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Foreword

Shaping educational institutions to serve those most marginalized in our society is a critical element of racial and social justice. That is why this report’s focus on overcoming inequities in postsecondary education in prison is such a shining example of the Vera Institute of Justice’s (Vera’s) Race, Equity, and Inclusion (REI) efforts.

At Vera, we hold dearly our antiracist and equity principles. For more than three years, Vera’s REI department—preceded by a staff-led REI initiative—has been dedicated to supporting Vera staff in applying an intersectional, antiracist, anti-oppressive focus and approach to the work we do internally and externally. We name our focus and approach as addressing race first because of its outsized effects on workplaces and the criminal legal and immigration systems that we aim to transform. However, we do not limit our REI focus to race; we are also deeply dedicated to gender equity, queer liberation, disability justice, equity for people who have been system-impacted, and other forms of equity and justice.

This focus and dedication, and the action that results from them, are especially important at this critical juncture in the country’s history. During the past decade, we’ve seen a surge of racial justice organizing, activating, advocating, and protesting, particularly in reaction to the police killings of Black people in the United States. In response to every major, Black-led movement for racial justice in the United States, white-led backlash has always been fierce. The current spate of lawmaking and book-banning aimed at whitewashing this country’s racist history and present shows us again the force of this fierceness. As critical race theory, wokeness, and even diversity, equity, and inclusion have been vilified and attacked, the U.S. Supreme Court has jumped in to join these efforts by eliminating affirmative action in higher education and abortion rights, decisions whose far-reaching negative effects fall uniquely on Black, Indigenous, and other people of color.
Now, as much as ever, we need to counteract the racial and social miseducation that poisons so much of our mainstream media and public discourse, misguides our institutions, and gravely damages us all. And arguably, the most equitable place to start undoing miseducation of all sorts is behind carceral walls, where our society tragically sends so many people to be dehumanized and forgotten. In 1964, Malcolm X said, “Education is our passport to the future, for tomorrow belongs to those who prepare for it today.” We are so proud that our colleagues on Vera’s Unlocking Potential Initiative have worked diligently to ensure that more people in prison have their passport to an enriched, dignified future. This report is testament to those years of work, and we hope it inspires you to invest in bright futures for people who are in prison or otherwise impacted by the criminal legal system.

Victor O. Obaseki
Managing Director, Race, Equity, and Inclusion
Vera Institute of Justice

Jian Gallo-Kohn
Senior Associate, Race, Equity, and Inclusion
Vera Institute of Justice
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Executive Summary

The July 2023 return of Pell Grant eligibility for all people in prisons brings not only a monumental shift in opportunity but also a responsibility to ensure that everyone—regardless of race or ethnicity—gets access to that opportunity and the support to make use of it.\(^1\) The complexity of addressing racial disparities is compounded when working at the intersection of two racially inequitable systems: postsecondary education and corrections.

Advancing racial equity requires work from actors at all levels of both systems, particularly from those who are responsible for administering these programs, such as prison education program (PEP) directors from postsecondary institutions and education and program directors from corrections agencies. This work starts with a shared understanding of equity and the root causes of racial disparities. (See “Introduction” on page 10 and “Overlapping Inequities” on page 14.)

To bridge the gap between promising practices for advancing equity in postsecondary education and current corrections education practices, the Vera Institute of Justice (Vera) launched a multiyear, cross-state, collaborative project to explore racial inequities in both systems and strategies to address their overlap in postsecondary prison education.\(^2\) This process resulted in three significant recommendations:

- **Examine and implement policies and practices with a racial equity lens and set equity goals for PEPs.**
  To advance equitable access and outcomes, PEPs and corrections agencies must apply a racial equity lens to all aspects of their program design, implementation, and monitoring. Postsecondary education and corrections policies and practices can have unintended negative impacts on people of color. Even when neither institution intends to discriminate, these policies and practices can shape who has access to programs in ways that
promote or discourage access according to race. PEPs and corrections agencies should design their programs with equitable access, completion, and outcomes as a goal. This includes considering racial equity in policies governing eligibility, recruitment, enrollment, pedagogy, student services and supports, and reentry planning. PEPs and corrections partners should examine and reform existing and create future policies and practices to advance equity goals. (See “Learning communities assess equity and implement strategies to advance equity” on page 19.)

- **Collect, share, analyze, and use student data.** Data allows programs to analyze disparities and ensure they can measure and sustain outcomes. PEPs, corrections, and other partners should build data collection, analysis, and use into their program design and implementation from the earliest planning stages. However, it is important to do so with equity goals in mind, which requires developing a common understanding of what goal is to be achieved (equitable programs) and what data will be required to measure and sustain this outcome. (See “Data Working Groups ground strategies in data” on page 37.)

- **Center student voice.** Student feedback strengthens programs. Ensuring that students and prospective students are a part of the process of forming strategic plans, designing programs, and revising policies helps program leaders to develop responsive programs that meet the needs and interests of incarcerated students. (See “Student Voice Councils center student voice in PEPs” on page 45.)
Key concepts used in this report

Below is a set of key concepts used throughout this document, which were also used for context-setting with project participants. These concepts serve as important reference points to navigate the report, and this glossary provides insight into how Vera interpreted them during the project. These concepts are dynamic: definitions and understanding of key terms and concepts may evolve and perspectives on them may vary.

**Equity** is when opportunities, benefits, and resources exist so that each person can thrive in their own identities, circumstances, and history, such that disparities are eliminated. Ultimately, equity requires that one’s identities, circumstances, or history does not statistically or experientially predict one’s outcomes in an institution, system, or structure.

**Diversity** is a quantitative measure of variety or differences among individuals or groups. It includes all ways in which people differ, encompassing all the characteristics that make one individual or group different from another individual or group. A broad definition includes not only race, ethnicity, and gender but also age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, education, marital status, language, and physical appearance. It also involves differences of ideas, perspectives, lived experiences, and values.

**Racial equity** is a process of eliminating racial disparities and improving outcomes for everyone. It is the intentional and continual practice of changing policies, practices, processes, systems, and structures by prioritizing measurable change in the lives of people of color. Racial equity is when racial identity no longer predicts, in a statistical sense, how one fares. “How one fares” can be defined not only in outcomes related to well-being such as in health, employment, postsecondary education, and contacts with the criminal legal system but also in intangible and internal feelings of self-
esteem, self-worth, and belonging. In a state of racial inequity, race and ethnicity statistically predict access to resources and services that enable people to thrive in their own identities, circumstances, and histories.\(^6\)

**Racism** is racial prejudice plus social and institutional power.\(^7\) It also refers to a system of advantage, disadvantage, privilege, and oppression sustained by race—a socially constructed hierarchy originally devised to justify racism and categorize humans based largely on observable physical features such as skin color and hair texture.

**White supremacy** is an ideology positing that white people and their ideas, thoughts, beliefs, and actions are superior to people of color and their ideas, thoughts, beliefs, and actions. It describes historical and contemporary institutions with practices that ensure that people who are considered white are afforded economic, political, social, and cultural benefits at the expense of people who are not considered white.\(^8\)

Both at a collective and an individual level, white supremacy is ever-present in society’s institutional and cultural assumptions that assign value, morality, goodness, humanity, and deservingness to the white group while casting people and communities of color as worthless (worth less), immoral, bad, inhuman, and undeserving.

**Inclusion** means authentically bringing marginalized people or groups into processes, activities, decisions, and policymaking in a way that shares and builds power. It is a qualitative measure of the quality of representation, such as full access, significant participation, belonging, and power sharing.

A **lens** is a conceptual set of questions, concerns, and issues people proactively center and repeatedly consider when they plan, develop, evaluate, or implement a policy, program, or decision. A lens is applied at all times, not temporarily or as part of a separate side task or project.
A racial equity lens is a continuous reflective practice and conceptual set of questions, concerns, and issues that proactively considers the lived experiences and perspectives of people of color when planning, developing, evaluating, or implementing a policy, program, or decision. Using a racial equity lens centers race at the forefront of the decision-making process and helps ensure the outcome does not produce unintended racially disparate consequences.

Prison Education Programs (PEPs) encompass various educational opportunities within correctional facilities beyond high school, including vocational, career, and technical education, and academic pathways leading to accredited credentials such as certificates, associate’s degrees, or bachelor’s degrees. Although PEP technically refers to programs approved by the U.S. Department of Education to offer Pell Grants to incarcerated people, this report’s findings extend to all postsecondary education initiatives in prison. It’s worth noting that the postsecondary institutions featured in this report were participants in the Second Chance Pell Experimental Sites Initiative. (See “Introduction” on page 10.) For simplicity, Vera uses “PEP” to refer to all prison-based postsecondary education programs in this report.
Introduction

Prison education programs (PEPs) hold promise for mitigating harms to marginalized communities and communities of color, who are overrepresented in the criminal legal system. The many promising benefits of PEPs include reduced recidivism, taxpayer savings, safer prisons and communities, and generational effects that disrupt cycles of poverty and create cycles of pursuit of postsecondary education. For students and communities to realize the full potential of postsecondary education, PEPs and their departments of correction (DOC) partners must design programs with a racial equity lens that intentionally support students across all racial identities and ensure that these students have reliable access to postsecondary education, representation in the student body, and resources to complete programs and be connected to career opportunities.

Advancing equitable outcomes in postsecondary education (such as eliminating completion gaps and post-graduate pay disparities) is a challenge in every context. Despite improvements in overall completion rates in recent years, disproportionately low completion rates for Black, Indigenous, and Latinx students persist. These institutional performance gaps exist in the prison context as well. Although it is true that PEPs enroll higher proportions of students of color when compared to the postsecondary education institutions that operate them, this is simply a reflection of the overrepresentation of people of color in prison. Among Second Chance Pell institutions, white students are overrepresented by seven percentage points compared to the overall prison.

A note on language

Language usage around race, ethnicity, gender, and other dimensions of diversity is ever evolving. As per Vera’s style guide, this report uses Latinx as a gender-inclusive term for people of Latin American descent, culture, or origin. However, the authors acknowledge that many people of Latin American descent may prefer other terms, such as Latine. We respect this term’s intentions to be gender inclusive and accessible to Spanish readers and speakers.
population. Conversely, Black and particularly Latinx students are underrepresented when compared to the overall prison population, by 8 and 15 percentage points, respectively.¹⁴

Institutions—both postsecondary and corrections—operate independently through their policies and practices to produce racially disparate outcomes. When postsecondary institutions operate inside prisons, the intersection of corrections and postsecondary institution policy and practice may compound inequities that exist in both. “Race neutral” policies—policies written with the assumption that all groups will share equal benefits—are based on a myth of equal access and do not effect change for people of color.¹⁵ Research shows that “race conscious” policies—for example, policies created to improve the experiences of people of color—have the most impact on these communities and help dismantle structural barriers to equity.¹⁶

To gain a deeper understanding of equity issues across states, pilot interventions, and provide recommendations for strategies to advance racial equity in PEPs, Vera launched the Race, Equity, and Inclusion in Postsecondary Education in Prison Project (REI Project) in collaboration with PEPs and DOCs in four states, ultimately working with three: Michigan, Oklahoma, and Washington. This report draws on lessons learned during the project. The sections that follow provide context on education and corrections systems in the United States and their relationship to race equity, share promising practices explored or implemented by Vera’s PEP and DOC partners, and offer recommendations to implement these strategies in new and existing PEPs.

**The history of Pell Grants in prison education**

In December 2020, Congress lifted the 26-year ban on Pell Grants for incarcerated students through the FAFSA Simplification Act, restoring access to need-based federal financial aid and making it possible for hundreds of thousands of people in state and federal prisons to pursue postsecondary education.¹⁷
From the time the United States first provided need-based federal financial aid in the 1970s in the form of Pell Grants and their predecessor, the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, people in prison were eligible to receive it. By 1982, more than 350 postsecondary education programs had been established in state and federal prisons, offering incarcerated students an opportunity to pay tuition and fees with Pell Grants. After more than 30 years of access and with more than 700 programs in operation, the 1994 crime bill revoked this eligibility. The impact of this change was swift and severe. By the end of the first academic year following the passage of the crime bill, half of postsecondary programs in prison had closed. By the end of the decade, only eight would remain. In the decades that followed, the U.S. prison population grew dramatically, fueled by policies that incentivized incarceration, resulting in the exponential increase in incarceration of young people of color.

