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Inmate Education as a Service Learning Opportunity for Students: Preparation, Benefits, and Lessons Learned

Cheryl L. Meyer¹, Megan Harned¹, Amanda Schaad¹, Katherine Sunderland¹, Judson Palmer¹, and Christy Tinch²

Abstract
There is mounting evidence that prison inmates benefit from educational opportunities but may not be afforded them. In addition, when they are offered, priority is given to prisoners who will be released in the near future, and those serving long-term or life sentences are less likely to have access to classes. A service learning opportunity was created where students taught a life span development class to women serving long-term sentences. This article provides a guide to setting up the class while avoiding obstacles along the way. It also outlines benefits to students, inmates, supervising faculty, and society. In order to teach, students must apply what they have learned, and the prison experience challenges them to consider their power and privilege.
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Creating a Proposal
The first step in planning this type of partnership is to create two proposals, one for prison officials and one for your
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Preparing for the Partnership

Preparing for the partnership will involve gathering materials needed for the class such as books and recruiting student instructors. An older edition of an introduction to life span development book (Santrock, 2007) was chosen because it could be acquired for less than a dollar per book, but the materials were still current. The newer editions contained electronic resources that inmates cannot access. Other options for finding books could be to ask for donations from publishers or desk copies from colleagues.

An announcement was sent to all students who were enrolled in our program, inviting them to participate. Approximately one fifth (20/100) of the students responded, and student instructors were chosen based on seniority in the program, an interest in forensic psychology, and diversity variables such as race and gender. For example, it is preferable if at least one male can be in the group of students, as it can be a good opportunity for women in prison to establish a positive relationship with a male. Students selected as instructors have had one or two semesters of diversity training as part of their program requirements.

Implementing and Maintaining the Partnership

Most prisons will require volunteers to complete extensive paperwork and undergo background checks as part of their security process. This paperwork and information should be submitted 6–8 weeks in advance of teaching. If the class is to be taught in the spring, it is a good idea to meet in the middle of the fall, generally when registration begins, to start this process. In addition, any other paperwork can be completed such as directed study forms or university service learning contracts.

At that point, students also begin to construct their syllabus and training on teaching techniques. Students prepare their class like any college class, and although they can look over prior class preparations, they need to create their own course content. Over time, the syllabus has evolved as each group has shaped the class. Students can also decide how they intend to measure student learning and what topics they will cover. For example, homework assignments have included reflection papers, and final assignments have ranged from projects to presentations which incorporate material learned in class into the inmate’s life story. The topics covered have typically followed chapters
in the book, but students may choose to go more in depth about a particular topic and/or delete chapters. All assignments are handwritten, and inmates are responsible for bringing their own supplies such as pencil and paper. Inmates do not have access to word processing or e-mail. Grading for all assignments and for the class is on a pass/fail basis, with attendance factoring into the grading as well.

Once the partnership has been established, maintaining it is much less time-consuming. Books have been bought, a liaison has been established, and the prison is engaged. Most of the work is in training students to teach. There is a wait list of students and inmates who want to take advantage of this opportunity. As such, inmates and students are not allowed to repeat the course.

Each semester, the faculty member supervising the course attends the first and last class to set the tone, explain who we are and why we are teaching this class, and administer a measure of knowledge about the topic before the class begins. It is noted on the syllabus, and discussed that first day, that the inmates will not receive college credit for the class. Since most inmates are serving life or long-term sentences, this is not an issue. They take the class because they want to learn and level of education is not considered a barrier to taking the class. For weeks 2–9, the pair of students teach the class with no corrections personnel present. At the last class, several assessments are administered including a course evaluation, the same knowledge test, and a measure of personal impact. These data have been instrumental in demonstrating the effectiveness of the partnership to university and prison personnel. The institutional review board was contacted prior to administering any assessments, but approval was not necessary.

**Method**

**Participants**

All of the inmates who enrolled in the course were women. Although we did not ask for specific demographics such as age or race, only women who were serving long-term or life sentences could enroll in the course. Most of them had indeterminate sentences or sentences with “a tail,” such as 15 years to life. However, a few of these women had consecutive sentences, which made their parole date beyond their life expectancy.

**Measures**

**Knowledge test.** A knowledge test with 1 broad-based item from each chapter of the book was administered on the first and last days of class. This test was revised 2 times so the latest version has only been administered to three classes. The knowledge test was revised because the student instructors considered it too difficult. The students have struggled with selecting broad-based items, and some questions have been too specific (e.g., at what age is a child first able to recognize himself or herself in a mirror?). They have learned valuable lessons on test construction. However, this scale continues to be revised, and so inmate’s self-report of knowledge gained was included in the Perceived Impact Scale.

