**INTEGRAL CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION**


**Three Explanatory Essays**

by Thom Gehring and Margaret Puffer


December, 2004

# Contents

**Integral Correctional Education:  Essay One—Introductory Level**
by Thom Gehring and Margaret Puffer

Abstract

     This essay briefly introduces salient aspects of the field of correctional education and provides basic concepts which apply to that field and are consistent with Ken Wilber's orienting generalizations.  It defines correctional education, introduces the Wilberian "integral" concept, and outlines the historical periods of correctional education practice.  A discussion of some core principles of correctional education is followed by some problems that afflict inmate students, correctional educators and the communities they serve.  The essay ends by suggesting that these problems might be solved if leaders and governments recognized that—despite the public safety concerns they have generated—prisoners are still people.  Interested readers can explore the two subsequent essays in this series.

Definition of Correctional Education

     Correctional education is the education of confined students, in residential confinement institutions—juvenile facilities and adult prisons.  It is closely allied with alternative education and the related field of prison reform, and is relatively eclectic.  For example, correc-tional schools often include programming in adult basic education, vocational education, special education, cultural and social education or life skills, and sometimes postsecondary education.  Yet there are various views about exactly what correctional education is or should be.  The remainder of this section briefly presents these views.

     There are three definitions of correctional education:  (1) program-based, (2) situational, and (3) inherent to instruction for confined learners.  Each definition is logical and coherent and suggests that the field has unique emphases; stage 1 represents the least mature understanding, stage 3 the most advanced.

     In stage 1 correctional education is an institutional program, and functions much like any other institutional program—the kitchen, the business office, the chaplaincy,

institutional industries, etc.  Supporters of this program-based definition sometimes discuss "corrections education," instead of "correctional education."  This slight spelling difference reflects a profound difference in meaning.  The word "corrections" describes services provided by the agency that manages the institutions, and "correctional" describes anything that takes place within the institution.  (Sometimes education is provided by an outside agency.)  Austin MacCormick, the founder of the modern correctional education movement, deliberately applied the term "correctional," which is also the name of the Correctional Education Association and the *Journal of Correctional Education*; MacCormick's term stuck.

Stage 2 is the situational definition—it holds that correctional education is education that takes place in a correctional institution.  This implies that correctional education is no different from other fields of education, except that it is conducted within the walls or within the compound.  Supporters of this definition identify profess-sionally with the disciplines related to correctional education (English, elementary education, carpentry, etc.), rather than with the field of correctional education itself.

In stage 3 an inherent definition of correctional education applies:  structured learning/teaching strategies that interrupt asocial, nonsocial, or antisocial behavior and foster social learning and growth.  This is the only definition that rests on the correctional dimension of the field.  Adherents believe correctional education is an intervention strategy that helps people who want to "turn their lives around" or correct their behavior.  That view represents the social aspirations of populations that have traditionally not had or used equal access to educational opportunity, and of people who have lived in conflict with their communities.  This definition suggests that all institutional programs must

4

bend to the priority of preparing students for successful community life.

The Wilberian "Integral" Concept

Models that apply the constellation of ideas and approaches Ken Wilber developed are called Wilberian.  From a Wilberian perspective, "integral" is central.  It means inclusive, comprehensive, indicative of the "big picture."

Integral designates the interior as well as the exterior, and individual as well as shared or collective.  Typically, the term is applied to represent four potential perspectives:  subjective, objective, social, and cultural.

Wilberians see reductionism as the opposite of integral.  Reductionism is the loss of one or more dimensions of what should make up the total picture.  For example, critics of science sometimes say that scientists focus on exteriors (the objective) and forget about interiors (the subjective).  Or militants tend to see every issue from the perspective of their own people (however that may be defined), but are unwilling to take another person's perspective.  Integral orientations are not based on reducing all input into a single worldview or emphasis.

Advocates of the integral perspective therefore make a special effort to acknowledge and include as many views as possible.  They assume that all views have some claim on the truth, or they would have no proponents.  A final dimension of the integral worldview is that it tends to assume all the ideas that diverse groups bring to the table contain some core of the truth.  Wilberians tend only to be critical of those ideas when they contradict their proponents' own principles—when they exhibit a double standard.

The General Concept of Developmental Sequences

Everything in the universe is part of something else, without negating either the part or the whole—the universe is structured hierarchically. Subatomic particles are parts of atoms, which are parts of molecules, which can be parts of cells, and so forth. The earth contains a "geosphere" or what Wilber calls the "physiophere," its barren and rocky core; a "biosphere," the envelope of life that extends downward and upward from the planet's surface, and a "noosphere," the membrane of humanity and its intercon-nections (trade routes, phone lines, FAXes/modems/Internet, etc.—noos is Greek for wisdom). Wilber writes about a "theosphere," a level more complex or deeper than the noosphere. An attribute of these levels, and their increasing maturity, is that they all follow a general pattern: physical to mental to spiritual, and so forth.

Humans grow and develop—mature—through parallel levels. Indeed, we all contain some of the raw material of the physiosphere, we are of the biosphere and the noosphere, and many argue that we contain a spark of the divine theosphere. Wilber fused Western with Eastern psychology to identify a longer continuum consistent with these ideas. Western psychology stretches roughly from the most basic levels to ego development, and Eastern psychology begins at approximately the ego and proceeds through higher levels that can be summarized for our current purposes as the spiritual. Wilber makes a case for applying these same levels not only to individual development, but also to social and cultural evolution.

There are many sequences or trajectories of human development. As a rule, they are organic and developmental. This means that everyone starts at infancy (a beginning), and ends life at a higher stage; no one can skip steps. Two of the most popular

6

trajectories for correctional educators were designed by Maslow and by Kohlberg.

Maslow's hierarchy generally posits that individuals cannot ascend to the highest levels if they have unmet lower needs. For example, it is difficult to focus on one's studies if one is uncertain when one will eat again, or whether there will be safe shelter to sleep in that evening. Wilber makes the point that there is traffic both up and down Maslow's hierarchy—most of us behave differently, depending on whether we feel vulnerable or safe. Maslow's work helps explain many features of life in confinement.

Kohlberg's sequence depicts cognition and its relation to morality. Although Kohlberg reported primarily on data from boys and men, subsequent researchers found that the general alignment of his stages and levels apply to girls and women. They found that masculine concerns tend to focus on systems of political rights (Kohlberg was the recognized leader in this area), and feminine concerns tend to focus on systems of nurture or care (Gilligan was the recognized leader in this area). Despite these differences, the overall patterns of maturation or cognitive-moral development have been found to apply universally.

Correctional educators typically find great merit in the Kohlberg/Gilligan sequence of human development. The general levels that are most frequently discussed can be illustrated in a single, public life, that of Malcolm X, who had three careers that correspond to the cognitive-moral levels. His first career was as an ego-centered criminal, Malcolm Little. When he was incarcerated and became a militant member of the Nation of Islam, he changed his name to Malcolm X. During this militant career he continued to have an ego—but the center of his concerns shifted from his own needs to those of "his people." Malcolm X had simply acquired additional concerns, so the

boundary of his emphasis shifted from a very close (ego-centered) horizon to a wider horizon (his people). After Malcolm X's pilgrimage to Mecca, this same personality acquired a third career, marked by new concerns for all humans, regardless of their situation. He thus moved to the third level, called universal citizenship. There was talk about what might happen if Malcolm X and Martin Luther King compared notes and strategies—would they find common cause?

These three levels—ego-centered, militant, universal citizenship—mark the general paths of cognitive-moral development. Correctional educators find Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and the Kohlberg/Gilligan sequence of cognitive-moral development useful because they mark out the turf that we aspire inmate students to pursue when they are ready. That is why correctional educators frequently remark that they take students where they find them, and bring them along to the extent they are able and willing to go.

Nevertheless, all this should not be confused with a "blaming the victim" orientation. Most institutional teachers are keenly aware that other causes of crime are operational, in addition to the immaturity of criminals. For example, the odds of engaging in crime are exacerbated when children live in poverty settings where their Maslow-oriented needs have been neglected: in violent neighbor-hoods with drugs all around and a neglected educational infrastructure, where they go to sleep without being sure if they will be awakened to be raped or beaten. These are called the environmental factors that can foster crime.