In the years that followed the ban, postsecondary institutions, advocates, and corrections education leaders who saw the value in these programs found innovative ways to continue or restart them. Philanthropic endeavors helped to create and support discrete programs. State-level initiatives coordinated the delivery of limited postsecondary education, primarily career and technical education, within many state prison facilities. People coming home from prison with certificates and degrees embarked on successful careers, underscoring the power of these programs. And research showing reduced recidivism among participants garnered corrections leaders’ support for these initiatives.

As the momentum of these postsecondary education in prison programs grew, federal policymakers took note. The U.S. Department of Education (ED) launched the Second Chance Pell Experimental Sites Initiative (SCP) in 2015, piloting the restoration of Pell Grant eligibility to incarcerated people who enrolled in one of 67 selected postsecondary institutions. Over the next six years, under the direction of
three administrations, this initiative was expanded twice to ultimately reach 200 postsecondary institutions in 48 states; the Federal Bureau of Prisons; Washington, DC; and Puerto Rico. During this same period, formerly incarcerated leaders, Vera, corrections officials, and many others launched a successful campaign to overturn the federal ban. In December 2020, the FAFSA Simplification Act was signed into law, and on July 1, 2023, the act made it possible once again for people in state and federal prisons to pay tuition for postsecondary education with Pell Grants.
Overlapping Inequities Exist in the Postsecondary Education and Criminal Legal Systems

Racism and white supremacy often manifest and are recognized by people through interpersonal interactions or observable individual behavior. Focusing only on the interpersonal can cause one to overlook the impacts of racism at an institutional level (the systems that govern society) and cultural level (ideas normalized because of these institutions). Institutional policies and practices can fail to account for—and are often the source of—racial disparities, typically benefiting white people more than people of color.

White people and people of color experience the postsecondary education and criminal legal systems in the United States differently and disparately. The groups that fare worse across these two systems are often the same: people who are Black, Latinx, Indigenous, women, LGBTQ+, or low-income. To address issues with equity in access, completions, and outcomes of PEPs, postsecondary institutions and corrections partners must pursue targeted strategies crafted to reduce disparities, especially racial disparities.

Racial Disparities in Education Can Impact PEPs

The United States has a longstanding history of unequal access to education for people of color, particularly Black people. The legacy of this history, coupled with the creation of a system of education that rewards advantages and experiences typically concentrated among white students and students from higher-income families, continues to promote unequal access to education. Even before students arrive on a college campus, white students and students
of color have had different and unequal experiences that may help or hinder admission. Advantages that support being accepted into and having success in postsecondary education include having friends and family who understand how to apply, the means to pay, adequately resourced primary and secondary school systems, access to honors and college preparatory courses, higher-skilled and more experienced teachers, and standardized testing preparation and tutors.

Students of color who do make it past admissions and enrollment are less likely to graduate than their white peers due to numerous challenges, including fewer resources, like tutoring, that address their needs and practices that disadvantage them, such as placement testing and developmental education. They also face barriers related to affordability (postsecondary education keeps getting more expensive while the racial wealth gap continues to grow), hostility in the student experience based on identity, invisibility in curricula and pedagogy, social segregation on campuses, and the marketing of more lucrative education and career pathways for some identity groups over others. Even those who graduate despite all these obstacles have poorer outcomes compared to their white peers. Black secondary and postsecondary graduates earn less than their white fellow graduates, and Black graduates holding associate’s degrees earn less than white people who hold only a high school diploma. Black and Latinx students have a higher likelihood of being underemployed post-graduation.

Racial disparities also exist within PEPs. The majority of people enter prison without a high school degree or equivalent. Within this group, unequal access to high-quality secondary education in communities means that Indigenous, Black, and Latinx people are less likely to have that credential when entering prison. These students would be academically ineligible to enroll in a PEP from day one, leading to racial disparities in PEP enrollment. (For further exploration of the impact of education policies on racial equity, see “Learning communities assess equity and implement strategies to advance equity” on page 19.)
RACIAL DISPARITIES IN THE CRIMINAL LEGAL SYSTEM CAN IMPACT PEPS

People’s experiences vary greatly by identity—particularly their racial identity—in the criminal legal system as well. Black people and other people of color are more likely to be surveilled, stopped, questioned, and arrested by police regardless of their behavior, primarily due to institutional policies that encourage discrimination and racial bias in these interactions. Judges are more likely to set bail, including higher bail amounts, for people of color, particularly Black defendants, which often results in unnecessary pretrial incarceration for those unable to pay. Racial bias may also influence discretionary pretrial processes such as prosecutors’ decision to proceed with a case and may contribute to more severe sentence offerings during plea bargaining or after trial. On average, people of color experience worse outcomes at nearly every stage of the criminal legal system, including arrest rates, types of charges, conviction rates, bail imposed, and sentence length and type. The cumulative result is the substantial overrepresentation of people of color, particularly Black, Latinx, and Indigenous people, in U.S. prisons.

These external disparities can translate to unequal access to education and programs designed to prepare incarcerated people for life after release. Security classification—a prison facility’s level of security—correlates to factors such as sentence length and conviction type, and people serving long sentences tend to be held in higher-security prisons. As a result, higher-security facilities typically hold higher percentages of people of color. In these facilities, there are few to no people preparing for release and, therefore, few programs—including postsecondary programs—designed to help people prepare for reentry.

Eligibility criteria contribute to disparities as well. DOC policy often uses earliest release date—informing factors like sentence
length—to prioritize people closest to release for postsecondary education. Those with longer and life sentences—disproportionately Black, Indigenous, and Latinx—may never become eligible with these types of barriers in place. Even when able to enroll, students closer to release may be considered first over students with longer sentences for key classes required for graduation, leading to longer time to program completion for students with longer sentences.

DOCs’ use of disciplinary records as an eligibility criterion for postsecondary education programs may result in fewer people of color being eligible to apply. For example, in many states, people qualify for postsecondary education while incarcerated only if they can meet certain requirements, including a clean disciplinary record for as many as three years. Black, Latinx, and Indigenous people disproportionately receive disciplinary write-ups for rule violations, including nonviolent behavior such as having an untucked shirt, having too many possessions in living areas, stepping into an out-of-bounds area, or being late to a job assignment. A series of these low-level violations can lead to very serious consequences, including placement in solitary confinement—in which most DOCs restrict technology access or congregate activities like postsecondary education classes. DOCs may administratively withdraw students from postsecondary education due to write-ups issued while attending or sanctions that lead to confinement in restricted housing.
For more than a decade, Vera has supported the equitable expansion of high-quality postsecondary education in prisons across the United States. Since 2015, Vera has provided technical assistance to 200 postsecondary institutions participating in the Second Chance Pell Experimental Sites Initiative (SCP), additional colleges working to develop PEPs, and 52 corrections agencies to support SCP and Pell reinstatement.

Vera launched the Race, Equity, and Inclusion in Postsecondary Education in Prison Project (REI Project) in 2020. In consultation with postsecondary education equity experts, Vera engaged SCP institutions, their DOC partners, and postsecondary education system offices over two years to collect and analyze data, assess policies and practices, and pilot strategies to mitigate inequities. The project sought to achieve the following:

1. assess racial equity in postsecondary education in prisons through an analysis of policies and practices in each state;

2. pilot interventions expected to advance equity in postsecondary education programs in prison and evaluate the process for implementing the interventions; and

3. provide recommendations to corrections administrators and their partner postsecondary institutions on how to advance racial equity in their postsecondary education programs.

Through the REI Project, Vera aimed to connect the knowledge and strategies used to advance equity in postsecondary education with corrections education practices. To achieve this, Vera engaged organizations and experts knowledgeable in effective equity strategies within postsecondary education on campus (specifically,
the Education Strategy Group and HCM Strategists) to adapt and apply them to postsecondary education in prison. Vera invited four states to participate and ultimately moved forward with three: Michigan, Oklahoma, and Washington.55 In August 2022, the Louisiana Department of Public Safety & Corrections discontinued its participation in the REI Project due to existing internal DEI efforts.56 Within each remaining state, Vera selected two to four SCP institution partners, for a total of nine, to participate alongside their state DOC.57

Over the course of the project, Vera and its partners piloted three interventions: (1) establishing a learning community within and across the states to discuss challenges, promising practices, and implementation and sustainability strategies; (2) creating Data Working Groups within each state that focused on developing a data collection, analysis, and use infrastructure that used a racial equity lens; and (3) establishing Student Voice Councils, in which student experiences and perspectives were embedded in the project and in the future development of the postsecondary programs, including future efforts to advance equity and inclusion.

LEARNING COMMUNITIES ASSESS EQUITY AND IMPLEMENT STRATEGIES TO ADVANCE EQUITY

Vera developed two self-assessment tools with its consultant partners to inventory essential policies and practices that advance equity in postsecondary education in prison. One tool helped Vera examine DOC policy and practice and the other was used to assess postsecondary institutions. Using two tools emphasized the entities’ distinct roles in advancing equitable practices in their PEPs.58 The tools consisted of five domains: data collection, analysis, and use; program values and culture; recruitment and admissions; student supports; and education and career pathways.59 DOC and PEP leads completed the assessments with others in their institutions who contribute to PEP implementation.60

Once completed, Vera and consultants reviewed the tools and made recommendations on opportunities to eliminate inequitable policies and establish policies that advance equity. Vera and consultants then worked with PEPs and DOCs to first develop
individual institutional priorities and then come to a consensus on a set of state REI priorities for the PEPs represented in the project. These action steps were documented in work plans for each state that synthesized the DOC and postsecondary institutional priorities. Vera then established learning communities at two levels. The first included stakeholders within each state who met regularly to work collaboratively toward achieving agreed-upon goals. The second included stakeholders from all three states who met nine times across the life of the project. At these virtual learning meetings, Vera and other subject matter experts provided an opportunity for a deeper dialogue about common practice areas of interest identified using the assessment tools.

The sections that follow highlight lessons from the assessments and the effective practices shared among the learning communities.

**APPLY MISSION AND EQUITY GOALS TO PEPS**

Although the details of their agencies’ overall mission statements varied, all three DOCs had among their objectives a stated goal to “empower individuals” or “promote success.” Likewise, the postsecondary institutions involved in this project had varying missions, but in most cases described promoting student success through education. This underlying mission alignment within and between institutions of postsecondary education and DOCs provided an opportunity for each type of institution to meet and support each other’s missions and goals while advancing their own.

Most of the postsecondary institutions had diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives underway on their main campuses. However, none had an explicit goal to advance equity for incarcerated students in their program. One DOC noted a DEI initiative; however, it was focused on staff rather than the incarcerated population. When racial equity is not explicitly

---

**Through this project, we learned we must be more intentional about our programs. That offering postsecondary opportunities alone is not enough, that we need to be intentional about ensuring equitable access, enrollments, persistence, and outcomes—and to hold ourselves accountable to that through policies and public reports.**

 Kyle Kaminski, 
OS Administrator,  
Michigan Department of Corrections
brought into operations and decision-making, institutions and systems are more likely to unintentionally perpetuate racial inequities. As part of the workplan, PEP and DOC partners in each state developed a vision statement for an equitable system of postsecondary education in prison.