**Perceived Impact Scale.** Inmates self-report the impact the class had on their level of knowledge, abilities, and other characteristics. Initially, inmates were provided a self-esteem scale to measure impact. However, it was clear in their personal reflections that this was not the correct construct to measure. In those reflections, they discussed impact on constructs such as self-awareness, emotional growth, and confidence. Following completion of the first class, a focus group was held with inmates who had completed the class to determine in what ways it had impacted them. There were no scales available in the literature to measure the array of constructs they identified as having changed so a scale was created. The instructions for this scale ask inmates to grade themselves on the items using the grading scale they used in school from “A” (4.0) to “F” (0.0). This scale was administered during the last class, and inmates provide two ratings that day, one for their recalled assessment of themselves on that construct before the course and one for their current assessment on the construct after the course. It was decided not to administer this as pre-post but as a posttest because respondents may overestimate their scores before the course. Dunning, Johnson, Ehrlinger, and Kruger (2003) indicated that people are unaware of their incompetence, and “This lack of awareness arises because poor performers are doubly cursed: Their lack of skill deprives them not only of the ability to produce correct responses, but also of the expertise necessary to surmise that they are not producing them” (p. 83). Most of the women enrolled in the classes did not have any college education, and some did not have a high school degree. They would classify as poor academic performers, yet they may not see themselves as such, especially when compared to their peers. It is certainly likely they would have assessed their skills at a higher level before the course and then after the course assessed themselves at the same level. More importantly, the scale was assessing the perceived impact that the women believed the course had on them. When the scale is only administered at the end of the course, and the numbers differ, respondents perceived the course had an impact on them.

**Course evaluations.** Inmates complete a short 3-item evaluation of each class meeting to provide feedback to the student instructors and a 17-item course evaluation at the end of the course. The final evaluation includes sections on the structure of the course, the content and workload, the overall quality of the instructors, and the contributions the course made to their learning. This scale was revised after teaching the class 1 time because the prior scale was more applicable to a traditional college class (e.g., “Was the instructor available outside of classes?”). It is a Likert-type scale of 1 (agree) to 5 (disagree).

**Student/instructor self-rating.** The first time this course was taught, instructors completed a series of reflection questions regarding the class (e.g., What did you learn about yourself today? What did you learn about working in a prison? What did you learn about the inmates?). At the end of the semester, all of the responses were collected and a thematic analysis was conducted. Three researchers independently examined their
reflection responses, analyzing them for common, recurring themes. The themes and questions were used to create a more objective assessment measure that would be completed by student instructors at the end of the next teaching experience. The last two semesters, this scale has also included a section where students rate the inmates on numerous characteristics such as enthusiasm, effort, ability, and motivation on a scale from 1 (very high) to 5 (very low).

**Results**

**Knowledge Test**

The average inmate score on the knowledge test after the course ($M = 7.71, SD = 1.88$) was significantly higher than that before the course, $M = 6.76, SD = 2.12, t(28) = -3.20, p < .01, d = -0.60$. Overall, 59% of the women increased their scores, 24% remained the same, and 17% decreased. Any inmate who did not have a matched pre- and posttest was excluded from the analysis.

**Perceived Impact Scale**

Table 1 provides the items for this scale. According to both parametric and nonparametric (Wilcoxon signed rank test) statistics, the differences between pre- and post-perceptions were significant for all items. Family-wise error was controlled for using a Bonferroni correction. In addition, at the end of the scale, the women were asked to answer the following item, “Overall, how has this human developmental class affected your sense of purpose on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being no impact and 5 being a strong impact?” The mean was 4.68 ($SD = 0.62$).

**Student/Instructor Self-Rating**

Results from this measure are included in Table 2. Students agree to strongly agree that the directed study increased their interest in teaching and in teaching in forensic settings. The class also made them more aware of their stereotypes, power, and privilege. A second part to this scale measuring students’ ratings of inmates on numerous characteristics was added after three semesters, and the results are included in Table 3.
The only exception is the item, “The course improved my factual knowledge in developmental psychology.” The mean for all items, except one, has consistently been in the 1–1.42 range. Questions are included in Table 4.


table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to apply material</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of learning opportunity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in understanding themselves and their lives</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to sharing personal stories</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 8.

table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The syllabus provided clear objectives for the course</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a reasonable amount of reading, writing, and assignments</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation methods (homework and exams) used were fair and reflected the objectives of the course</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course required a lot of work</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The homework assignments were valuable in helping me learn</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I kept up with the readings that were required</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively paid attention and participated in class</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course improved my ability to communicate with others effectively</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course improved my ability to express myself in writing</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course improved my factual knowledge in developmental psychology</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructors were prepared for class sessions</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructors provided opportunities for questions and discussions</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The responses to questions raised during classes were adequate</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructors held my attention</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having multiple instructors was an asset to the course</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall quality of the course was excellent</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this course to others</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 33.