Most correctional educators are alert to environmental influences in students' lives. However, they feel unable to address those concerns in a meaningful way. It is unlikely that, even if all the institutional teachers got together and unanimously

advocated a safer, more nurturing way to ensure safety in the neighborhoods, they would be able obtain the needed results.

By contrast, correctional teachers do know that they can impact students' ability to navigate through life's problems more successfully, and equip them with skills required to live decently in community. In other words, correctional educators are unable to transform our entire society, but they are able and willing to help individuals develop skills that will help them to stop committing crime, stop recidivating, and live as good community members. In general, these are the core meanings that correctional educators take from the cognitive-moral sequences of human development, as articulated by Wilber and the researchers whose work he reports (in this case, Maslow, Kohlberg, and Gilligan).

<u>Levels of Correctional Education Development</u>

In addition to levels of personal maturation, there are levels of development in fields of study such as correctional education. One way of portraying these levels is chronologically. Figure 1 on the next page shows nine historic periods of correctional education development.

**Figure 1:  Historic Periods of Correctional Education**

| |
|---|
| 1.  1787-1875:  Sabbath school period; Pennsylvania (solitary confinement) and Auburn (factory model) systems of prison management; beginnings of reform schools; correctional education is possible, despite the harsh conditions. |
| 2.  1876-1900:  Zebulon Brockway's tenure at Elmira Reformatory, bringing together the reform themes emphasized by Maconochie(near Australia), Crofton (Ireland),Carpenter(England); and the Pilsburys (prison managers in the U.S.); the beginnings of correctional/special education; reformatory movement efforts to transform prisons into schools. |
| 3.  1901-1929:  The development of prison libraries, and reformatories for women; democratic patterns of correctional education—William George, Thomas Mott Osborne, and Austin MacCormick; Anton Makarenko's work begins in the Soviet Union. |

| |
|---|
| 4.   1930-1941:  "The golden age of correctional educa-tion;" MacCormick's programs and professionalization influence:  the New York State and Federal experiments, rebirth of correctional/special education; Kenyon Scudder begins his tenure as reform warden of an important experimental prison without walls. |
| 5.1941-1945:  World War II. |
| 6.   1946-1964:  Recovery from the interruption of World War II; the themes of Glenn Kendall's work extend those of MacCormick, and set the pace for Cold War correctional education. |
| 7.1965-1980:  Key improvements and centers of correctional education--the Federal influence in education, postsecondary programs, statewide correctional school districts, special education legislation, correctional teacher preparation programs. |
| 8.1981-1988:  Conservative trend begins in Federal influence and most states; rise of Correctional Education Association influence; continuation of trends from the previous period; Ross and Fabiano's definitive book on progress in Canada and the U.S. |
| 9. 1989-    :  The current period, with its research emphasis on culture and humanities, developmental education; rise of international cooperation; information access to inform correctional educators of their history/literature and promote professional networking; some experiments in mandatory education for inmates. |

As suggested in the narrative associated with the ninth period, most correctional educators have not had access to the literature of their own field.  However, much scholarship has been pursued on this and related topics, especially at the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at California State University, San Bernardino. Although there is dialogue about the periods of the field, and refinements and extensions should be expected, it is likely that the bulk of the Figure 1 material will remain intact. The field experienced a certain coherence during each period—the Figure 1 patterns were perceived by practitioners as the various periods unfolded.

Thus far in this essay, certain basic issues have been addressed.  Several definitions of correctional education were advanced, and the Wilberian term "integral"

was introduced.  Patterns of cognitive-moral development were briefly summarized, and the general historic periods of the field of correctional education.  The next sections anchor all this through a discussion of some of the most salient dimensions that foster teaching and learning in correctional education, and some of the impediments that block it.

Student Learning as the Foundation of Classroom Practice

Four closely related issues that tend to make correctional education a unique field of education can be organized under the following headings: (a) the criminal plumber problem, (b) priorities reversed from those of the local schools, (c) the principle of social education hegemony, and (d) the transformational imperative.  These issues are introduced below.

a. The Criminal Plumber Problem

Criminologist Vernon Fox advised that "if one teaches a criminal to be a plumber, then the result must be a criminal plumber" (in Roberts, 1971, p. 129).  In Canada this is discussed as the problem of criminals with job skills.  Austin MacCormick reported that it is possible for a man to carry a Ph.D. and a kit of burglar's tools at the same time.  The problem is that, while education is usually associated with progress toward living decently in community, it cannot ensure that result.  Many assume that, since the mere accoutrements of education may not turn a criminal's life around, criminals should be systematically denied educational opportunity.  This anti-education sentiment flies in the face of everyday logic.

The whole point of correctional education is that criminality and recidivism are in part attributes of immaturity—as introduced in the narrative about cognitive-moral

development above.  Keen observers report that most inmates behave as though they were "late bloomers," slow to mature.  As a rule they do not lack intelligence, though they have often become embittered learners as a result of previous failures in the local schools.  Therefore, one of the central roles of the correctional teacher is to be available with a repertoire of learning activities tailored to meet the identified needs of most incarcerates, to assist in their schooling when they mature to the point that they are ready to improve their lives.

Typically this happens when the inmate lives past a certain age—for example, on his 23$^{rd}$ birthday.  After a life of violence, characterized by the need to coerce or manipulate others for his livelihood, most criminals expect to die early like most of the people they have known.  At the shock of reaching a certain age and still seeming to have years ahead, the average criminal pauses to consider the mess he has made of things.  The most accurate predictor of criminality and incarceration is not race or even socio-economic status; it is gender (that is why this paragraph applies masculine pronouns).  The second most accurate predictor of crime is age:  after age 30 the incidence of criminal activity diminishes sharply.

These patterns are available for anyone who cares to review the record, and they fit precisely with the "late bloomer" theory of crime and incarceration.  In short, education by itself cannot determine that a person will refrain from criminality, but it is almost always associated with the process of turning one's life around.  Prisoners need access to education when they make that momentous life decision.  It is therefore in the interest of neighborhood safety that a quality education infrastructure should be available, tailored to meet their needs when they are ready.

## b. Priorities Reversed from those of the Local Schools

This leads directly to questions about the attributes of an institutional education program that will best serve inmate, and hence community, needs. Certainly a sterile replication of the schooling that led to their embittered status would be inappropriate. Many hold that these students originally became criminals because they failed in—or were failed by—the local schools. So most confined students need something useful but quite different from the schools they experienced earlier in their lives.

Correctional educators often remark that the establish-ed priorities of the traditional, local schools are precise-ly the opposite of what is needed for confined students. The formula that drives local schools, "knowledge, skills, and attitudes," was forged during a time when teachers assumed that students were properly socialized, that they would grow into good community members (with families, jobs, and values to foster a decent life). Obviously, those assumptions did not apply for these students.

Therefore, correctional educators seek to replace the "knowledge, skills, and attitudes" approach with one tailored for confined student needs: "attitudes, skills, and knowledge." It is generally held—by both correctional teachers and students—that it is more important to live a crime-free life than to know how to diagram a sentence, more important to have a marketable skill than to perform algebra, and more important to respect others than to be well versed in the plays of Shakespeare. If knowledge of the parts of a sentence, algebra, or Shakespeare will result in an improved self-esteem and an enhanced pattern of social interaction, then indeed those content areas should be pursued in the institutional classroom. However, the clear priority for most confined learners focuses on the need to be assigned to the free community, to stop living in a cage.

### c. The Principle of Social Education Hegemony

Another way of discussing this issue is called the principle of "social education hegemony." This holds that the underlying purpose of all institutional activities and programs should be social education, the ability to live decently in community without committing crime.

According to this view every institutional program should be educational—if it is not, why would it be pursued? So security, housing, the chaplaincy, the institu-tional industrial or agricultural program, even the Kitchen and the Business Office programs should be articulated and coordinated to help foster learning about how to be social.