**Promising practices.** Tulsa Community College in Oklahoma noted its involvement in the University of Southern California Center for Urban Education’s Equity Scorecard initiative. This ongoing effort offered an opportunity to include the unique considerations of PEP students into these cross-departmental conversations as well as to integrate campuswide goals and initiatives into PEPs. Similarly, the Oklahoma DOC saw an opportunity to integrate efforts from this project into its existing initiatives by broadening the scope of its DEI committee to include the incarcerated population and the programs they can access. Expanding on existing efforts can be an inroad for DOCs and PEPs elsewhere to consider. In Washington State, Tacoma Community College spent two years developing a mission and goals that align with institutional DEI goals. It plans to develop an addendum to this mission and goals that focuses directly on the incarcerated student population.

**Recommendations:**

- Develop or update program, institutional, and agency missions to articulate a goal for equity—specifically regarding marginalized groups—such as to define equity and explicitly name advancing equity as a measure of success.
- Integrate PEP equity advancement efforts into existing REI/DEI institutional or agency initiatives.

**HIRING, TRAINING, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD SUPPORT EQUITY**

Postsecondary faculty and staff too often lack people of color, while student bodies grow increasingly representative of communities of color. The racial disparities between faculty and students on non-PEP campuses are even more stark in PEPs due to the higher proportion of Black, Indigenous, and Latinx students in prison.
programs compared to the non-PEP campuses. At the same time, most prisons are located in majority white, rural areas across the country, often the same communities where corrections staff reside. Training and professional development that helps faculty, PEP administrators, and corrections education staff understand and act to counter implicit bias, racism, and white supremacy, and—for faculty—implement inclusive pedagogy, can help mitigate this challenge and advance student success goals.

Hiring practices, training, and professional development are instrumental for agencies and institutions to establish a culture that supports equitable student success. All postsecondary institutions and DOCs in this project required faculty and staff implementing PEPs to undergo training. Most of these trainings were designed to ensure the programs and their staff adhered to prison institutional practices and PEP administrative requirements. In only a few cases did PEPs indicate they had developed training programs for their faculty that have components specific to working with incarcerated people from diverse backgrounds. All participants indicated a desire to learn more about how to integrate racial equity concepts into existing training and professional development components to better serve incarcerated students.

Promising practices. In Michigan, Calvin University used concepts learned from the project to bolster its faculty training curriculum, and the DOC committed to prioritize hiring candidates who are system-impacted, demographically reflect the population, and/or align with DOC values. Tacoma Community College in Washington uses members of its Student Voice Councils to sit in on faculty interviews. (See “Student Voice Councils center student voice in PEPs” on page 45.) Students shared during the project that they thought it was important to select faculty who would be a good fit for teaching in a prison environment and suggested that they were best positioned to weigh in on a candidate’s fitness for the job.
Recommendations:

• Develop or update hiring processes to ensure the hiring of underrepresented faculty and staff—particularly those who reflect the identities of incarcerated students—whose views align with the program, institution, or agency’s mission and equity goals.

• Create training and professional development programs that utilize an inclusive pedagogy with strategies to counter implicit bias, racism, and white supremacy and that also do not rely exclusively on training designed to meet the minimum standards of complying with laws, regulations, or agency policy.

• Ensure students, staff, and faculty are included in creating curriculum, policy, and training/professional development.

LEARN FROM RELATED RESEARCH AND EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

At present, there are few resources available to PEP and DOC leaders implementing PEPs that connect evidence-based practices in corrections, “high-impact” practices in postsecondary education, and promising strategies to advance equity in postsecondary education access, completion, and outcomes. To bridge the gaps between the research and implementation of PEPs, Vera, consultants, and the state teams approached these issues from an exploratory standpoint. Vera connected state teams with resources to enhance their practices in a wide range of additional areas. This assistance came in the form of facilitated discussion, research support, planning, and implementation strategies. Highlighted below are equity-advancing practices that learning communities discussed.

RECRUITMENT

There are aspects of recruitment, such as how PEPs and DOCs recruit and who recruits new students, which can lead to inequitable access and enrollments in racially segregated environments like prisons. Recruiting a representatively diverse student body from
among the social networks in a prison is challenging. In prisons, information tends to travel by word of mouth. Social networks in prison often fall along racial and ethnic lines. Information may travel well within a social group defined by race but not as well or not at all across groups. At the same time, white people and people from higher-income backgrounds are more likely to have family members and friends who have had positive experiences in education and may be more likely to enroll. If prospective students are not seeing people from their racial group attending classes, they may assume it is not an inclusive or welcoming environment for them. These factors can lead to the appearance of interest concentrated within one or a few racial groups and little enrollment interest from others. Program recruitment strategies not attuned to these differences in experience and social networks among students may not connect with students from all backgrounds.

Promising practices. In Michigan, Jackson College and the DOC worked together to devise a way to get recruitment messages out to a broader audience via facility information kiosks and tablets. Although the PEP's audience was limited to current students, the DOC's audience included all people at the prison. In Oklahoma, the DOC worked closely with its systemwide tablet provider to learn how to use the tablets more effectively as an education tool, including for recruitment. During the project, one of the PEPs piloted the distribution of a flyer for its program via the tablets, which was celebrated by Student Voice Council members. (See “Student Voice Councils center student voice in PEPs” on page 45.) In Washington, Student Voice Council members play the role of credible messengers, speaking at orientation classes for people coming into the prison system and high school diploma/high school equivalency (HSD/HSE) classes and participating in recruitment events. These students noted how their peers were inspired to enroll in PEPs when seeing SVC members talk about their own successes and transformative experiences.

Recommendations:

- Use a variety of recruiting tools including technology, posters, flyers, information sessions, meetings with facility staff, and word of mouth to reach students.
• Consider using current and graduated students, including members of Student Voice Councils, as credible messengers.

• Disseminate program marketing that clearly communicates the eligibility guidelines, the enrollment process, and how to connect with advisors or navigators so students can make informed decisions. (See “Student support services” on page 27.)

Paying for School

Although Pell Grant restoration reestablishes a crucial source of federal financial aid, people in prison face a variety of other financial hurdles to accessing PEPs. Living in prison comes with costs borne by incarcerated people and their families. Incarcerated people often need to purchase supplemental food and clothing and pay for phone calls home, fees for room and board in prison, medical co-pays, or restitution or other court-imposed fines. They may also wish to send money home to loved ones while incarcerated. Although wages are meager, forgoing them can be impossible, either due to financial need or forced labor. This has two implications for equitable enrollment in PEPs. First, when PEPs are offered only during hours that conflict with their job assignments, some potential students will make the difficult choice to work instead. Second, even with need-based financial aid available, there are costs, such as the living expenses described above, that cannot be paid for with a Pell Grant in prison even though many of these expenses would be considered in financial aid award packages for non-incarcerated students.

Among incarcerated people who earn any wages for their work, the average wage is between $0.13 and $1.30 per hour. With such low wages, even a $7 transcript fee may become a substantial barrier to enrollment. An application fee or any amount of previous student loan debt could be insurmountable. Most incarcerated student loan borrowers are in default, and existing avenues for addressing loan defaults are unaffordable and out of reach. Even when students are eligible for need-based aid, costs can still be a barrier. Federal financial aid policy requires that postsecondary...
institutions return grants awarded to students when they withdraw from courses too early in the term—even when the withdrawal is because of an unexpected transfer to another prison.\textsuperscript{80} Typical postsecondary institution practice is to pass this cost to the student, charging them the tuition that the grant would have otherwise covered. However, such a practice would likely saddle an incarcerated student with overwhelming debt that could not only have an impact on their ever returning to postsecondary education but also could impact their ability to have a successful reentry experience post-release.

In addition to their own reduced means, most people in prison come from low-income communities and families.\textsuperscript{81} Research indicates that Black communities face high rates of incarceration among both friends and family.\textsuperscript{82} People who have been diagnosed with mental illness, have experienced adverse childhood experiences, and men tend to have less supportive social networks, and men, in particular, have less emotional and instrumental support both during incarceration and after release.\textsuperscript{83} This suggests that when there are costs to enrolling in a PEP, most incarcerated people will face challenges in drawing on their nonincarcerated support networks for help in paying these costs. The intergenerational and community impact of incarceration can also make it difficult to gather crucial documents to complete the FAFSA, making it impossible to apply for a Pell Grant.\textsuperscript{84}

**Promising practices.** In Michigan, DOC administrators are looking at how they can ensure that incarcerated people do not have to choose between education and work by offering stipends and are considering how they might incentivize higher levels of educational achievement with a sliding-scale stipend system. To overcome the documentation burden on students or to fill other funding gaps, several participating PEPs in all three states used funding streams other than Pell Grants, including state- and private-funded programs in Washington and Michigan and tribal grants and institutional scholarships at PEPs in Oklahoma.
Recommendations:

- DOCs can eliminate the conflict between work and school and incentivize education for people who are currently incarcerated by offering an education stipend to those participating in education programs.\(^8^5\)

- DOCs and PEPs can revisit facility schedules and reduce conflict between work and school hours by offering courses at night or at other times that do not overlap with prison jobs or by offering jobs at different hours to people enrolled in the PEP.

- PEPs should examine the funding available to support students in other locations of their institution and then determine how to make these opportunities accessible to incarcerated students.

- PEPs should plan in-prison office hours or financial aid workshops to address challenges in paying for school. Specifically, PEPs can expect and should prepare to assist students with financial aid barriers such as forgotten Social Security numbers, pre-incarceration student loans in default, or inability to find or receive tax records, even for non-filers.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

PEP faculty and staff orient new students to postsecondary education and help them select courses, programs, and majors. How PEPs approach student services can shape enrolled students’ completion rates and academic success. Students complete credentials more consistently and quickly when they enroll full-time and when they are interested in the topics they are studying.\(^8^6\) To ensure students’ engagement—and thus, their chance of academic success—PEPs can mix required distribution courses with higher-level courses in subjects in which the student is most interested. They could also utilize hands-on learning experiences such as internships or career exploration opportunities in which students meet with people in their fields of interest and discuss the work they do. These promising practices bring students’ credential goals in reach sooner, increasing their motivation to continue and complete postsecondary education.\(^8^7\)
Identifying student needs is vital to adequately support students. Older models that rely on tests meant to assess a student’s academic preparedness produce unreliable results and tend to underestimate the academic skills of people of color. In newer models, assessments still play a role, but not as high-stakes placement tests. The multiple measures assessment approach considers high school transcripts, a variety of assessments, and evaluations of student motivation. Effective and equitable practices in postsecondary education such as pre-college or summer bridge programs, corequisite rather than prerequisite courses, embedded tutoring, cohort models in which a group moves through a course or series of courses together, and intensive and frequent advising all can produce more positive outcomes for students and can be applied to PEPs. These strategies are more accurate than assessment testing in identifying students’ needs and academic preparedness and produce more equitable placements for students.

Academic and career advising support students across their academic paths and are integral to fulfilling the teaching and learning mission of postsecondary education. Postsecondary institutions seeking to become PEPs under the regulations governing Pell reinstatement must provide these services. Academic advising helps students to engage with the learning process, be members of the learning community, think critically about their role as students, and implement their learning as citizens of the world. Advising can also help PEP staff identify student needs and connect them with vital resources. Although career advising can often be a separate function in an academic institution, it is similarly meant to help students think more deeply about their academic options and connect their learning with their career interests and pathway.

Promising practices. Students participating in this project almost universally noted the desire for more tutoring from faculty, PEP staff, or peers. In the absence of available faculty or staff, many students indicated that informal peer networks developed in which students supported one another with more challenging assignments or
subjects. However, finding the time and space to do so was often a significant barrier. Administrators should formalize tutoring structures and compensate peer tutors to help ensure quality and sustainability and recognize student leaders for their work to support student success. Student Voice Council participants and education administrators in Michigan worked together during this project to identify spaces and times to ensure these activities can take place. Mott Community College recently piloted paid tutoring roles in the facility with support from the DOC.