Course Evaluations

Responses indicate that the women believe the course improves their ability to communicate with others more effectively, express themselves in writing, and increase their knowledge of life span development. Questions are included in Table 4. The mean for all items, except one, has consistently been in the 1–1.42 range. The only exception is the item, “The course required a lot of work (M = 2.74).” Every inmate who has responded to the course evaluation has said the course was excellent and she would recommend it to others. A typical comment on the course evaluation is, “I found extremely valuable how our upbringing affects the aspects of my life. I understand why I have come to prison. The knowledge I have gained I share with everyone! Friends, family.”

Discussion

The purpose of this article was to provide a guide to setting up a prison–academic partnership while avoiding obstacles. The initial time teaching the course can be frustrating and time-consuming, but this guide should facilitate the process. Assessments have always been included in the course to demonstrate to prison officials that the course was having a positive impact. The scales are included here to use or not use and to administer before and after the class or as postassessments. All of these assessments, of the inmates and of the student teachers, suggest that the course is beneficial for inmates and for students. Although the knowledge test indicates that learning is occurring, it may not be an accurate indicator of how much learning is actually taking place. The students have constructed the scale, but it may be weak in construct validity and could be revised again. However, the real impact for the inmates seems to be on a more personal level. The material has helped them to understand themselves and their family and friends.

This same thing is true for the university students. Although they are exposed to and experience some of the intricacies of teaching, the real impact is on their understanding of other people. Many students have never interacted with a prisoner and have colorful stereotypes about who prisoners are, particularly those serving life sentences. Exposure to this population helps them to dispel these inaccurate beliefs and makes them acutely aware of their own power and privilege.

Lessons Learned

This section is provided to help expedite the process of establishing an academic–prison partnership. Although initially setting up the partnership can involve some time, afterward, like most courses, the amount of preparation is greatly diminished. Moreover, having the process outlined here will reduce the overall planning time.

First, prison protocol, such as forms and policies, can change suddenly. Volunteers may be the last to receive notice of changes. Initially, students did not need to complete any paperwork to teach the class. The fourth time the class was offered, students had to complete extensive paperwork, have thorough background checks, and undergo Prison Rape Elimination Act training, which consisted of watching a video. Although the prison may be appreciative of the classes, it is a very small part of prison responsibilities. The background checks delayed the start of the class twice. Therefore, it is important to maintain frequent contact with the liaison overseeing the project. The liaison is ultimately responsible to the facility for the success or failure of the course so ensure that the liaison remains informed and has input into the structure of the course. Continually check on paperwork, inmate selection, and scheduling. The liaison is not the only one in the prison to process the paperwork and it can be lost at any stage. Make
copies of everything and send reminders when there is a change in protocol. For example, it is a good idea to have gate passes (permission from prison officials) for every instructor for every week in case of last-minute substitutions. If the instructors bring food 1 week, the instructors and the food need gate passes. There is a separate gate pass for the food. After a while, you will become aware of the nuances in prison rules. Rules, terminology, and protocol differ from prison to prison.

Second, expect the unexpected, do not assume anything, and always check and recheck. The prison may be a long drive, and if it is on lockdown, class cannot be taught. Bad weather can stall the class at any time. Have extra weeks available at the end of a quarter or semester in order to make up any missed classes.

Third, as much as possible, make sure students are aware of proper dress code and protocol. What might be proper dress code in most settings may not be for the facility. The wrong pants may result in being denied access to the facility.

Fourth, schedule instructors in advance and know who can substitute. Select your instructors carefully. Ensure that your instructor group is not only diverse, but that all students are mature enough to teach in a prison. In other words, they can follow the rules and will be respectful of the environment including the inmates and staff.

Benefits of a Partnership

This partnership benefits the student instructors, supervising faculty, long-term inmates, and society. Student instructors get an opportunity to test their competency in the material as they are asked to apply what they have learned throughout their training. In addition, they are exposed to a prison population and gain a better understanding of their own power and privilege through working with this population. For student instructors, it can also provide empowerment in regard to their professional growth as well as valuable teaching experience. Student instructors get the inmates to be engaged and enthusiastic learners (see Table 3).

Supervising faculty may find it incredibly rewarding to create an experience that has such a positive impact on students and inmates. In addition, they can use this experience to integrate their teaching, service, and scholarship. Finally, as funding begins to return to prison teaching (Papa, 2014), experience in this setting may open up funding opportunities. The U.S. Department of Education outlines these opportunities in Partnerships Between Community Colleges and Prisons Providing Workforce Education and Training to Reduce Recidivism (2009).

For inmates, perceived benefits include an increase in self-awareness, an alleviation of boredom, and contact with the outside world. In addition, they gain knowledge and a sense of accomplishment. Student instructors will see their inmate students as people, and this can assist in dispelling some of the stereotypes associated with prison and inmates. In turn, they can use this knowledge and educate others around them. For society, there can be a reduction in the stigma associated with inmates. In this way, there can be a decrease in the obstacles inmates may deal with in regard to reentering society, which can impact recidivism. Overall, this type of program can positively impact students, inmates, and society through the growth that both inmates and students have throughout the experience.
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