### d. The Transformational Imperative

Stated yet again, the principle of social education hegemony is known as the "transformational imperative." Just as Louie Armstrong sang in that old Duke Ellington song ("It don't mean a thing if it ain't got that swing.), adherents of the transformational imperative maintain "It don't mean a thing if it ain't transformational." Accord-ing to this view the burden of being assigned to live in a cage is so intense, and of such compelling magnitude, that the purpose of one's life is systematically adjusted: the incarcerate's priority is "to get out." Since it is not likely that the whole of society will be improved so that mankind's brutality will suddenly reverse and all children have opportunities to live in the upper reaches of Maslow's hierarchy, the inmate's only route for positive change is to transform oneself, to become a more social person.

Correctional educators sometimes note that the inmates in their classes were never anti-social in any sense, were never opposed to society. If they were, they would have plotted to burn hospitals and churches, blow up schools and factories, and kill social

14

leaders.  The persons committed to our juvenile facilities and adult prisons never fit into this category.  Even terrorists do not fit that category:  they are social—terrorists commit their crimes because they are social advocates, and they plan their crimes with others in a social way.  Most inmates are social:  they are concerned about the people they left behind, and about government.  For example, confined students are often (a) "news junkies," eager for newspapers and broadcasts, or (b) filled with remorse for what they did, and eager to "give something back" to their communities.

Instead of being anti-social, most inmates are nonsocial or asocial.  They only intermittently accessed programs that foster social living (local schools, community organizations, religious institutions, vocational programs).  Indeed, some correctional educators report that students actually tend to be latently pro-social.  That implies that their participation in the institutional education program is exactly the right activity to access when they realize that they must improve their lives.  Education is the most pro-social program in America.

Whenever inmates reflect on their lives and take stock of their condition, as they tend to do "inside," they inevitably decide to "learn their way" out of a cell and back into the free community.  How else to do this, except by acquiring the basic and marketable skills that they missed during their earlier careers as children?  In the course of their studies, they inevitably learn how to live new lives, with respect and dignity instead of crime and coercion.  Therefore, a correctional education program that is fashioned to meet these identified inmate needs also meets the public need for law-abiding citizens.

<u>When Student Learning is Not Prioritized</u>

However, not all correctional education experiences are that helpful.  Most

institutional school programs are administered by jailers, not educators.  Qualified educators often are not in charge of key educational decisions.  Central among these are decisions about the school curricu-lum, spending funds that are earmarked for educational purposes, and the hiring and firing of education personnel.  Although a minority of institutional education programs are structured like real schools—with qualified educators making these decisions—most merely look like real schools.

For example, many institutional education programs only have vocational courses that are needed to manage the facility:  auto repair (to maintain State cars), welding (to do institutional maintenance), culinary arts (to staff the kitchen), and so forth.  Even the academic programs reflect the warden's ideology toward education:  emphasis on the elementary grades, with few secondary courses (the GED is often the only route to secondary completion) and no postsecondary programs at all.  The schoolrooms are often remote from each other and use an assortment of facilities never designed for teaching and learning (broom closets, corridors, shower rooms; with standardized testing in noisy dining areas), a sign that education is not prioritized.  A standard problem in many facilities is that the institutional superintendent can use the funds assigned to education for other purposes—a new parking lot, overtime for correctional officers, new uniforms, etc.

Many institutions have far fewer teachers assigned than are shown in the budget, with the personnel costs "rolled up" and diverted to other priorities.  Inmates' time in school is subject to interruptions by almost any institu-tional employee who needs the inmate to work in a shop or come to sign papers or be briefed on some new regulation.

Most institutions have several educational programs; only a few have full, well-

rounded school programs.  Yet most inmates can be transferred at any time to another facility in the system, regardless of the educational programs offered there.  In summary, continuity of inmate student learning is almost never an institutional priority, and correctional systems are reluctant to conceptualize transfer systems that would help students complete the education programs they are able to start.

A related problem is that school records rarely flow into and out of the institutions.  For example, correctional teachers typically know only intermittently or anecdotally if the students in their classes have been diagnosed for special education services.  In addition, and despite the standardization of the GED, many released or paroled inmates  have a terrible time getting official recognition for the learning they completed "inside."  This especially impacts students who are ready to pursue education at a local college after release, but it is a widespread concern.

Almost no correctional educators were professionally prepared to work in correctional education.  Neither do they have access to the literature of the field of correctional education.  As a result, they have to "reinvent the wheel" whenever they encounter a classroom problem.  A symptom of all this is that many correctional teachers do not apply a student-centered approach in their classrooms.  Rather, they apply a curriculum- or teacher-centered approach.  Drill sheets frequently are used as a procedure to make it appear that individualized learning is being pursued.  Teachers are confused about the attributes of a good school program, alienated from colleagues in the local schools and colleges, and therefore vulnerable to anti-education institutional influences. A typically asked question is Am I a teacher or a jailer?

Unfortunately, the combined sentiments of various groups contribute to the

institutional anti-education hostility.  This is fueled by (a) many correctional officers, who frequently express the view that education is nothing more than an attempt to "coddle" criminals (which is not true—learning is hard work), (b) inmates themselves, who were typically turned off by the education they received as children, and (c) institutional managers, whose priority has to be public safety and the health of the inmates and staff (not education).  In brief, prisons were not designed as schools, and few people are sure whether they can, or should, function as schools.

A Remedy that is Not Often Considered

The problems that afflict correctional education appear myriad and complex. However, many of these problems are driven by misperceptions.  For example, most of the structural problems could be satisfactorily addressed if governments, decision-makers, and communities recognized that prisoners are people, despite the problems they caused prior to their incarceration. This concept was articulated during the 1950s by Kenyon Scudder, the reform warden at a large and innovative West Coast prison without walls—the title of his book was *Prisoners Are People* (Scudder, 1968).

This changed attitude would bring an array of present practices into question.  If prisoners are people, should not institutional schools be organized like other schools, with educators in charge of curriculum, the education budget, and educational personnel decisions?  Should not continuity of student learning be built into these "inside" schools, as it is in the local schools in our communities?  Should not teachers be prepared for the special challenges they meet in the workplace, instead of for challenges that relate only to completely different categories of workplaces?  Should not prison teachers be good people, instead of merely loyal to the institutional superintendent—and should not they

be able and willing to help confined students become engaged in learning?

To answer all these questions requires only that citizen voters, decision-makers, and correctional educators approach their work in an inclusive (integral) way, without reducing it to the lowest common denominator (the anti-education institutional bias). It requires that we approach the issues with open minds, and yes—even warm hearts. Anything less will merely perpetuate the abuses that have already been experienced, and the dangers to public safety that result from the unchecked cycle of crime.

<u>Summary</u>

This essay began by defining correctional education, introducing the Wilberian concept of "integral," and suggesting there are hierarchical levels of personal growth. It outlined the levels of correctional education development over the last approximately 225 years. The essay summarized some of the problems that can be solved when student learning is placed at the center of this work, and some of the problems that abide because that concept is often not applied. It ended recommending that many seemingly unrelenting problems might be solved if we collectively recognized Scudder's point that prisoners are people, in addition to all the other things that we already know about them. These approaches are suggested by the orienting generalizations contained in the corpus of Ken Wilber's books. Interested readers are invited to partake of the subsequent two essays, which will add structure and details to these basic concepts.

**References**

Roberts, A. (1971). *Sourcebook on prison education*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Scudder, K. (1968). *Prisoners are people*. New York: Greenwood Press Scudder.

# Integral Correctional Education:  Essay Two—Intermediate Level

by Thom Gehring and Margaret Puffer

<u>Abstract</u>

   This is the second in a series of three essays that introduce Ken Wilber's orientating generalizations and show how they can be applied to the field of correctional education. Wilber wrote about the human condition in a broad sense; it is up to us to give his ideas and models substance by anchoring them to our daily work.  The first essay established a context by defining correctional education and the Wilberian concept of "integral," the idea of hierarchy and developmental sequences, and the historical periods of correctional education.  It also outlined some underlying assumptions and concerns that can be said to drive daily practice, and ended by suggesting that many concerns could be addressed through simple acknowledgment of Scudder's principle that prisoners are people.