PEPs might also consider credentialing tutors. In Washington, one college partner piloted credentialing peer tutors through the College Reading and Learning Association. This is one way to recognize the skills of peer tutors while simultaneously setting and raising the standards for tutoring staff in general. Similarly, students also noted how finding quiet spaces to study on their own was often a challenge. To support studying and tutoring, some states have created housing units where students live together, something that Michigan has piloted with some success.

For PEPs participating in this project, student support came in various forms ranging from staff tasked with multiple roles that included advising to designated academic advising faculty. Students participating in the project often noted the value of these staff while simultaneously recognizing their high workloads. For example, in Washington, facility and campus education navigators funded through a partnership between the DOC and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges provide numerous services to students including career and academic advising or connections to these services both prerelease in prison and post-release on campus. In Oklahoma, Tulsa Community College and Connors State College placed staff at each facility who provide similar services. The PEPs there are able to supplement staff capacity with student clerks who help guide their peers through the enrollment and financial aid process and act as liaisons between the PEP and the student body. In Michigan, Calvin University uses student support specialists, funding by federal TRIO programs, and regular access to faculty advising. (See “Leveraging Federal TRIO Programs” on page 31.) Likewise, Jackson College uses success navigators. The Michigan
DOC is working to address challenges with limited staff capacity by hiring additional support staff.

Recommendations:

- Avoid standardized placement tests that cause racially disparate barriers to entry. Instead, use other mechanisms to identify and support students with needs, such as pre-college courses, corequisite support courses, embedded tutoring programs, and high-touch advising.

- Eliminate developmental and prerequisite courses that create barriers to students progressing in their programs in favor of targeted tutoring based on need, intensive advising, and corequisites.

- Use multiple measures to place students into appropriate courses and supports, such as high school or postsecondary education transcripts, highest level of coursework completed in a subject area and corresponding course grade, attitude surveys, vocational or career aptitude interest inventories, specialized certificates or licenses, education and employment histories, military training and experience, interviews, and holistic scoring processes, all of which account for a range of experiences and metrics.

- Create a continuum of student services that span pre-enrollment through reentry, including:
  - Implementing advising models that build momentum for students by pairing required courses with areas of interest, accumulate credits quickly to keep the credential in reach, and help students identify and pursue career interests.
  - Hiring dedicated navigators and advisors and paying student clerks who provide services otherwise offered by PEP staff, for example through the Federal Work-Study Program.96
  - Providing tutors who can address specific learning needs and implementing peer tutoring models (and
ensuring that these positions are formalized and compensated), as well as credentialing all tutors to raise standards and help recognize their skills.

- Ensuring adequate quiet study spaces are available on a consistent, predictable schedule.

### Leveraging Federal TRIO Programs

To supplement support offered by prison education programs, several states leverage federal TRIO programs to provide supplemental services to students who are incarcerated.

TRIO programs are uniquely designed to support students from underserved communities, focusing on students with low incomes, first-generation students, and students with disabilities. These include

- Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC), which specialize in recruiting and enrolling students, including helping them prepare for postsecondary education and navigate financial aid procedures. Although sometimes an EOC is hosted within a particular college, EOCs are mandated to recruit and help enroll students into all postsecondary institutions, which can be particularly beneficial in prison systems where multiple colleges offer a PEP.

- Student Support Services (SSS) programs, which offer tutoring, academic advising, and financial aid guidance to help motivate and support students toward completion. SSS programs are institution-specific, meaning that, unlike an EOC, they are limited to serving only the students within their host postsecondary institution.

### DIGITAL EQUITY

Black, Indigenous, and Latinx people are less likely than their white peers to have had consistent access to high-speed internet at primary and secondary school and at home prior to incarceration. Due to racial disparities in sentence length, incarcerated people of color are more likely to have been in prison for so long that
technological advances have passed them by.\footnote{101} Even those with shorter sentences can be affected by the disconnection of incarceration.\footnote{102} People in prison rarely have access to the kinds of technology available in the community, like smartphones, tablets, and personal computers. When they do have these devices, the tools and materials they can access through them are limited by firewalls and security protocols and are often outdated.\footnote{103} Students in PEPs regularly write assignments by hand, sometimes in multiple copies so they can retain a record.\footnote{104} Employers expect college graduates to have the skills to operate common workplace technology, but incarcerated students face substantial difficulty in gaining these skills.\footnote{105}

Postsecondary institutions in the community require students to engage with various forms of technology from basic word processing, spreadsheets, and email to more complex statistical software, math and engineering modeling applications, coding applications, and industry-relevant tools and programs. Bachelor’s degrees typically require some level of academic research experience to graduate. PEPs have experimented with different methods for offering relevant academic technology in prison. This includes access to academic journal databases such as JSTOR and EBSCOhost, which not only allow students to use these materials but also offer them the opportunity to develop and exercise the skills to find relevant literature within these databases.\footnote{106}

**Promising practices.** Models for technology access are emerging in various states, with a growing momentum to provide broader access.\footnote{107} In Washington, for example, PEPs issue each incarcerated student a laptop that operates on an internal server. Students get access to a learning management system (LMS) operated by PEP instructors, supplemental instruction, support materials, and word processing software. In Oklahoma, students have systemwide access to tablet technology, but it has not yet been deployed to support student learning. During the project, PEPs worked with the tablet provider to learn how to utilize the LMS for supplementing instruction. In Michigan, the DOC has committed to expanding
educational technology, piloting small-scale deployment and consulting with other DOC information technology teams to learn tactics for managing security concerns.

Recommendations:

• Provide access to technology as an educational support tool and to ensure students are equipped to navigate the technology they will face in the community upon reentry.

• Leverage the growing availability of online and offline academic journal databases, such as JSTOR and EBSCOhost, through digital libraries.

• Build towards broader access by test-piloting technology deployments to ensure security and build buy-in with administrators or, when necessary, building systems that can operate on internal servers.

CREDENTIAL PATHWAYS

Education resources in prisons are scarce. DOCs often prioritize limited space for other mandatory programming, such as Adult Basic Education, HSD/HSE programs, or programs required for parole. Therefore, system actors must think strategically about which programs they offer to incarcerated people and make the best use of their limited resources by prioritizing programs that produce a return on investment for students in terms of wages and/or advancement in a desired career, that students are most interested in, and that help students avoid spending limited Pell Grant funding on courses they do not need. Credentials that “stack” onto one another to earn higher-level credentials leading to in-demand living-wage careers are important to prioritize when space and resources are at a premium. In addition to career-technical programs, bachelor’s degrees provide training in perpetually in-demand transferrable skills that lead to viable career pathways. Associate’s degrees for transfer have a place in a credential and career path as well. Although these degrees do not always equate to livable-wage

System actors must think strategically about which programs they offer... prioritizing programs that produce a return on investment for students.
careers on their own, they hold value when they enable students to transfer efficiently and earn a bachelor’s degree, preferably as part of a designed direct transfer or “2+2” model—a model in which the receiving four-year institution guarantees junior-level matriculation to students who achieve specific two-year credentials.\textsuperscript{111}

Program administrators will likely encounter students with a variety of accumulated credits from past education experience. It is important that institutions operating PEPs within the same jurisdiction commit to working with one another to ensure students who end up in programs other than where they started can continue seamlessly so that previous efforts and resources are not wasted. Under the regulations governing Pell reinstatement, PEPs must also provide transferability.\textsuperscript{112} Program administrators should also find ways to help students receive credit for skills learned through other experiences, such as work, professional or military training, language acquisition other than English, or courses taken during incarceration. Prior learning assessments or credit for prior learning may present good opportunities to move students closer to completion by awarding credit for college-level knowledge a student gained outside of the postsecondary classroom and may include standardized exams (such as the College-Level Examination Program, or CLEP) or institutional reviews.\textsuperscript{113}

**Promising practices.** In Michigan, the DOC has implemented a guided pathways approach—an equity-focused framework that creates clear paths for students and removes systemic obstacles to their success—in its Vocational Village program, which partners closely with local industry to ensure the programs offered align with student need.\textsuperscript{114} The DOC also partnered with Siena Heights University, which specializes in degree completion and is developing a bachelor’s degree pathway for students with accumulated credits or associate’s degrees. Mott Community College (MCC) partnered with Ferris State University to offer a “3+1” program in business administration where MCC provides the first three years of instruction that leads to a bachelor’s degree. In Oklahoma, Tulsa Community College and Langston University started strengthening their partnership during this project to create a more robust 2+2 pathway. In Washington,
one-year certificate programs in fields like automotive technology, HVAC, welding, and various business certificates from Walla Walla Community College and Tacoma Community College can pair with additional instruction to lead to two-year Associate of Applied Science degrees. Walla Walla Community College also offers a direct transfer associate’s degree (DTA) in human and social services to help students continue to a bachelor’s degree program while incarcerated or on release. Tacoma Community College also offers a DTA program in partnership with Freedom Education Project Puget Sound at the Washington Corrections Center for Women that transfers directly into a bachelor’s in liberal studies from the University of Puget Sound.

Recommendations:

- Offer streamlined pathways to industry-recognized, in-demand, living-wage-yielding credentials for students.
- When PEPs offer general and transfer associate’s degree pathways, ensure they efficiently transfer to a bachelor’s degree program.
- Create memorandums of understanding among programs within the state to allow transfer of credits among PEP programs and to other programs in the community.
- Create options for students with accumulated credits and prior learning experiences to complete a credential, such as CLEP exams and other prior learning assessments and reviews.

REENTRY SUPPORTS

Students leaving prison—particularly those who are Black, Latinx, or Indigenous—often return to frayed social networks, lack of opportunity, and an enormous array of state and federal laws and community supervision rules that regulate the lives of people with conviction histories.116 These are extraordinarily difficult circumstances and require extra support for students reentering, with specific supports needed by those who are seeking to complete a credential not completed during incarceration. These supports may include connecting students to educational
institutions near their communities and to support staff who are on the outside. Students may need assistance accessing transcripts, transferring to a new institution, and updating financial aid records as well as connections to on-campus support services that can help with navigating the postsecondary educational experience. The ability for students who do not complete a degree prior to release to continue at the same institution after release is also a requirement of PEP regulations.\textsuperscript{116}

For students who leave prison with credentials, PEPs and corrections partners must ensure they can navigate the job market and get hired. Allowing students to connect with potential employers before release can help better prepare them for these conversations post-release, including practicing articulating how their newly acquired skills apply in the real world. Emerging models that intentionally support postsecondary education and the successful reintegration of formerly incarcerated people hold great promise.\textsuperscript{117}

**Promising practices.** In Washington, a partnership between the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Washington DOC provides education navigators both within the prison facilities and on campus for students at each partner PEP, to help create a strong connection between facilities students are leaving and campuses to which they are returning. Employment readiness and employer connections were a notable strength in all three states participating in the project. However, these robust supports tended to focus almost exclusively on career and technical education programs run by the corrections agencies or other state agencies and not the academic programs run by PEPs.

**Recommendations:**

- Develop support systems that span the student experience, including targeted on-campus services for those continuing education post-release.
• Connect students to employment opportunities prior to release and prepare them to have conversations about their educational and work experiences that translate to workforce needs.

DATA WORKING GROUPS GROUND STRATEGIES IN DATA

In PEPs, the sources of disparities are likely to be complex, subtle, and often challenging to identify on an individual level, which makes the use of data critical. To identify sources of disparities and assess the effect of planned interventions, PEPs and DOCs need to collect, analyze, and collaboratively use data. PEPs and DOCs can use this information to inform changes to policy and practice and support the engagement of underrepresented groups in PEPs.

PEPs and DOCs collect and store data about students and people in the prison or prison system, respectively. However, DOCs and PEPs that participated in Vera’s REI Project store data in ways that support the implementation of programming but not necessarily the tracking of outcomes. From the assessment tool (See “Learning communities assess equity and implement strategies to advance equity” on page 19), Vera identified three common challenges to using data faced by participating PEPs and DOCs:

• data exists, but not in a way that is conducive to program assessment or evaluation;

• partners in PEPs and DOCs face capacity constraints; and

• collected data is not used for assessment or evaluation of race, equity, and inclusion goals.

