mus = Don't know

Question 25: What is your annual budget for education programs? (Include internal and external funding sources.)

MMM

C = Very small
C = $20,000 (Education & Library)
H = $10,000
H = $20,000 (Title I - gets $10,000)
H = SPU = I've never seen one - or have been told. Guess, $3,000
McL = $7,000
LARC = Title I, Appr. $9,000
LARC = Less than $10,000
LARC = $12,000 Inst. - Annual Grant $10,000 Title I, Total $22,000, doesn't count salaries

Section III

Question 25: What is your annual budget for education programs? (Include internal and external funding sources.)

MMM

B = $5,000
McA = $9,000
McA = $9,000
McA = $9,000
McA = $9,000
G = $5,000 plus salaries this year
G = $2,500 Title I
G = $300,000
S = $3,000

CTC

M = None
Mus = Don't know

Section IV

Question 2: If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points:

MMM

C = 5th grade
C = 8.9
C = 9th and above GED, Grade 1 through 8 ABE
H = 7th grade or above qualifies for GED; below qualifies for ABE
H = Grades 0-8
H = Grade point 8.0
H = Below 6
McL = None
LARC = 12th GED
LARC = Title I = 10.0 ABE 8.0 GED
B = K-7
McA = 7.0 - 8.0
G = Special Ed. 3.0, ABE - 8.0, High School 8.1 and above
G = In my class, those that scored below 3.0 in anything came to me. With lack of teachers, I get "anything!" (Lows of 4th or 5th)
O = 7.5 grade level
O = We have thus far accepted all inmates who desired to enter training program
O = 8th grade level

CTC

CW = Any student that has not completed a high school degree
E = None
M = 3 through 12
Mus = 8th grade
OKC = 4th

Section IV

Question 4: How is an inmate's progress in the ABE program monitored and evaluated?
Other:

MMM

H = Daily teacher evaluation through oral and written work

CTC

E = Only if the person passes the GED test

Question 5: How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress?
Other:

MMM

C = Daily progress kept on folder
H = Daily consultation
H = (CRT - teacher made) every 8 weeks
B = Verbal evaluations
G = Pre and post test comparison

CTC

CW = Verbal
E = Self check answers available - continued progress discussion

Question 8: Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the ABE program?
Other:

MMM

H = Anyone upon request
H = Anyone who wants one

CTC

No Response

Question 10: What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/competencies have been met/achieved?
Other:

MMM

C = PACE Test
G = Teacher-prepared tests, also

CTC

E = At this point, if they pass the GED test, if appears that the student was successful

Section IV

Question 16: Does your funding source for the ABE program require that a program evaluation be done?
Other:

MMM

McA = Monthly

CTC

No Response

Section V

Question 2: If grade level is used for placement, please specify your cut off points:

MMM

C = Tests are used. However, 5th and below is ABE
C = 9th grade
C = 9th grade and above
H = Grade 7 or above qualifies for GED instruction
H = Grade 8-12
H = 8th
H = Above 8
McL = None
LARC = 12th
LARC = GED open-ended
B = 8-12
McA = 7th and 8th
McA = 7 and 8th
McA = 8th
G = Accepted at all levels
O = 10 for GED preparation
O = Grade equivalent of 10 in California Achievement Test
S = 7th grade

CTC

CW = Anything below high school degree
M = 9 through 12
Mus = Finish high school
OKC = 6th grade

Question 3: Which of the following best describes the GED or Secondary program?
Other:

MMM

H = Evening discussion after filmstrips--borrowed from Moore Regional Service

CTC

No Response

Section V

Question 4: How is an inmate's progress in the GED or Secondary program monitored and evaluated?
Other:

MMM

C = Staff meetings (some times)
H = Daily teacher evaluation through oral and written work

CTC

E = I know of no way that they are monitored or evaluated

Question 5: How is the inmate made aware of his or her progress?
Other:

MMM

H = Daily consultation
B = Verbal evaluations
G = Report cards
H = CRT - Teacher made