   The three essays in the series are intended to make available a Wilberian "all quadrants, all levels" (AQAL) model of correctional education, as a tool to help solve everyday problems encountered at the workplace.  The current essay will build on the underlying assumptions and theoretical foundations presented in the first essay.  The current purpose is to show how the quadrants work, how they relate to correctional education, and how they play out specifically for teachers, students, and administrator/ supervisors.  In addition, the current essay will elaborate on the concept of reductionism that was introduced in the first essay, and anchor it to the most salient problem that constrains the work of teaching and learning in the institutional setting—"good old boys and girls" (anti-education, predatory obstructionists).

<u>A Quick Review of Concepts from the First Essay</u>


        The earlier essay introduced and explained three definitions of correctional

education:  (a) program-based, (b) situational, and (c) inherent.  The program-based

definition holds that correctional education is merely a type of institutional program; the

situational definition proclaims that correctional education is merely education offered

within the institution; the inherent definition holds that, since most inmates were

criminals prior to incarceration, there is something—usually an attitude or a condition—

that should be corrected.  "Integral" was explained as an inclusive approach to help

ensure that the whole of an issue is not represented as merely one of its parts.

The nine periods of correctional education since the 1780s were briefly summarized. A number of issues that practitioners must address when they put student learning at the center of their professional lives were then presented: the problem of the criminal plumber or criminals with job skills, the reverse priorities that drive correctional education and the local schools, social education hegemony, and the transformational imperative. Then the focus shifted to concerns that often intervene to make teaching and learning difficult in the confinement setting: most correctional education decisions are made by jailers, not educators (special problems are in curriculum, budget, and personnel matters), correctional education resources are frequently diverted to non-education priorities, institutional educators tend not to be prepared through useful preservice for their work in correctional education (so they have no concept of the history of the field, no tools to solve the intense problems they face daily), and the correctional setting is typically staffed with personnel who have an anti-education disposition (or who are not sure that education for inmates can or should be provided). The essay ended with the idea that most of these problems could be solved by recognizing that, despite all the other things they may be—inmates are people—and implying that all people should have access to useful education programs. Having reviewed the content in the first essay, we can now proceed to the expanded focus of the current material.

Wilber's Quadrants

Ken Wilber's first book was *The Spectrum of Consciousness*, which emphasized the layered stages of individual development, and the worldview of each (issues, problem-solving approaches, etc.). Through a series of subsequent books, Wilber pursued specific emphases of these worldviews and the relationship between them. Then,

after intense study of over a hundred different hierarchies of human development—
individual, social, anthropological, philosophical, spiritual, etc.—he realized that each of
the sequences represented a part of the truth, and they somehow fit together into a larger
pattern of "all that is."  He aligned them in a matrix with four parts, which have become
known as quadrants.  The process of articulating all these parts was really quite simple.

First, Wilber noticed that some of the sequences were about interiors (subjective
emotions, thoughts, aspirations, etc.), while others were criteria of exteriors (sizes,
shapes, quantities, structures, etc.).  This process can be shown by drawing a vertical line
down a blank sheet of paper, with one side representing interiors and the other exteriors.

**Figure 1:  Interiors and Exteriors**

| INTERIOR | EXTERIOR |
|---|---|

Next he found that some of the sequences described individual things (personal
development, emotions, individual constraints or expectations, etc.), while others applied
to shared or collective things (economic systems, social units, cultural expectations, etc.).
These he represented on the same page by dividing it with a horizontal line (Figure 2).

**Figure 2:  Interiors and Exteriors X Individual and Collective**

| INTERIOR<br><br>INDIVIDUAL | EXTERIOR<br><br>INDIVIDUAL |
|---|---|
| INTERIOR<br><br>COLLECTIVE | EXTERIOR<br><br>COLLECTIVE |

When he considered this configuration, Wilber saw it was a schema that included all the sequences with which he had been wrestling. Each quadrant could be identified by its placement: Upper Left (UL), Upper Right (UR), Lower Right (LR), and Lower Left (LL). Each had logical themes that emerged from the labels. The UL quadrant (interior, individual) contained "I" interpretations and intentions; he called it the subjective area. The UR (exterior, individual) contained "it" things that could easily be measured—behavioral, empirical; he called it the objective area. The LR (exterior, collective) suggested interobjective, socioeconomic relationships—another type of "it." The LL (interior, collective) showed the intersubjective "we;" he called it the cultural area.

The big picture on all this is that the two right quadrants (two types of "it") align with a materialist-scientific perspective and sociological Truth. The UL quadrant (the "I") corresponds with the Beautiful, with aesthetics. And the LL quadrant (the "we") corresponds with morality or the Good. So, on a single page he was able to denote Truth, Beauty, and Goodness. The process was getting both interesting and promising.

Next Wilber recognized that to each quadrant could be assigned what Habermas had termed a "validity claim:" an inherent criterion to help identify whether the things associated most directly with that quadrant were indeed properly considered there. The validity claim for the UL subjective quadrant was truthfulness. Our understanding of subjective realities depends on self-reports; the only test of such information is whether the person is being truthful. The validity claim for the UR objective quadrant was truth, according to the empirical, scientific meaning of the term. The validity claim for the LR social quadrant was functional fit—for example, the extent to which socioeconomic organization fits with social experiences and professed aspirations. The validity claim of

the LL cultural quadrant was justice, the extent to which group experiences were consistent with the group's moral and legal parameters. (Note: In a Wilberian sense "social" indicates infrastructure [external—buildings, transportation and information systems, land use, and so forth]. "Culture" denotes value-oriented worldspace [internal—morés, shared expectations, perceived constraints, and so forth].) When all this is combined on one sheet of paper, the result corresponds with Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Wilber's Quadrants**

| *Upper Left (UL)* | *Upper Right (UR)* |
|---|---|
| INTERIOR | EXTERIOR |
| (Individual, Intentional) | (Individual, Behavioral) |
| INTERPRETATIVE/**SUBJECTIVE**/"I" | EMPIRICAL/**OBJECTIVE**/"It" |
| Validity Claim: Truthfulness | Validity Claim: Truth |
| INDIVIDUAL | INDIVIDUAL |
| INTERIOR | EXTERIOR |
| (Collective worldspace) | (Collective, Empirical) |
| INTERSUBJECTIVE/**CULTURAL**/"We" | INTEROBJECTIVE/**SOCIAL**/"It" |
| Validity Claim: Justice | Validity Claim: Functional Fit |
| COLLECTIVE | COLLECTIVE |
| *Lower Left (LL)* | *Lower Right (LR)* |

With a few abiding rules, this system functions effectively to engage the intellect and the imagination; it is a wonderful tool for gaining clarity on issues. Consistent with the integral emphasis, the quadrants are all connected—the quadrant structure encourages

us to be inclusive, to see interconnections.  Another way of expressing this principle is to acknowledge that each of the exterior things has an interior, and each thing in the universe is part of some larger thing.  As mentioned in the first essay, subatomic particles are parts of atoms, which are parts of molecules, which are parts of cells, which are parts of organs, which are parts of organisms, which are parts of social units…  One way of recognizing these interconnections—to recognize that each thing exists by itself, and is also part of a larger thing—is to acknowledge that our placement of things in the respective quadrants is really just to facilitate consideration of it.  There is a difference between the quadrant map and the actual territory; we want to use the quadrants to tease out relationships that otherwise might have gone unnoticed, but the system is not intended to replace reality.  Having identified these caveats, a little time directed to illustrate the quadrants will demonstrate their usefulness to correctional educators.

<u>Three Illustrations, to Show How the General Quadrant Principles Can be Applied</u>

The quadrant format is easy to master once one has applied it to address a few problems.  Its purpose is to gain greater clarity about pertinent issues.  In this section we will apply the quadrants to three rather non-controversial issues to show the model and its attributes, thereby helping readers ease into this seemingly new system.  Two of the three examples will be from the history of correctional education and prison reform, and the last will be about correctional education curricula.

Our first example will be to see some of the everyday implications of residential confinement institutions.  For simplicity, we will consider juvenile facilities and adult prisons as one category (prisons), within a larger category of human institutions, the

congregate shop or family substitute institutions.  (They are called family substitute

institutions in this case because they accomplish parts of what was primordially

accomplished through clans, tribes, and other extended family units.)  Figure 4 addresses

some congregate shops, and the quadrant format allows us to suggest something that most

correctional educators already understand:  some people go to universities to learn

community expectations, and some people go to prison.