To promote data collection, sharing, and collaborative use to support and inform race, equity, and inclusion interventions, Vera, PEPs, and DOCs piloted Data Working Groups (DWGs) in all three states.
Through the DWGs, Vera found that participating DOCs struggled to use their data systems to identify people eligible for PEPs based on academic qualifications, in-facility behavioral history, and correctional programming requirements because DOCs did not set up data systems with this purpose in mind. As a result, a corrections education professional might determine the pool of eligible people through a manual review of individual files or by recommending only people who express interest in the program. These strategies limit the pool of prospective students to those already interested in education or for whom the DOC staff member believes the program would be a good fit. This type of passive recruitment of prospective students can have racial equity implications by excluding people in prison who do not believe postsecondary education is for them, who do not learn about opportunities through social networks, or who have not managed to make connections with DOC staff.

Similarly, PEP administrators work with data systems designed with other uses in mind. For example, postsecondary institutions in each of the three states do not always store incarcerated students’ records in a way that allows for data analysis of students in prison, separate from those who are not in prison. Without the ability to review student metrics at the prison locations, PEP administrators may miss opportunities to identify and respond to student needs. With PEP classrooms typically filled with higher proportions of students of color than those on campus, this missing functionality could hinder student success in a way that impacts a concentrated group of students of color.

Challenges with data systems reflect an overall lack of capacity within DOCs and PEPs to explore and address questions of equity. PEPs and DOCs face two types of capacity constraints: resource constraints and knowledge constraints. Resource constraints include the limited availability of funding and personnel for data analysis and use. Knowledge constraints include difficulty framing questions about racial equity in PEPs as research questions that staff can answer with available data. The dual impact of these
constraints puts PEPs and DOCs at a significant disadvantage in understanding and responding to inequities in their PEPs.

All PEPs and DOCs that participated in this project collect some information and often report on the race and ethnicity of students and people who are incarcerated generally. However, PEPs often use this data primarily for program administration and compliance reporting rather than to assess racial equity within programs, conduct strategic planning, support policy development, or evaluate progress toward race, equity, and inclusion goals. As discussed, existing data system structures and PEP and correctional education capacity constraints present challenges to the proactive use of data to inform strategic planning and policy development to promote racial equity.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PROMOTE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RACE, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION GOALS USING DATA

Vera piloted six practices with participants in this project to explore the importance of data in measuring equity and quality, identify additional capacity within and across both education and correctional institutions, and embed the routine use of data into strategic planning and accountability for race, equity, and inclusion goals.

DEVELOP AN ONGOING FORUM FOR COLLABORATION WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS THAT IDENTIFIES ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

This project piloted statewide DWGs as a strategy to navigate data collection, sharing, and collaborative use to assess and promote accountability for racial equity goals. These groups functioned as open forums to share knowledge and available resources, identify and problem solve challenges, collaborate on defining racial equity goals, and gain a collective understanding of data-sharing processes with partner institutions. Establishing this forum at the state level supports efficient collaboration with correctional education and other statewide actors, including PEP partners, state higher education offices, and workforce and labor boards.
The DWGs drafted common objectives for themselves that expressed the goal and intended outcomes of the groups’ efforts, as well as an initial timeline to achieve those goals. (See “Example goal and intended outcomes for a state Data Working Group” in Appendix B on page 67.) DWGs can use this as a living document and update it as goals, outcomes, and processes develop and become more complex over time.

DWGs should include a variety of stakeholders. Identifying needed roles and people in the DWG may be an iterative process. Who is needed at the table may shift as the goals and outcomes of the DWG develop, and this may change over the life of the group. Program leads at each institution may need support in identifying which roles from within the institution they need in group meetings and who currently occupies those roles. Some guidance on essential roles to include and how to identify them within each institution is below.

- **Program leads:** Who is responsible and accountable for the overall administration of the PEP at your institution? Who is responsible for daily implementation of processes and procedures?
- **Decision-makers:** Who at your institution is making decisions that affect the PEP? Whose choices should be informed by evidence?
- **Data holders:** Who holds and maintains data about students? If you wanted to know a particular fact about the student body or about student success, who would you ask?

**USE DATA FOR ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY WITH PURPOSE AND INTENTION**

In launching the DWGs, Vera first facilitated consensus among participants on race equity goals that DOCs and PEPs would like to attain. Next, Vera worked with participants to develop questions related to those goals that can be answered with data. Vera and its partners in this project pursued a four-step process to determine what PEPs and DOCs sought to learn about race, equity, and inclusion in postsecondary education in prisons in their program or state.
1. Involve important stakeholders
   • Who has the power to effect change? Who is directly and inequitably impacted and whose voices need to be amplified?

2. Agree on the program’s racial equity goals
   • What do stakeholders want to achieve in the near-, mid- and long-term? What does success look like and for whom?

3. Plan a strategy to achieve the goals
   • What inequities exist? What are the sources of those inequities? How can we address the causes of the inequities?

4. Identify how to measure progress toward goals
   • How would important stakeholders, including students and alumni, define progress? How do stakeholders know if programs have made progress on specified goals?

MAINTAIN A RACIAL EQUITY LENS THROUGHOUT ALL ACTIVITIES

The DWGs practiced centering racial equity considerations in all data collection, sharing, and collaborative use by applying a racial equity lens. Participants consistently applied this lens throughout the activities in this project. This offered a measure of accountability and advanced the sustainability of the work done during this pilot. (See “Key concepts used in this report” on page 7.) Vera supported the DWGs by developing the following questions through which to apply a racial equity lens in data collection, sharing, and collaborative use:

- Whose voices and perspectives are centered, incorporated, or excluded in defining and prioritizing important equity questions, including how race and ethnicity are measured and categorized?
- What data sources are we using? How do those data sources reflect and reinforce existing power relationships? What alternate sources of data could we use or create ourselves?
- What is our comparison group for data analysis? How does shifting the comparison group change our conclusions?
• Which stages of the student life cycle are we assessing for racial equity: recruitment, enrollment, choice of programming, persistence or withdrawal, completions, or post-completion outcomes?

COLLABORATIVELY DEVELOP QUESTIONS AND DATA PLANS TO MEET EQUITY GOALS

The PEPs and DOCs participating in each DWG developed questions and data plans collaboratively, constructing a single plan per state. Collaborative plans are more efficient for statewide actors such as DOCs and state higher education offices because they consolidate data requests that multiple stakeholders would otherwise submit separately. Collaboratively developed equity questions and data plans also build the capacity within each institution to understand processes for sharing data across all participating institutions. Finally, collaborating on equity questions supports the development of a common purpose across institutions and gives those who have well-developed racial equity goals an opportunity to provide leadership within the state. When missions and interests differ, DWGs can add additional and independent questions to a racial equity data plan.

One PEP administrator noted how the project “helped them to realize how important a racial equity lens is to ensure they are not inadvertently harming students of color” and that “not thinking about race” isn’t the answer to stop racial disparities from occurring.
Although the specifics of the question will vary, a question DWGs can answer with data should have several key features.

| Specific, clear, focused, narrow in scope | • Consider who, what, when, where  
• If the question feels too narrow, it is probably not  
• If you want to know more, develop additional questions |
| Relevant | • Relates to your racial equity goals  
• Relates to the process to get to racial equity goals |
| Feasible | • Achievable with available time and resources  
• Ethical |
| Time-limited | • You have a stopping point  
• Accounts for resource limits |
| Useful | • Answer is more than “yes/no”  
• Someone wants this information (including you) |
| Analytical rather than descriptive | • Helps to inform decision-makers  
• Has a comparison group |

**IDENTIFY DATA NEEDED TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS, AND WHETHER THAT DATA ALREADY EXISTS OR NEEDS TO BE COLLECTED**

The DWGs then developed strategies to answer each question in their data plans. Identifying the data needed to answer a particular question is best done in partnership between program leads and data specialists within each institution, potentially with collaboration across institutions as needed. (See “Identifying data needed” in Appendix B on page 70.) To guide the DWGs, Vera drafted the following questions:

- What is the population of interest? Who are we interested in knowing something about?
• What is the right comparison group? Who should we be comparing or contrasting the population of interest to?
• What is the outcome, achievement, or event? What is the topic or place in the student life cycle we want to know about?
• How will you define race, ethnicity, gender, and other categories for equity analyses? What is the time range of interest?

After identifying what data they needed, the DWGs determined whether that data already existed in their own or other data systems. These other data systems might include longitudinal data systems, the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), higher education offices, or other state agencies such as court systems or departments of labor. (See “Race and ethnicity categories in IPEDS” in Appendix B on page 69.) Researchers can use a codebook, also sometimes called a data dictionary, to compare data stored and managed by different agencies. A codebook describes the contents, structure, and layout of data. A well-documented codebook contains information intended to be complete and self-explanatory for each data element or variable in a data set.124 DWGs shared codebooks internally to identify where data existed and what data groups could utilize to answer questions in the data plan. (See “Codebook components” in Appendix B on page 68.)

PLAN FOR LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY

The DWGs needed an initial period of setup before they could move into implementing their data plans. Vera provided this structure and facilitation to the participating groups as part of the pilot project. As the pilot period ended, not all DWGs had moved past initialization and into implementation. Without the extra capacity offered by a pilot project, postsecondary institutions and DOCs will need to plan to provide this infrastructure to ensure continued collaboration, plan for near- and long-term outcomes, and commit to certain activities, resource sharing, and policy or practice changes to ensure sustainability. (See “Sample data working group sustainability plan” in Appendix B on page 71 for an example.)
STUDENT VOICE COUNCILS CENTER STUDENT VOICE IN PEPs

As PEPs expand and access to education in prison continues to increase, programs must consider how to measure student outcomes holistically. Although quantitative data has its merits, it can fall short of capturing the nuanced aspects of students’ experiences. Qualitative feedback can fill this gap. Within PEPs, program administrators can offer students the opportunity to speak on issues related to program access and completion, instructional techniques, technology, financial aid policies, student services and supports, academic mentoring and counseling, and culturally responsive programming and teaching.

There are several benefits to collaborating with students in this way. Students have a unique perspective as participants that PEP and DOC staff lack. As such, their feedback is essential to better understand how effectively programs operate. Seeking student feedback can also help PEPs measure things like engagement and motivation, which are not otherwise easily captured. Additionally, when students feel like their opinions matter, they are more likely to perform better and experience stronger feelings of self-worth and self-esteem. Ultimately, gathering insights from students allows for program refinement and contributes to a more student-centered, effective, and responsive correctional education system.

The DOCs and PEPs participating in the REI Project shared an interest in soliciting student voice—both to help shape the REI Project itself and to pilot the model as a potential long-term structure for gathering and implementing student feedback. Building on a preexisting practice in Washington, Vera, together with PEPs and DOCs in Oklahoma and Michigan, sought to develop Student Voice Councils (SVCs). These entities, incorporated into the PEP’s operations, create avenues for students to provide feedback to PEPs and DOCs to inform possible interventions, thus improving programs. SVCs in the REI Project shared their input and
proposed strategies for advancing equitable enrollment, completion rates, and outcomes among incarcerated students.

HOW THE STUDENT VOICE COUNCILS WORKED

Recruiting students. Vera provided technical assistance to PEPs and DOCs to establish and launch the SVCs. To assist with recruiting students, Vera and consultants developed a “frequently asked questions” document about the SVC, a flyer for PEPs to distribute, and criteria for selecting students for the council. PEPs recruited participants who varied across race, length of enrollment in a PEP, and time to release from incarceration to help ensure the students involved in each SVC represented a diversity of experiences and perspectives.