CTC

CW = Verbal
E = Participation
M = Feedback on lessons and sessions each meeting

Question 7: If the GED test is offered, please answer the following:

1. Number of times the GED test is offered per year:
2. Average number of inmates taking the exam per test:
3. Percent inmates taking the GED test for the first time:
4. Other:

MMM

C = 1. about each 3 months
2. at least six
3. 85%
4. pass pre-GED test

C = 1. No response
2. six
3. No response
4. teacher observation

C = 1. 12-15
2. 7
3. 85%
4. pre-GED

Section V

Question 7: If the GED test is offered, please answer the following:

MMM

H = 1. 12
2. 5-10
3. 90%
4. T.A.P.E. and pre-GED results

H = 1. 10-12 times
2. 8
3. 90%
4. Required to take a pre-GED exam, must qualify 10% higher than State law requires

H = 1. 12
2. 6
3. 85
4. No response

H = 1. Once a month
2. Once a month
3. 90%
4. Personal (inmate) need. Inmates at SPU are sometimes allowed to take a GED cold, if they have a high enough score on a pre-GED test. Inmates are allowed to take the exam cold, if it is a treatment decision - i.e., dealing with motivation factor or working out an emotional block to school.

McL = 1. As needed
2. 5
3. 95%
4. TABE score

McL = 1. 12
2. 6
3. 95%
4. No response

LARC = 1. 12
2. 10
3. 80 to 90%
4. No response

LARC = 1. 12
2. 10
3. 75%
4. No response

LARC = 1. 12
2. 12
3. 90%
4. No response

LARC = 1. 12
2. 16
3. 83%
4. Passage at 48.6 GEPI

Section V

Question 7: If the GED test is offered, please answer the following:

MMM

B = 1. 12
2. 4
3. 92%
4. No response

McA = 1. 4-6
2. 12-15
3. 100%
4. No response

McA = 1. 4
2. 12
3. 80%
4. No response

McA = 1. 4-6
2. 12
3. 100%
4. No response

G = 1. As needed
2. 8
3. No response
4. Or willingness to pay for the exam one's self

G = 1. 6
2. 15
3. No response
4. No response

G = 1. Don't know
2. Don't know
3. Don't know
4. Must be 21, pass a screening or be leaving institution shortly

O = 1. 10
2. 6
3. 96%
4. Desire

O = 1. 12
2. 4
3. 95%
4. No response

O = 1. 12
2. 5
3. 85%
4. Oklahoma requires one percentile

S = 1. As required
2. 5
3. 95%
4. Pass a pre-GED

Section V

Question 7: If the GED test is offered, please answer the following:

MMM

G = 1. No response
2. No response
3. No response
4. Age time served

CTC

E = 1. 2
2. No response
3. No response
4. Can take test any time

E = 1. 2
2. No response
3. No response
4. No response

E = 1. Anytime
2. No response
3. No response
4. No response

M = 1. No response
2. No response
3. No response
4. General interest level is high

M = 1. Continuously
2. No response
3. No response
4. Taking a similar test prior to taking GED

Mus = 1. 5
2. 5
3. 80
4. No response

OKC = 1. 3 to 4
2. 2
3. No response
4. Complete course

Question 9: Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the GED or Secondary Program? Other:

MMM

H = Any support staff
H = Anyone who wants one
LARC = By GED needs and testing
B = Warden

Section V

Question 9: Do you have a list of specific objectives and/or competencies for the GED or Secondary Program?
Other:

CTC

M = Volunteers

Question 11: What method(s) is used to determine whether objectives/competencies have been met/achieved?
Other:

MMM

H = Consultation with student
B = Post tests

CTC

M = Passing GED

Question 14: Can a student enter the program?
Other:

MMM

O = Depending on existing enrollment

CTC

No responses

Question 16: Does your funding source for the Secondary/GED program require a program evaluation be done?
Other:

MMM

H = New evaluative procedures being developed
LARC = Monthly
McA = Will be required this year

CTC

No responses