**Figure 4:  Some Congregate Shops**

| *Subjective* | *Objective* |
|---|---|
| MONASTERIES/DRUG PROGRAMS | LABORATORIES/MUSEUMS/ARCHIVES |
| *Cultural* | *Social* |
| SCHOOLS/COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES | FACTORIES/FARMS/OFFICES/PRISONS |

Figure 4 illustrates the quadrant criteria discussed above.  For example, the

congregate shops mentioned in each quadrant correspond with the inherent substance of

that quadrant.  The UL subjective quadrant represents individual interior intentionality, so

monasteries and drug treatment programs can be represented there for our current

purpose.  The UR objective quadrant represents individual exteriors—empirical data that

can be measured, such as would be done in laboratories, museums, and archives.  The LR

social quadrant displays collective exteriors as in the socioeconomic infrastructure:

factories, farms, offices, prisons, etc.  To the LL cultural quadrant we assign interior

collective patterns that can be assimilated through schools, colleges, and universities.

Figure 4 applies the validity claims for the respective quadrants.  For example,

monasteries and drug treatment programs are sites where individuals can introspect on

their experiences and aspirations, and the usefulness of these congregate shops typically depends on the extent to which those individuals are truthful in their reflection. Laboratories, museums, and archives are only useful to the extent that the data presented in these shops is accurate, as in the sense of being measurable truth. Factories, farms, offices, and prisons are supposed to be places where productive labor is pursued; the measure of their productivity is the functional fit between inputs and outputs. Finally, the usefulness of schools, colleges, and universities rests largely on their ability to prepare people to live decently in community (or to live up to the expectations associated with justice). Thus, Figure 4 illustrates the quadrant approach.

Figure 4 also addresses a point that was mentioned in the first essay and by many observers of correctional education: the central problem is that inmates are treated as objects rather than subjects. This is simply another way of stating the issue: society has not recognized that prisoners are people. The differences between the two lower quadrants add depth to these observations. The most relevant difference is that subjects in the LL cultural quadrant (with interiors that are valued by the community—experiences, emotions, aspirations) are initiated for membership as enfranchised members with inherent rights and privileges. Objects in the LR social quadrant (there is no compelling reason to identify whether they have interiors) are socioeconomic assets to be exploited. Prisoners are strangers because they are disenfranchised. This is the same orientation that until recently prevailed among men about women (who were perceived as owned and denied legal status), the proprietary orientation directed toward slaves by slave owners. We summarize similar differences in the notion that inmates are known not by their names but by their assigned inmate numbers.

Once prisons were established as congregate shops, great competition arose about whose institutional management plan was best. Holl's 1971 literature review was based on a useful review of 19th century New York programs that was first circulated at the 1910 International Prison Congress. That review posited three systems of prison management which, for sake of the current narrative, can be labeled Auburn, Reformatory, and New Penology (Holl, 1971, p. 223). If we add the Pennsylvania system, which predated Auburn, the result is a complete list of four systems, which is summarized in Figure 5.

**Figure 5: 19th Century Prison Management Systems in Wilberian Quadrants**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Subjective*<br><br>PENNSYLVANIA<br><br>"make men think right" | *Objective*<br><br>REFORMATORY<br><br>Prepare for real world success |
| *Cultural*<br><br>NEW PENOLOGY<br><br>"our standard is citizenship" | *Social*<br><br>AUBURN<br><br>"make men act right" |

In Figure 5 the Pennsylvania system is in the UL subjective quadrant, which corresponds to the placement of monasteries in Figure 4. Pennsylvania institutions were managed like solitary confinement; prisoners had access to a Bible and some craft work. Osborne's summary of this introspection-oriented (monklike) system was that it was

designed to "make men think right" (1975/1916, pp. 185-186), an aspiration for how inmates would develop subjectively. The Reformatory system is associated with the UR objective quadrant because it used extensive empirical/behavioral data, through application of progressive housing, indeterminate sentences, and parole, to prepare inmates for a true challenge—future success in the real world.

Auburn's system is associated with the LR social quadrant because its main program was a highly regimented, factory-style discipline (see Figure 4 above). Osborne reported that the purpose of this factory-oriented approach was to "make men act right" (1975/1916, pp. 185-186). Finally, the New Penology emerged and was quickly covered up because it introduced democracy into closed confinement institutions. Based on community membership, this model aspired to help develop better citizens; Osborne's summary was "our standard is citizenship" (in George, 1909, pp. x-xi). Although correctional educators advocated each of these systems during their respective heydays, opportunities for meaningful educational programming were realized in the following order (from least to most): Pennsylvania, Auburn, Reformatory, New Penology.

Prisons as we know them today were an American invention; they emerged after the American Revolution. By contrast with Figure 5, Figure 6 is about institutions today. It shows the rather traditional content of correctional education programs.

**Figure 6:  Correctional Learning Content**

| *Subjective* | *Objective* |
|---|---|
| Cognitive-moral development, values clarification, motivational content, life planning | Basic literacy and numeracy, community resources, current events, math and science |
| *Cultural* | *Social* |
| Multicultural studies, the arts, crafts, cultural education, humanities content | Vocational education, pre-release, health, social education, social sciences |

Close review of the placements of these curriculum components will show that they are associated with the same quadrant principles discussed in reference to Figures 4 and 5. Many additional details can be extrapolated about the work of correctional educators by applying the quadrants perspective.  For starters, the general domains of correctional education activity can be presented for discussion, as in Figure 7.

**Figure 7: Domains of Correctional Education**

| *Subjective*<br><br>RATIONALE FOR THE WORK | *Objective*<br><br>CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION |
|---|---|
| *Cultural*<br><br>PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY | *Social*<br><br>ADMINISTRATION |

In Figure 7 the rationale for the work is portrayed as a subjective (UL) phenomenon.  Correctional education is uniquely concerned with rationale—a situation that should be expected whenever people are removed from their families and normal settings.  They tend to focus on the need to understand what happened to them and why.  Working in confined settings also prompts many staff to look for the meaning in their everyday interactions.  This combined inmate and staff effect tends to make prisons and juvenile facilities places where many people are more concerned about why things happened to them than what actually happened.  For example, a person who is stabbed in a prison might fixate on why it happened.  This rationale-oriented emphasis is one of the factors that make correctional education a unique field of education.

Every field of education has a unique emphasis:  special education is teaching/learning strategy oriented, elementary education is socialization-oriented, secondary education is qualifications-oriented, vocational education is skills/competencies-oriented.  The emphasis of correctional education is on the search for meaning or rationale, but it is also an eclectic discipline:  in addition to its own emphasis, correctional education contains all the other emphases of the related fields.

The objective (UR) quadrant is the domain of classroom instruction. This is the arena that should be the core of our daily work, where teacher expectations—goals and objectives—interact and help shape student learning. Under this heading we associate curriculum, classroom logistics, and activities and interactions.

The social (LR) quadrant is the reality of the socioeconomic system; its validity claim is "functional fit," in part the correspondence between how we earn our living and how we think. It is about resources, both human and material, as reflected most concisely in the budget, the province of administration. Many correctional educators focus mostly on funds assigned to equip and stock their classrooms—this is an accurate but partial view. Correctional educators themselves are essential resources (denoted "personnel" in budgets), as are the physical plant in which they teach and the furniture that occupies those spaces (capital outlay), the procedures by which students come to and leave their classes, and the services of volunteer tutors.

The cultural (LL) quadrant is associated with professional identity. In this domain we consider professional networking, such as occurs through Correctional Education Association conferences, contact with persons at other locations who provide similar services, and the reading and writing of professional journals such as the *Journal of Correctional Education*. Many correctional educators report that the most difficult aspect of their work is resource inadequacy, but evidence suggests it is actually professional isolation that exacerbates all the problems experienced by education providers in this most difficult setting. For example, most of us never encountered a person with a degree in the field of correctional education as opposed to a related field; most correctional educators do not know the authors or titles of the field's definitive

books; even if we encountered it, many of us would not recognize a program that is consistent with the great themes of correctional education.  As a group, correctional educators tend to be poorly prepared for the work, and this condemns us to reinventing the wheel whenever we are challenged by a problem that impacts teaching and learning.