Initial challenges. Once students had agreed to participate, Vera facilitated the first six meetings of each SVC to establish common practices and provide additional capacity to PEPs and DOCs during the pilot phase. After the first in-person meeting, Vera scheduled virtual meetings with students. Holding meetings in this medium proved challenging. Although each state was ultimately able to use a virtual meeting platform, Vera staff still elected to travel twice more to meet with students in each of the participating 10 facilities in three states to build rapport and trust with and among students and administrators, continue troubleshooting challenges, and provide general guidance.

Initial steps to create the first SVCs

Vera, colleges, and DOCs took the following steps to establish the initial Student Voice Councils.

1) Gained approval from Vera’s Institutional Review Board.

2) Met with colleges to discuss the recruitment process and inclusion criteria. From this, each college generated a list of recommended students for their council. The college conducted initial outreach using the flyer and FAQs document Vera created, and fielded student questions.
3) Each college then shared council member names with Vera and their partnering DOC. The DOC approved these lists and shared them with facility staff to ensure appropriate notifications to and movement permissions (i.e., “callouts”) for students to meet with Vera staff.

4) DOC correctional education leads facilitated security and background checks for Vera staff to clear them for facility entry. Upon DOC approval, Vera and the colleges began scheduling visits to the facilities where SVCs would exist.

5) Vera worked with DOC education staff to set up the initial meetings in a way that would allow for privacy during Vera’s initial interactions with students, during both in-person and virtual meetings. Students later asked that college and corrections administrators be invited to join the meetings, as students identified them as stakeholders key to advancing the changes students sought and support they needed to be effective.

SVC members also experienced varying ability to meet with each other in between meetings with Vera depending on the jurisdiction and the facility. SVC members did have the option to contact Vera staff through a corrections-specific messaging and email system, through which they were able to discuss next steps, report concerns, and request and receive resources. This communication helped keep the groups moving along in their development while Vera worked out the various logistical challenges with DOC partners.

Many of the challenges Vera and the students faced could be and were mediated by supportive partnerships, showing that DOC support at the facility and leadership levels is necessary to create resilient SVCs. The students require meeting spaces, appropriate callouts, places to store important documents (such as bylaws and meeting notes), supplies (such as pens and paper), and more. Much of this activity happens within the facility, but leadership will also likely have to buy into the effort to implement it. Vera found that communicating with DOC staff at the facility level while maintaining communication with state DOC leadership was a successful strategy to build support and ensure SVCs could meet.
Group developmental lens

Vera facilitated the Student Voice Council meetings through the lens of Bruce Tuckman's Group Development Model.\textsuperscript{130} This nonlinear model describes how groups achieve high performance and functionality. According to this theory, groups move through five stages: forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. Groups may move back and forth across the stages or occupy two at once.

- **Forming.** In the first stage, the group becomes acquainted and establishes ground rules. In this stage, certain structures develop, and members begin to establish rapport.

- **Storming.** In the second stage, members start to communicate more authentically, but may still see themselves as individuals rather than as a team. People may resist group leaders' control.

- **Norming.** In the third stage, people feel part of a team and realize that they can achieve more if they work together. There is also greater clarity around roles and responsibilities.

- **Performing.** In the fourth stage, the team works in an open and trusting atmosphere in which flexibility is key, and hierarchy is of little importance. The team works interdependently.

- **Adjourning.** In the final stage, the team recognizes members' contributions, assesses the process, and implements a plan to bring in new members as older ones leave.

Meeting for a purpose. Over the six meetings, the SVCs established council structures and made decisions about how the council would function. Though the council members needed time to establish rapport and cohesion, students came to the council with several ideas on how to improve the PEP, and they were
eager to share these with the appropriate audience. Vera helped students develop a presentation to PEP stakeholders that would serve two purposes: to concisely describe some of the issues they were experiencing and to make a case for why their existence as a council was important and how the SVC could benefit the program. Some issues extended past the PEP and focused on challenges with DOC program implementation. As such, students also invited DOC education leadership from the facility and central administration to listen to their concerns and ideas for solutions. In doing this, SVCs further advocated for their existence as a council and potential role in improving correctional programming. During these meetings, Vera grounded the group in the equity principles informing the REI Project—including exploring students’ perceptions of how race or ethnicity may have played a role in their own and other students or prospective students’ educational experiences—building a shared set of goals among SVC, PEP, and DOC participants. In the final meeting, the SVCs met with DOCs and PEPs to discuss strategies to sustain the SVCs beyond this project. Each DOC and PEP committed to continuing the SVCs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE STUDENT VOICE COUNCILS

Soliciting student feedback will require a significant shift in operations and mindsets for all stakeholders involved. Engaging student voice also requires programs to act on student feedback by updating policies and procedures to reflect the lessons learned. Below are four recommendations based on lessons Vera learned in this process. (SVC members also shared lessons learned from the REI project, which can be found in Appendix A on page 54.)

Give the SVC time. The PEPs hoped these students could act as liaisons with the student body from their launch. However, the SVCs first had to build rapport in order to speak freely and interact with each other before they could serve in that capacity. When these councils initially developed, members were often unfamiliar with each other, their roles, and the PEP’s goals. Over time, the council members were able to build relationships, understand their responsibilities, and develop a sense of purpose. By the third meeting, several councils began to build consensus on their
group’s function as well as talk openly about concerns the SVC members and other people in the prison had about accessing and participating in PEPs. At this time, Vera observed councils experiencing the storming and norming phases as they handled internal conflicts, developed cohesion, and built trust. (See “Group developmental lens” on page 48.) Allowing for this process to unfold aids councils in developing conflict resolution skills and establishing clear communication channels. By the time the councils presented to the DOCs and PEPs in the final meetings, they were skillfully collaborating and well-positioned to offer feedback.

Maximize diversity and representation in the council for more comprehensive insight. Students may experience a PEP differently depending on their identities and experiences. Representation of as many different experiences as possible within the SVC allows for the most comprehensive insight into the operation of the program and its impact. Representation is valuable for in-group dynamics, as well. Prison social networks are typically homogenous across various characteristics such as race. People who are incarcerated may not have the opportunity to be regularly exposed to different groups and viewpoints. SVCs brought together people who might not ordinarily interact to work toward a common goal. As cohesion grew within the SVC, members gained skill in collaborating with students of all backgrounds, which contributed to their ability to become representatives of the student body. Through interactions in the SVC, members can experience changes in their own perceptions and see the different ways in which other members experienced their PEP. This positions them to be advocates for themselves and other students.

Foster resiliency and transparency. When developing an SVC, PEPs must maintain clear and transparent communication with SVC members regarding the purpose of collecting feedback and its subsequent use. Students should be prepared for some of their feedback to not be immediately acted on given the complexity of creating change within correctional facilities. What students share may show gaps in the PEP’s operations or the DOC’s support for the program, which may be challenging for representatives of these organizations to hear. In addition, some requested changes may not be achievable without statutory or policy change at the institutional,
state, or federal level. Transparency about what can and cannot be changed and demonstration of due diligence on the part of the PEPs and DOCs can foster resiliency. Although council members may have immediate suggestions to improve programs, they should be prepared for the time it will take to implement these changes. This patience is essential to allow for thoughtful consideration and strategic planning, which can ultimately result in more effective and sustainable improvements.

**Leverage student perspective and skills for other purposes.**
Originally, PEPs set out to obtain student feedback on their programs, but over time, several realized the multifaceted potential of these councils. Councils proved to be versatile and invaluable resources that could play vital roles in supporting PEP orientations, recruiting underserved populations, and tutoring. PEPs, DOCs, and students should consider how the charge of the SVC may evolve and be open to the SVC playing roles beyond providing feedback on programs. Vera found that students were willing to support both the PEPs and other students by expanding their roles on the councils and serving as in-prison representatives and advocates for PEPs. What role SVCs may play varies depending on need, but PEPs and DOCs should be flexible in their perceptions of what an SVC in prison is and how it can contribute to education programs.
**Conclusion**

Pell reinstatement offers an opportunity to scale up high-quality postsecondary education programs in prisons to meet the programmatic needs of corrections agencies and the educational and career aspirations and goals of incarcerated students. To realize this potential, postsecondary institutions and corrections agencies must intentionally build PEPs with racial equity as a goal to ensure people from marginalized communities reap the benefits of high-quality education in prison. Doing so will help to fulfill the promise of postsecondary education for everyone, especially those who are disproportionally excluded from education and impacted by the criminal legal system.

Vera launched this project to gain a deeper understanding of equity issues across states, pilot interventions, and provide recommendations for strategies to advance racial equity in PEPs. This effort in Michigan, Oklahoma, and Washington highlights the need for PEP and corrections education administrators to collaboratively

- develop an understanding of the overlapping inequities that exist in the postsecondary and criminal legal systems, set equity goals, and implement policies and practices with a racial equity lens;
- collect, share, analyze, and use student data to measure outcomes and inform changes to policy and practice—Data Working Groups can create a venue for developing equity goals that are grounded in data; and
- center student experiences, perspectives, and ideas in program planning and implementation—Student Voice Councils can create an empowering venue for students to take agency in their own education programs and can help PEPs better meet the needs of their students.

This work requires engagement, commitment, and accountability from administrators at all levels, particularly PEP directors and
corrections education leaders. But it also demands the meaningful inclusion of those most impacted—the students.

This REI project was only one step toward advancing equity in corrections education practices. Vera hopes these recommended strategies will begin to shape more equitable policies and practices in PEPs, and that this collaboration among colleges, departments of correction, and students will inspire other system leaders to work together to advance equity in their own PEPs.
Appendix A: First-person experiences of Student Voice Council members

TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT VOICE COUNCIL, WASHINGTON CORRECTIONS CENTER FOR WOMEN, WASHINGTON

The Tacoma Community College Student Voice Council of Washington Corrections Center for Women was established in 2017 by the dean of education, Sultana Shabazz. The founding members were chosen by the program educators and Shabazz. It is imperative that the members of the Student Voice Council are current students or graduates (alumni) of an educational program at your facility. The founding members worked diligently to construct foundational documents for the council to stand upon while maintaining a cohesive roster of at least two incarcerated student representatives from each educational program at our facility.

Foundational documents consisted of bylaws, a constitution, a letter of intent (purpose and mission) and an organizing system to formally document the SVC’s progression and history. I call this organizing system the legacy model. As an SVC founding member, it has been vital to document all SVC projects, meeting minutes, templates, daily functions, proposals, and the results of all completed projects. The need for a legacy model was heightened during the COVID-19 pandemic. Incarcerated-led organizations and councils crumbled due to the shutdown and incarcerated student-led programs became obsolete. This brought awareness to the threat any organizing group may face due to the quick turnover of incarcerated student leadership. Having documents and leaving a legacy helps eliminate the threat of student-led groups dissipating because the next generation of student leaders will have documented information to reference or utilize as a guide to further evolve the council.
It is important to note that we as incarcerated students are resources to one another, but staff support is necessary throughout the process of maintaining the SVC because, as incarcerated students, it is unfortunately our reality of not being able to exert our independence and authority to access space, direct communication with one another or with outside organizations, and maintain a secure location for the SVC’s documents. I also want to note that in order to make a smooth transition between leadership, once again thorough documentation of the day-to-day functions, activities, projects, and meetings are the key. When evolving the SVC, it is essential to consider all voices and have a diverse representation in the SVC. Diversity includes newer and older incarcerated generations within your facility, long-termers and short-termers, as well as diversity in the individual students’ positionality and intersectionality.

A democratic voting system is used when making decisions within the SVC. After decisions are made, taking immediate action is what allows the SVC to thrive. We are an action-oriented council. By prioritizing our task, we ensure that a project is seen all the way through and completed.

This summary is written on behalf of the Student Voice Council (SVC) by chair Tiana Wood-Sims with collaborative efforts from co-chair Kallie Le Tellier, historian chair Mariah Boudrieau and activities chair Ilene Erwin.
EXCERPTS FROM SVC MEMBERS’ RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS VERA POSED TO THE SVC:

“SVC has helped to develop and better form education, for the entirety of the incarcerated population. SVC brings recognition to individualism and diversity within the prisons educational system.”

“SVC has opened up opportunities that allow our voices to be heard in regard to decisions being made about our education and by being able to voice firsthand real issues directly from the student population to the administration. Being able to be a part of the process gives us power to enhance and change the educational system to better fit the need of all within the incarcerated student population.”

“All of SVC’s decisions are put to a vote and discussed democratically, ensuring everyone’s input is shared and an agreement is reached.”

“Every member in SVC has a voice and thus we operate and make decisions like a democracy. We put together our thoughts and ideas as a collective. Every project or activity is done as a group. We vote together on everything. Every member’s voice is heard, and no decision is final until agreed by the council as a whole.”

“Throughout the entire process of SVC, we have needed all kinds of support. Starting with supporting one another as we grow into leaders, learning from each other, helping to work on and improve communication skills, as well as public speaking. We, as a council, provide a safe space for self-expression and individual growth. It has been pivotal having the support of the staff and education directors as well as the administration within the Department of Corrections Education to be available and help us hold meetings and being open to our ideas to the positive changes WE envision within the structure of education inside prison.”

“One way we’ve overcome hurdles is by being persistent with the communication of our needs through written proposals, emails, and phone calls so as to open up a line of dialogue.”
“There are many hurdles to overcome when trying to keep SVC alive and thriving. DOC has many structures and rules in place that make it hard to keep a consistent schedule or even a consistent education. There are cease movements, safety training, dining schedules and movement interruptions that hinder scheduled meetings and classes from taking place. We have to be adaptable around DOC policy when DOC should find flexibility around individuals working towards an education. DOC putting limitations on education or dictating qualifications for education hinders an individual in their path of rehabilitation.”

“SVC is an excellent way to support the student population by getting involved in the inner workings and politics of education within the prison system. It is a great way to practice leadership skills and allows a safe space to grow individually and as a team. SVC helps with communication skills and public speaking, and brings out hidden talents within an individual. SVC helps individuals to find their voices and teaches them how to put into words and actions the positive changes for a collective goal to better education for all incarcerated individuals.”

Advice for new groups or those wishing to start an SVC is be determined, set clear goals, and keep true to your mission—advocacy. Lean on one another and remember to never give up on your vision. It is necessary to have a formal written vision/mission statement, rules, and regulations for inner workings of the council, bylaws, letter of intent stating what SVC does, a breakdown of a written constitution, declaration of sentiment (purpose), parliamentary procedures, written guidelines about the order of business for every meeting, and knowledge of DOC policies. It is important for the Tacoma Community College Student Voice Council here at Washington Corrections Center for Women to share our experiences and knowledge. We are in high hopes that this information sharing will be of benefit to other incarcerated student leaders of the future.

In Solidarity,
Tiana Wood-Sims, SVC Chair
Our journey in establishing the Handlon Campus Student Voice Council has been both exciting and challenging at times. In this brief letter we share the history and some of the events we experienced in developing what eventuated into the Student Voice Council at Handlon Correctional Facility.

In 2021, by way of electronic messaging, Calvin University (Calvin Prison Initiative—CPI) staff sent all active students a message concerning Vera Institute of Justice’s interest in helping develop a student advisor group at the Handlon Correction Facility (hereafter referred to as Handlon campus). In 2022, students of CPI were informed that six active students were chosen by Vera to assist in this project: Wilson Rivera Bey, Ming Ho, Carlon Hughey, Emil Sporcic, Darron James, and Cesar Valladolid. Not long thereafter, we began the process of working to establish the Student Voice Council. The participating students, being from different cultural and religious backgrounds, brought with them different experiences and perspectives that proved beneficial to the process of developing the Student Voice Council at Handlon.

Our initial attempts to establish the Student Voice Council were less than favorable as we faced difficulties with establishing a proper meeting place where active students could meet to develop the Student Voice Council. This was primarily due to the fact that at that moment the selected students were housed in separate housing units. However, while inconvenient for meeting purposes, we managed to work around this reality by using our study hall time and space as an opportunity to meet.

Having established an initial meeting time and place, we understood that the first thing needed was to gauge each student’s sincerity and commitment to this project. Once each student agreed to give their full efforts into establishing the Student Voice Council, we set out to determine our organizational structure. We understood that
to be effective in this mission we were going to need a foundation to build upon. We decided unanimously what offices were going to be needed and who we believed would be best to fill them. This form of agreement helped establish a democratic process by which the majority of the votes declared the decision-making process we engage in.

While the students were able to determine the positions ranging from a president to a treasurer, we faced the obstacle of developing the overall structure of the council. This was due, in large part, to the fact that, with the exception of one student, none of us had ever participated in any form of student council in our previous school experiences. However, during our first face-to-face meeting with Vera’s representatives, we were offered the opportunity to receive and review examples of the organizational structures other states (and their facilities) had used in developing their Student Voice Council. This proved to be extremely helpful as it gave us a roadmap, or blueprint, to follow. It was during this time that Handlon administration began moving all active Calvin students to the same housing unit, which proved favorable because it gave us the opportunity to meet more often as we aimed to solidify our organizational structure.

During the process of working on developing the Student Voice Council’s structure, we were afforded the opportunity to meet with the Handlon school principal and the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) education department at Lansing through Zoom technology. The meeting gave us an opportunity to gauge the MDOC’s, Handlon’s, as well as Calvin University’s interest and sincerity in having an active Student Voice Council at Handlon. We were pleased and motivated to see that there was genuine interest and support on behalf of all parties, and so we continued the process of developing the Student Voice Council’s structure.

After reviewing and discussing the examples of Student Voice Council structures sent by Vera through CPI, we determined that there was a need for creating and adopting our own set of bylaws to serve as the foundation for what eventually developed into a two-tiered organization combined to make up the Handlon Campus Student Voice Council. The Student Voice Council at
Handlon consists of the executive body, which is the voting and decision-making portion of the Student Voice Council, and the Voice Council class representatives, consisting of two students from each of the currently existing cohorts, or groups of students. Together with the student body at large, we make up the Student Voice Council at Handlon.

While we are still in the process of completely developing our structure, having adopted our current bylaws has given us a place to begin. Each participant has contributed greatly to the development of the Student Voice Council. While there were times of disagreement about the direction we each wanted the Student Voice Council to go, we also understood that it was not about each one of us, but about the interest of the student body at large. In every decision we made, we reflected upon the potential benefits and possible harm that could be visited upon the students at Handlon. Therefore, every decision was made bearing this in mind.

Lastly, we state that while the process of establishing the Student Voice Council was not simple due to the initial limited movement and our lack of knowledge about the process, the joy comes from experiencing the way in which we listened to each other, pushing our egos aside, all done in the interest of CPI’s student body at Handlon. While not yet completely developed, the Student Voice Council is far enough along to be introduced to the student body at large, which we are currently preparing to do with the assistance of the Handlon school principal. We are hopeful.

**Handlon SVC**

Wilson Rivera Bey  
Ming Ho  
Carlon Hughey  
Emil Sporctic  
Darron James  
Cesar Valladolid
CONNORS STATE COLLEGE STUDENT
VOICE COUNCIL, JESS DUNN CORRECTIONAL
CENTER, OKLAHOMA

Education in prison presents a special challenge. In Oklahoma, the overriding purpose is to provide secure detention, not to promote rehabilitation by furthering education and training. The rehabilitation of inmates in prison is a two-edged sword. On one side, a person struggles with the loss of freedom and identity because they are automatically labeled as an “offender” or “inmate” which leads to the stigma of being thought of as “less than” a normal member of society. However, on the other side, DOC is not here to hold an individual’s hand and show them how to battle personal and physical addictions, character flaws, trauma, and most importantly, a lack of education. The Department of Corrections’ job is simply to keep inmates alive to carry out the term of their incarceration and inmates are often told what to do and when to do it without explanation or questions. An inmate has to make the decision on their own to rehabilitate with the help of an insufficient number of dedicated people in the system who often find themselves overwhelmed with a large caseload of individuals. It is this group of inundated people and occasionally outside entities who shed light on the possibility that an inmate can be rehabilitated into a contributing member of the general public again. Education is a key piece of the puzzle in creating an overall picture of rehabilitation. A majority of incarcerated individuals test at a middle-school education level. Additionally, they tend to have a history of social exclusion, including an unsatisfactory relationship with education prior to their incarceration. While the importance of obtaining a GED cannot be overstated, educational opportunities should not stop at that point. Recidivism rates decrease dramatically for inmates that have attended college during incarceration. Most DOC administrators consider a GED to be more important than attending college and limit their support of prison-based higher education programs.

Inmates learn not to speak up or question authority and are often made to feel that their opinions do not matter because they have no right to be treated as a normal person. Creating a student voice council that strives to highlight the importance of incorporating
student voices and perspectives in educational matters in prison is one of the most impactful things that imprisoned individuals can do to promote fellow inmates to increase personal rehabilitation, which subsequently leads to decreased recidivism rates. A lack of education generates instability, poverty, and for some, a feeling that there is no other way to make money than to participate in criminal activities, which eventually brings them right back to prison. Choices to drop out of school often lead to low-wage jobs and/or crime. Getting out of these societal prisons is often a grueling and arduous journey. There are many people at the bottom of the ladder looking for the next rung to climb up and escape the abysmal pit of poverty. Educated individuals have an enhanced chance of finding higher paying jobs when released from prison than people who do not have a GED or college degree. This in part aids in the reduction of poverty rates which help keep released inmates from re-offending. Convincing society—including their community, friends, and family—that they are honest and trustworthy will be problematic. It will be a slow process for employers and society at large to accept that they are anything other than an ex-offender. Education is an integral part of developing integrity, trust, and honesty. A Student Voice Council is just the structure needed to nurture these important characteristics along with encouraging motivation, persistence, cooperation, civil debate, and the creation of social capital which is often defined as our connections with others, our networks, and the things we do for each other.

“It is like the golden rule. I’ll do this for you now knowing that, down the road, you will return the favor or pay it forward... I think education changes lives. Seeing these guys have a chance to be successful and believe in themselves, that’s what this education program should be all about.”

Aaron Waldrip

The essential plan in developing a Student Voice Council was to find current college students and recently graduated college students who share a move-forward thought process. The first step in preparing this plan for a Student Voice Council is to gather people who seize opportunities when they arise and are goal-oriented future planners that believe everyone’s opinion matters regardless
of race or ethnicity. The second step is to create a vision of what the SVC will represent and who and what they will fight for to benefit higher education opportunities. The third and final step is to recognize the support systems, social capital, and limitations that can be available to further the vision and opportunities for current students and potential students who are incarcerated. When all of these steps come together, new ideas and fresh perspectives will be curated, paths become clearer, relationships and bridges are built, and a team of people become stronger, while individuals feel empowered and the SVC’s vision for a better future for incarcerated people matters.

“The steps to creating our higher education learning panel were fairly easy, given the tools we were provided. A representative from our Jess Dunn Education Department and a Connors State College Representative have been the most important tools we needed.”

_Corinthian Moore_

“My experiences in the creation of a student voice council revolve mainly around three main aspects. Who we are, what we can do, and what sort of world we leave for others. I think inmates are more honest than university students outside the fence. Inmates are ‘real’, they don’t care what the professor wants to hear, they only say what they care to say, whereas university students play the ‘education game’ and give answers back that they think the professor wants. There is a different discussion atmosphere in the prisons versus the universities.”

_Aaron Waldrip_

We modeled a great deal of our decision-making on how this council will operate with the help of Roberts Rules of Order. We also had assistance from someone on the council who had a small amount of prior experience in creating this type of assembly. These combined foundations afforded a checks and balances approach to decision making. Our decisions were also based on civilized discussions instead of ill-mannered debate by simply listening before speaking. We also embraced diversity and the understanding that we have much in common while still celebrating our differences. We strive not to judge others, but instead, hold up a mirror to ourselves.
and try to discover why others are different. Lastly, we endeavor to be civil, respectful, empathetic, and democratic when making decisions. This is accomplished by putting in place bylaws that address the council’s purpose, management, membership, duties, appointments, rules of order, meeting logistics, standards, discipline, voting procedures, and amendments.