In summary, thinking about the quadrants as representing these four domains can facilitate thinking about correctional education:  rationale for the work (subjective or UL), instruction (objective or UR), administration (social or LR), and professional identity (cultural or LL).  The next displays will help us sort out concepts associated with the quadrants and thereby provide a framework for three different but related perspectives on the same work, those of correctional teachers, students, and administrators.

The Teacher Perspective

When all the ground rules in the previous sections are applied, quadrants on the teacher's perspective of the work of correctional education can be informative.  Figure 8 shows how Wilber's quadrants can be used to concisely portray those themes, through the teacher's perspective.  Immediately following it, Figure 9 gives examples of teacher skill clusters that support those themes or perspectives.

**Figure 8: The Teacher Perspective in Wilberian Quadrants**

| *Subjective*<br><br>PERSONAL RATIONALE<br><br>OR MOTIVATION FOR<br><br>TEACHING PRISONERS | *Objective*<br><br>CLASSROOM LEARNING<br><br>AND TEACHING STRATEGIES |
|---|---|
| *Cultural*<br><br>THE CORRECTIONAL EDUCA-<br><br>TION SCHOOL OF THOUGHT;<br><br>NETWORKING | *Social*<br><br>HUMAN AND MATERIAL<br><br>RESOURCES TO SUPPORT<br><br>CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION |

**Figure 9: Some Teacher Skills in Wilberian Quadrants**

| *Subjective*<br><br>TEACHER'S RATIONALE<br><br>Examples: Develop self-awareness; Sustain a high level of energy over a prolonged period, even in a setting which can be harsh. | *Objective*<br><br>TEACHING ACTIVITIES<br><br>Examples: Implement strategies to stimulate interest in learning and growth; Retain and expand knowledge in relevant content areas. |
|---|---|
| *Cultural*<br><br>PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL OF THOUGHT<br><br>Examples: Establish meaningful goals, and plan in a way that promotes success; Relate well with others; Associate daily experiences with the themes of correctional education. | *Social*<br><br>EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION<br><br>Examples: Assume a responsible, action-oriented, professional role; Manage, produce, and solicit resources effectively. |

Figure 8 engages language very similar to Figure 7, but adjusted to the teacher's perspective. For example, the language previously assigned for the UR objective quadrant in Figure 7 was "Classroom Instruction," but the Figure 8 language is "Teaching Activities" to focus on the classroom teacher's role. The language for the LR social quadrant in Figure 7 was "Administration," but in Figure 8 it is "Educational Administration," to contrast with institutional administration generally. This adjustment announces that the purposes, experiences, and aspirations of institutional school administration should diverge from those of the overall institution. Also, in Figure 7 the general LL cultural quadrant "Professional Identity" term has been substituted by the more precise Figure 8 term "Professional School of Thought." This change leads to the assumption that correctional education is not (never was) monolithic or eternal—there are several logical themes that have been available, several coherent ideological approaches.

The Student Perspective

**Figure 10:  The Student Perspective in Wilberian Quadrants**

| *Subjective*<br><br>REASON FOR  ENROLLMENT | *Objective*<br><br>LEARNING ACTIVITIES |
|---|---|
| *Cultural*<br><br>IDENTIFICATION AS A STUDENT | *Social*<br><br>RESOURCES TO SUPPORT LEARNING |

The shifts between the terms applied in Figures 7 and 10 show relations between the subjective, objective, and social quadrants. However, there is another dimension of the cultural (LL) quadrant that must be emphasized:  whenever inmates identify as students, rather than as criminals or prisoners, substantial progress has been accomplished.

The Education Administrator Perspective

**Figure 11:  The Education Administrator Perspective, in Wilberian Quadrants**

| *Subjective*<br><br>RATIONALE FOR BEING ENGAGED AS AN EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR | *Objective*<br><br>SUPPORT FOR CLASSROOM TEACH-ING AND LEARNING |
| --- | --- |
| *Cultural*<br><br>SUPPORT FOR TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT | *Social*<br><br>BUDGETARY SUPPORT FOR TEACH-ING AND LEARNING |

There are at least two important implications of Figure 11.  First, the display expresses aspirations for how educational administration is supposed to function.  "Good old boys" (and girls) have intervened in the noble profession of correctional education, exacerbating all the impacts of institutional constraints and the problems of the institutional anti-education bias.  Figure 11 shows how correctional education administration can and should function—actual practice is at best mixed or uneven, and intermittent.  This accrues from the combined facts that (a) prison schools tend not to be real schools (they are operated according to different principles), and (b) inmates are not recognized as people (they are perceived as objects rather than subjects).

Second, Figure 11 implies that the real function of education administration should be to support classroom instruction.  Together, Figures 7, 8, 10, and 11 suggested that (a) the priority of students is to learn, (b) the priority of teachers is to facilitate and monitor student learning, and (c) the real priority of administrators should be to support teachers in their work of classroom instruction and to establish a school climate conducive to learning.  These are consistent with a principle identified in the first essay, that the priority of correctional education should be, must be, student learning.  There is

no acceptable alternative to this emphasis; real schools prioritize student learning.  Any other configuration of priorities, overt or covert, is a perversion.

Stated alternatively, when the priority of the institutional school is not student learning, then learning becomes an accident.  Of course, everyone always rejoices when students learn.  But when learning is not the priority it is reduced to a mere accident rather than the underlying, driving purpose.  What other purpose besides learning could a school program have?  In correctional education, many and sundry purposes have dominated:  loyalty to the boss, a desired promotion, a more appropriate salary, etc.

Even institutional security is a flawed priority for the school program.  If teachers and other education personnel emphasize security over learning, then only the same flawed, accidental result can occur.  This does not imply that institutional security should not always be practiced, or that teachers are not part of the overall institutional security team.  Rather, it merely suggests that the purpose of education, regardless of setting, has to be education (teaching and learning).  Any other orientation represents an assault on the aspiration for equality of educational opportunity.  This is precisely why Scudder's "prisoners are people" concept, introduced in the previous, essay is so important.

Any observer who suggests that correctional education administration consistently, or even typically, functions as it is supposed to is either poorly informed or deceitful.  An aspect of this problem related to what Wilber calls "reductionism."

Wilber's Use of the Term "Reductionism"

Wilber called the postmodern world "flatland" because of rampant reductionism.  By this he meant that the hierarchies introduced in the first essay are perceived by many postmodernists to represent absolute inequality, despite the facts that (a) lower levels

inherently have less depth and higher levels more, and (b) hierarchies can function in a healthy way—they are not always involved in unhealthy domination. Thus flatland is a kind of reduction, a superficial or shallow substitute for meaningful or deep experience.

In the first essay reductionism was generally defined as an emphasis on one or more of the quadrants at the expense of the others. Wilber reported that many systems neglect interiors and focus on exteriors, usually because exteriors are easily measured and fit neatly into data cells on standard reports. Correctional educators are directly familiar with this pattern, which happens whenever school program success is measured only by student completions, recidivism statistics, enrollment or attendance, or dollars saved.

Even the standards by which schools are accredited and evaluated are only indirectly concerned with student learning. Those standards address safety measures, facility architecture, paper trail documentation, schedules, job descriptions, and floorplans, etc. It is entirely possible to have a school gain high praise as a bastion of appropriate procedures and timetables, yet be staffed entirely by personnel who share the anti-education bias, devoted merely to pleasing a good old boy administrator who is ideologically opposed to anything that might possibly threaten the boss. In this situation, learning is reduced to an encyclopedic array of variables that are only indirectly related to student gains in attitudes, skills, and knowledge. Wilber's discussion articulates two general types of reductionism, defined according to their impact on the quadrants.

Subtle reductionism, the first type, is when interiors are neglected and exteriors treated as if they were the only things that matter. Since anything that would be anchored to the two left, interior quadrants is not acknowledged, those things are either ignored or

38

established as superficial correlates in the right exterior quadrants. The accreditation example in the previous paragraph fits into this category.

Wilber's "flatland" point is largely about a broad problem that most of us avoid discussing, that the modern West has done remarkably well from an historical perspective in providing things, but that many of us simultaneously experience a terrible lack of spiritual fulfillment. This is summarized in the term "materialistic," and is often associated with our emphasis on science and technology. It seems anomalous that, precisely when such material needs were more generally satisfied, this de-emphasis on things that really matter became such a problem. Correctional educators regularly discuss this concern in their remarks about the appeal of gangs and drugs.

By contrast with subtle reductionism, gross reductionism (the second type) happens when three of the quadrants are ignored, and it is a terrible problem. Ego-centeredness is a good example because egotists tend to recognize their own subjectivity, but treat others as if they were cardboard cutouts rather than real people. There are various terms for this condition, in addition to ego-centered: selfish, narcissistic, sociopathic, criminogenic, authoritarian, young or immature.

This last term applies because of the general sequence of individual development (from ego-centered to militant or ethnocentered, to universal). Since everyone begins at the first level during infancy, most youngsters are walking examples gross reductionism. This observation is why criminality is largely a function of youth--why criminals may be just "late bloomers" or immature. Correctional educators are familiar with these concepts, even though the language used to describe them in this essay may appear new.

There are several ideological camps that have earned reputations for gross reductionism (see Figure 12 below).  Each camp is a problem to correctional educators because closed confinement institutions tend to exacerbate all life's problems, especially when populated by immature persons. The real problem for correctional educators is that gross reductionism sometimes appears attractive to staff just before they experience stress burnout, because it appears to promise simple solutions to complex problems.

So take note:  advocates of gross reductionism tend not to use all the intellectual equipment Nature provided—gross reductionism inhibits effectiveness and makes people act stupid, even though their native ability actually might be impressive.  Four of the best known examples of gross reductionism are presented in Figure 12 to illustrate the point.

**Figure 12:  Examples of Gross Reductionism**

| *Subjective* | *Objective* |
|:---:|:---:|
| FREUDIANISM | BEHAVIORISM |
| *Cultural* | *Social* |
| MILITANCY | MARXISM |

Freudians are notorious for reducing all phenomena to the realm of the emotional, which is represented in Wilber's UL subjective quadrant.  From this perspective, if one has a problem in one's life it is likely associated with some childhood impression or sexual issue, and some variety of therapy might help.  On the other hand, behaviorists are rampant advocates of clinical solutions, which are called the medical model when applied in corrections and the diagnostic-prescriptive approach in education, and introduced in the UR objective quadrant.  They seek to reduce all the glorious functions of the mind to an infamous "black box" which cannot or should not be penetrated; they diagnose and

prescribe the deficits of others (in Wilber's terms the mapmaker is not on the map) and then monitor any progress they can measure.

Marxists and critical theorists proclaim that all human troubles accrue from overt exploitation, which is also known as colonization or marginalization. According to this LR social brand of gross reductionism problems result from imperialist practices by dominating elites who rape the socioeconomic landscape for their own gain, and to further their socioeconomic class status. Finally, LL cultural militants are convinced that only "their people" matter, however that is defined. Usually membership depends on some organic attribute (race, sex or gender orientation, disability; sometimes language); everyone else is treated with a double standard consistent with their unimportance.

Summary

This essay built on the general principles introduced in the previous one, and explained Wilber's quadrants and how they can be used to foster clear thinking and an integral perspective. The essential dimensions of the quadrants were examined: configuration, the names and labels applied in their use, their meaning and relationship, validity claims, etc. The quadrants were used to display key perspectives, such as those of correctional teachers, students, and education administrators. Further, elaboration was provided on the concepts of gross and subtle reductionism, and their relation to the field of correctional education.

The authors hope these brief explanations will open new perspectives for interested correctional education practitioners. If your experiences with Wilber's quadrant system are parallel to ours, his system will confirm many of your own insights about your daily work and its connections to the larger world. As examples, it was

suggested that (a) student learning should be the "glue" that unites students, teachers, and administrators in real, effective schools, (b) most institutional schools do not function like real schools precisely because they do not prioritize student learning, and (c) a root cause of these concerns is that students have been dehumanized, reduced from subjects to objects.

Most readers understood these concepts long before reading this essay; the quadrants merely helped to make them more evident, and confirmed or helped justify them. Wilber's quadrants—half of the "all quadrants, all levels" (AQAL) approach, can be a useful tool for examining our work in the rationale-oriented discipline of correctional education. The next essay will embellish on these ideas and revisit the "levels" part of the approach, in an effort help interested readers navigate through their daily work more easily by applying this invaluable, integral approach.

### References

George, W. (1909). The Junior Republic: Its history and ideals. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Holl, J.M. (1971). Juvenile reform in the Progressive era: William George and the Junior Republic movement. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Osborne, T.M. (1975—reprint of the 1916 edition). *Society and prisons: Some suggestions for a new penology.* Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.

**Integral Correctional Education: Essay Three—Advanced Level**

By Thom Gehring and Margaret Puffer

Abstract

This is the final essay in a series to introduce how Ken Wilber's models and orienting generalizations can be effectively applied to increase correctional educator clarity about the work of teaching and learning in confinement institutions. The first essay provided an overall context for the series by defining correctional education, "integral," and developmental sequences, and then anchored some of these ideas to everyday issues faced by institutional teachers. It ended with a suggestion that many issues could be addressed through recognition that prisoners are people. The second essay focused on Wilber's quadrant schema for fostering an integral approach, and showed how the worldspace associated with the quadrants might appear to correctional teachers, students, and education administrators. It ended with an explanation of subtle and gross reductionism and their impact on the field of correctional education.

The current essay will revisit and expand several of the ideas that were introduced in the other two. Then it will focus on the levels of correctional education experience, to result in an "all quadrants, all levels" (AQAL) approach that can help field-based practitioners solve workplace problems and continue the struggle to gain clarity—thereby diminishing vulnerability to institutional anti-education constraints. The following material discusses the flow of energy through the quadrants, the convergent thinking among major education theorists whose work is relevant to correctional education and the role of intuition in an integral or Wilberian approach. It also introduces various levels of educational change in correctional institutions, and offer some ideas about the attributes of the levels and the aspirations of the correctional education field. The authors hope these essays will confirm and support correctional educators in their especially difficult, intense, and meaningful work of helping interested learners turn around their lives.

A Quick Review of the Material Presented in the First Two Essays

The first essay explained three views of correctional education as being program-based (wherein the highest aspiration is to provide program opportunities to help manage the institution), situational (to provide "regular" education within the institution) and inherent (education helps people who are ready to transform themselves). The inherent definition is an accurate description of the field's highest, deepest, or most mature approach. "Integral" was found to be inclusive, balanced, or comprehensive—an integrative or synthetic approach. In these definitions, as in all developmental or additive sequences or trajectories, the higher definitions subsume and transcend the previous

43

definitions.  For example, the inherent (highest) definition holds that correctional education is an institutional program, and that it is education within the walls.  It also requires that correctional education should be correctional.

These ideas contributed to a description of the Wilberian approach—each of the views people bring to the table contain partial solutions to the problems of the field; it was implied that acceptance of multiple, partial truths will promote an effective repertoire of approaches, more capable of solving problems than any particular approach by itself.  The first essay explored how pro-education and anti-education views interact in institutions to foster and impede teaching and learning, and proposed that a major flaw has been reluctance to admit that prisoners are people.  It implied that as long as the educational needs of confined persons are unmet, community needs will also be unmet.

The second essay explained the quadrants:  subjective, objective, social, and cultural, and how their configuration emerged.  It illustrated how quadrant principles are applied, and went on to show how the quadrants appear to teachers, students, and administrators.  Finally, that essay introduced the concepts of subtle and gross reductionism, and how they obstruct an integral perspective.  The next section of the current essay will introduce the concept of human energy in the correctional education quadrants, and how it tends to flow or be impeded.

Problems Associated with the  Professionalization of Correctional Education

In an earlier essay it was mentioned that—despite a widespread notion that resource inadequacy is the biggest constraint to the field of correctional education—the most intense impediment might actually be a lack of professional awareness.  This lack has been called the correctional educator confused identity problem.