“The leadership panel as a collective group developed and revised by-laws. We voted in a President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, Sergeant-at-Arms, and Coordinators. The panel consists of a diverse group from different racial and ethnic backgrounds as well as current and graduate students. Our goal is to increase the number of new and returning students to help educate and rehabilitate. We look forward to the continued support from Connors State College.”

David Mellor

“My experience has been pretty straightforward and simple. Our decision-making process is simple, we decide things by voting as a group where we follow ‘Robert’s Rules’…. I am excited to work with our group to create a new position to replace the treasurer.”

Brixton Schuman

Having outside support to fill in the gaps created by inexperience and logistical limitations was necessary for what felt like a monumental undertaking. This was graciously provided by the Vera Institute of Justice. Without their motivation, commitment, experience, compassion, and persistence, this council would have never been created and inmates would have never moved from a fixed mindset that told them they are not good at this to a growth mindset that tells them they are not good at this…yet! By facilitating face-to-face meetings, Vera was able to help inmates interested in forming the council to focus on the progress of set goals by always asking, “Where were you? Where are you now? Where do you want to be?” Vera was vital in creating necessary connections between the Oklahoma Department of Corrections and Connors State College, and the Student Voice Council by fostering communication, mutual respect, and recognition.
“I was very honored when asked to be on this panel. For one, it has made my thoughts change that someone has cared for others’ education. My opinion has greatly changed in a way that I have not comprehended. Vera has been a great deal of help on this subject and has caused my feelings to change for people in this field. With each meeting, I am further educated and also remain in the same mindset that our panel can have a voice and opinion on an inmate’s education. I do want to continue this endeavor so that others along with myself can see that even though we as men are in prison; we can be someone that has meaning to ourselves and to others.”

Johnny Garcia

While we are in the infancy of our student council, there are several takeaways and perspective bits of guidance that we can give to currently incarcerated individuals that are passionate about educational opportunities. First, simply by being here with an open mind and investing in yourself, you ultimately give back to everyone around you. Endeavor to discover the power of your story, but also step into others’ shoes. Think of who is the recipient of what you do. Listen and observe. See what is and is not available. Be naive and know there are no stupid questions. It’s O.K. not to know. Change your attitude toward rejection and wear it like a badge of honor. All that should matter to you is to keep moving forward. Promote a desire to move students beyond the walls in their thoughts and future plans. What you do from here is up to you.

“I feel that the most important thing to setting up an SVC is to have people who really care about those that come after us and want others to succeed. The people selected to the SVC need to be here for the right reasons, they have to be able to discuss topics without taking things personally that don’t go their way. They have to be teachable and want to teach others. I also believe it is important to try to find books on parliamentary procedures and read them to grasp an understanding of how meetings are conducted. We must go out and talk with fellow students to see what they feel needs to be done in order to bring those needs to the council. Maybe with fresh ideas you can learn something new and prompt an idea/bylaw to come up for discussion.”

Justin Deluna
“By participating in the student voice panel, I have learned what it is to work together to accomplish goals of organizing meetings, forming a council and gathering different opinions to come together for the same purpose. I have learned to listen to others even if I don’t agree, people can still find common ground to find solutions.”

Santiago Ruiz, Jr.

Higher Education Leadership Panel:
Aaron Waldrip, President
Johnny Garcia, Vice-President
Justin Deluna, Secretary
Brixton Schuman, Treasurer
David Mellor, Sgt-at-Arms
Santiago Ruiz Jr., Coordinator
Rashad Newsome, Coordinator
Nickolas Grass, Coordinator
Corinthian Moore, Coordinator
Appendix B: Data Working Group additional tools and guidance

EXAMPLE GOAL AND INTENDED OUTCOMES FOR A STATE DATA WORKING GROUP

Goal:
PEPs and DOCs collaboratively will leverage data to assess and make changes to policy and procedures that can promote racial/ethnic equity and inclusion in postsecondary education in prison programs.

Outcomes:
Working together from [month and year] through [month and year], members of the [state] Data Working Group will:

- understand roles for data collection among all institutions in the REI project;
- consider questions related to race, equity, and inclusion in postsecondary education in prison that could be used to inform decision-making about student recruitment, enrollment, persistence, completion, and post-completion outcomes;
- determine which questions can be answered with available data within and across each institution, which additional actors and datasets should be considered, what data is still needed, and how to take next steps where necessary;
- understand what a racial equity lens is, and develop increased capacity and skills to apply a racial equity lens to data analysis and data-informed decision-making;
- develop increased capacity and skills to communicate findings stemming from data analysis conducted through a racial equity lens; and
• develop working relationships across the participating PEPs, DOCs, and other actors in the state or national postsecondary education data ecosystem to ensure ongoing collaboration and improve alignment of data systems and availability.

CODEBOOK COMPONENTS:

• **Variable names** typically give quick indicators of the information presented by the variable. These names should be unique.

• **Variable labels** are abbreviated variable descriptions (maximum of 40 characters) that can be used to identify the variable. This is an extended version of the variable name.

• **Answer labels** provide exhaustive and mutually exclusive potential answer options for a variable that uses categories. Variables that are numeric, capture dates, or are open-ended do not have answer labels.

• **Variable type** determines what type of value a variable can have and what operations can be performed.

  ○ **Numeric variables** contain only numbers and are suitable for numeric calculations.

  ○ **Categorical string variables** may contain letters, numbers, and other characters but are restricted to a limited set of answer options. It is not possible to perform calculations on string variables, but data users can make simple crosstabs.

  ○ **Open-ended string variables** may contain letters, numbers, and other characters, but are not restricted to a set of options. These are difficult to analyze and the choice of when to use them should be made carefully.

  ○ **Date variables** capture dates or time periods, such as a specific calendar date or perhaps a semester or term.
RACE AND ETHNICITY CATEGORIES IN IPEDS

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) uses the following categorizations for race and ethnicity of students: Hispanic; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; white; two or more races; and unknown race and ethnicity. This schema at first does not appear to be mutually exclusive, as people with Hispanic ethnicity may be of any race. The IPEDS race and ethnicity reporting categories are actually Hispanic (any race); American Indian or Alaska Native (non-Hispanic); Asian (non-Hispanic); Black or African American (non-Hispanic); Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (non-Hispanic); white (non-Hispanic); two or more races (non-Hispanic); and unknown race and ethnicity.

Using standardized categories is an important part of compliance reporting and making comparisons across institutions of postsecondary education and across geographies. However, PEPs and DOCs should consider whether these categories used for compliance reporting adequately represent students within their programming, or whether they wish to explore additional categories. For example, it may be that tribal affiliation, or having no tribal membership, is an important part of the postsecondary experience of students with Native American or Indigenous ancestry. Adding further categories to capture race and ethnicity may be important in this case.

PEPs and DOCs may wish to maintain information on students’ race and ethnicity using an open-ended string variable type (variables that contain letters, numbers, and other characters but are not restricted to a set of options, as defined above). Using this variable type fully empowers students to self-identify their own race and ethnicity without having to conform to a preset menu of options. However, expanding the number of potential answer options may present challenges to using that data to evaluate progress toward program goals.
IDENTIFYING DATA NEEDED

A PEP may have a goal of ensuring representative recruitment by race and ethnicity. A question that the PEP could ask might be: “How do the demographics of our students in the last financial aid year compare to those of all people eligible to participate?” The program may identify data and an analysis plan to answer this question by understanding the following:

- The **population of interest** is students in the last financial aid year.
- The **right comparison group** is people who are incarcerated who meet eligibility requirements to participate in postsecondary education.
- The **event** is recruitment.
- The **categories for subgroup analysis of the outcome** would require race and ethnicity categories used by the PEP and those used by the DOC to be brought into alignment.
- The **time range of interest** is the last financial aid year, running from July 1 in one year to June 30 in the next.

Correctional education leads may share the same goal and wish to understand how eligibility policy may affect the representativeness of newly recruited students, asking the question, “how do the demographics of incarcerated people eligible for postsecondary education compare to all people currently incarcerated in this state?” For this question:

- The **population of interest** is people who are incarcerated who are eligible for postsecondary education due to their academic credentials, behavior history, programmatic completion, and location. Correctional education leads may wish to identify four populations of interest: those who have the necessary academic credential; those who meet thresholds for behavioral history; those who have completed other necessary programming; and those who are housed where postsecondary education programs are offered, if relevant.
• The **right comparison group** is all people who are incarcerated at a point in time.

• The **outcome** is eligibility.

• The **categories for subgroup analysis of the outcome** are DOC race and ethnicity categories.

• The **time range of interest** could be within a single year or at a single point in time.

### SAMPLE DATA WORKING GROUP SUSTAINABILITY PLAN

**DATA WORKING GROUP SUSTAINABILITY PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFRASTRUCTURE</th>
<th>SHORT TERM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES</th>
<th>COMMITMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. DWG listservs.</td>
<td>2. Strengthened DOC policies for college participation.</td>
<td>2. DWG tied to statewide consortium.</td>
<td>2. Colleges to commit that program leads will attend convenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monthly / bimonthly / quarterly meetings with DOC as convener of program leads.</td>
<td>3. Strengthened relationships, access to each other (e.g., listserv).</td>
<td>3. Consistent and skilled application of a racial equity lens.</td>
<td>3. Colleges and DOC to commit to pull data when requests are made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DWG called upon with clear data requests in service to collaboration's area of focus.</td>
<td>4. Data and student voice leveraged to make changes to policy and procedures.</td>
<td>4. Strong network of statewide program, data, policy leads working in concert in service to co-developed priorities.</td>
<td>4. Colleges to continue SVCs and incorporate student voices into defining and prioritizing race equity goals and questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Voice Councils (SVCs) that provide input for area of focus and use of data for REI.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Data quality and analytics member in DWG.</td>
<td>5. DOC and colleges continue to develop intra-institutional capacity to ask and answer questions with data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department of Corrections and colleges in _______________ have identified an initial area(s) of focus for the Data Working Group (DWG):

Initial area of focus:_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

This includes __________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
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124 Although codebooks vary widely in quality and amount of information given, a typical codebook includes variables names, variable labels, answer labels, and the variable type. Some colleges use the categories that align with the IPEDS through which they are required to report data to the U.S. Department of Education. See National Center for Education Statistics, “IPEDS,” https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/.


126 Washington’s experience in this area presented a learning opportunity for Vera, the other REI Project participants, and the students who volunteered to develop SVCs in the other two states. Vera met with the colleges in Washington to learn about how their SVCs were developed, lessons they learned, and how they have been able to sustain the councils. The REI Project adapted and expanded on the processes used in Washington across the other two states.

127 While this had a potential side effect of limiting corrections and college buy-in, Vera and participating sites agreed on this strategy to overcome capacity issues.
Although colleges selected the initial council members for this project, those that are seeking to replicate this work should lean on whomever has the best sense of the student body. Additionally, during the final meeting, several councils recommended that the initial council write a short essay or be interviewed to better gauge interest and reduce turnover.

For example, Vera did not have some of the required software to interact with DOC-regulation equipment (such as Polycom). Therefore, alternative arrangements were made to allow students to interact with Vera via Zoom and Microsoft Teams with DOC supervision. Some facilities did not have this capability initially, so on at least one occasion a conference call was made to keep the group development going while DOC administrators figured out the technological issues.
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As researchers and readers alike rely more and more on public knowledge made available through the Internet, “link rot” has become a widely acknowledged problem with creating useful and sustainable citations. To address this issue, the Vera Institute of Justice is experimenting with the use of Perma.cc (https://perma.cc/), a service that helps scholars, journals, and courts create permanent links to the online sources cited in their work.
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