Research indicates that only about eight percent of institutional teachers know the names of the field's greatest contributors or the titles of their books; far fewer have ever read the most salient books on the field (Kistler, 1995; Sauter, 1999). Many correctional educators do not know they are correctional educators. Instead they think they are simply institutional employees, or teachers in some particular content area who happen to teach in a facility. Similarly, the overwhelming majority of correctional educators do not know how the problems they face daily were approached at other times or locations—most do not even know how those problems are currently addressed throughout their own jurisdiction. Only about 60 % of correctional education practitioners know that the Correctional Education Association (CEA) exists, and only about 10% of them are members.

No universities grant terminal degrees, Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s, in correctional education, though at some universities students can fashion interdisciplinary terminal degrees in correctional education if they do not need courses or advisors with expertise in the field. Despite nearly 225 years of history there have only been two definitive books on the field, and the best literature is long out of print. In addition, there has been a massive cover up of much of that literature because it proves that (a) prisoners are people, (b) juvenile facilities and adult prisons can be managed democratically (in contrast to the authoritarian paradigm), and (c) these democratic strategies can be effective in motivating incarcerates to turn their lives around, and helping them attain that goal.

No state has a licensure for correctional educators. There have been three general approaches to correctional teacher preparation over the decades. The first two were rooted in the program-based definition of the field, the second was based on the situational definition, and the third approach is being planned now. Correctional teacher

preparation, to the extent that it exists (how many people do you know with degrees in correctional education?) is regulated by the confused professional identity problem. There is only one comprehensive collection of correctional education literature, and it took longer than a decade of intense effort to collect it.

In summary, correctional educators have not had access to knowledge about correctional education. Because they define correctional education as just another institutional program (and usually prioritize loyalty to the institutional administration rather than student learning), or because they define the field situationally (they are displaced teachers who will likely return to the local schools in the future—sojourners), they are not inclined to pursue that knowledge base. The result of these conditions is that there are no structural incentives for learning about correctional education. Further, anti-education influences, which are inseparable from an anti-theory, anti-intellectual, anti-university perspective, exacerbate these negative tendencies among correctional faculty.

This analysis could proceed ad infinitum. The field of correctional education has backed itself into a situation in which it is difficult to avoid being highly opinionated and poorly informed. Most correctional educators are unaware of all the resources that could be brought to bear to help them solve the intense challenges they face daily.

However, this wretched, vulnerable condition of the field often leads to a wonderful effect. When practitioners are genuinely interested in addressing the challenges—interested in prioritizing student learning and intent on their own personal development—tremendous energy is released as they realize that support actually exists.

In Wilberian terms, this is a cultural energy, about practitioners' internal, collective professional needs. It can be interpreted as a kind of justice since it would

mean that they need not sell out their ideals to be correctional educators, feel alienated from education communities, or remain ignorant about programs and models that have been proven to work in settings similar to the ones in which they work. This realization is compelling: "I am a correctional educator, and my field has experienced more than two hundred years of struggle to improve student learning, even in these ugly, hateful places." In a flash, rejections of history transform into keen, directed interest; networking with colleagues shifts from a peripheral to a central endeavor; and aversion to relevant theory becomes a new, driving interest.

These changes have been experienced by the most unlikely persons. Perhaps the only prerequisite is an open mind, or a warm heart. Just as institutional education should be available so it can help when inmates are ready to learn, so correctional teacher education programs should be available when teachers are ready to scratch the surface and get engaged in the best thinking and programming of the field. For all these reasons, the LL quadrant can be a source of correctional education energy. The only people who discount this energy are those who have not taken the time to learn about their own field.

The Energy Flow Through the Quadrants

Figure 1 (Fig. 7 in the last essay) shows the domains of correctional education:

**Figure 1:  Domains of Correctional Education**

| *Subjective*<br><br>RATIONALE FOR THE WORK | *Objective*<br><br>CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION |
|---|---|
| *Cultural*<br><br>PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY | *Social*<br><br>ADMINISTRATION |

In Figure 1 the energy that has been introduced is associated with the LL, cultural quadrant because it relates to the exemplars of the field and their contributions, professional conferences, journals and other readings, professional associations, and so forth. Collectively, these attributes are the school of thought (SOT) phenomenon; in this case they are fueled by recognition that "I am a correctional educator," a sentiment that carries as much emotional content (enthusiasm) as it does ideas. Wilber would call this burst of SOT interest transrational—better than if it was only rational or only emotional.

Wilber reported that a problem has been that only two approaches were recognized: rational and irrational. Any knowing driven by emotion was seen as irrational and therefore flawed. But he wrote that instead of only two choices, there were actually three: irrational (pre-rational, highly suspect), rational, and transrational (post-rational). Correctional educators might associate the rational capacity with "head" and emotional or intuitive capacity with "heart." Head can be strong, but head and heart together are stronger. The LL SOT phenomenon is an example of head and heart together.

This energy expands to the parameters of the LL quadrant and remains strong. Since the quadrants are merely a map of the territory, the boundaries that separate them are permeable. SOT energy rushes from the LL to the UL subjective quadrant, infusing the correctional educator with a renewed, vital rationale for personal involvement in correctional education. This can be like a sudden conversion process, a transformative shudder that shifts all the individual's perceptions and realigns expectations—the teacher is more willing to pursue the work with personal vigor. Teacher enthusiasm motivates students. It informs the teacher's UR objective quadrant instruction. New strategies are explored, previously unknown historic ideas are worked into the mix of teaching and

learning. New confidence pervades the practitioner's work with increased appreciation for the previously inaccessible sources of support (CEA, well written books on the drama of correctional education, new friends in distant places who pass on a word of encouragement when the immediate situation at any particular worksite looks grim).

Thus, the LL, UL, and UR quadrants resonate with vitality. Everyone benefits: students (whose motivation and opportunities have increased), teacher (whose time at work is much more enjoyable, meaningful, and rewarding), and community safety.

If enlightened education administration is at the site (call it the principal's office), all this energy is further sustained by wise use of LR quadrant human and material resources. The principal hires teachers who prioritize student learning rather than those who will just be loyal, engages in classroom supervision to help faculty improve their teaching, facilitates teacher professional development, and generally makes curricular, personnel, and budgetary decisions that extend and confirm the student learning priority. Thus, the cultural quadrant energy has flowed through all the other quadrants, and is still strong. All the quadrants worked together effectively, integrally. Life is good.

However, it does not always work that way. Often there is an impediment separating classroom instruction and administration, a firewall. It is not required that the principal be enlightened. Or, if the principal at the school is enlightened, that situation might change next week with a personnel transfer. This insecurity accrues from the fact that these are school "programs" rather than real schools (they are not obliged to live up to state statutory and regulatory school criteria). Such problems arise because prisoners are not seen as people—that is why institutional education programs do not have to be real schools. These are obviously political decisions with educational implications.

If the principal is not enlightened an array of obstructions impedes teaching and learning, blocking the otherwise healthy flow of SOT energy through the quadrants. It might be that the fixation on escapes dominates, so more time is directed to counting, recounting, and filing reports than to teaching. Or the principal, dominated by security concerns and anti-education hostility, does not encourage institutional work bosses to let interested inmates to attend class. Or the focus on security results in a lack of computers ("the inmates will just find a way to use them to rip someone off!") or instructional videos ("who knows what will happen in the room when the lights are turned off!") or reliance on donated texts ("no money"); or only large ex-military people as teachers ("those inmates need discipline!"), or only zealous missionary teachers ("those inmates need to find God!"). Almost anything can go wrong in a closed confinement institution.

All these problems may be exacerbated because the state department of education is disinclined to ensure that the statutory/regulatory requirements are implemented because that might expose leaders to criticism—after all, prisoners are not real people, anyway. And so correctional education, which should be at the "life and death" cusp of the human drama, is reduced to a den of thieves, of whom only some are incarcerated.

Educators at a facility with enlightened education leadership should be grateful, but cautious. Conditions could easily shift into reverse. And those without an enlightened principal should tap into the LL SOT to improve their professional lives, even if it might only rehabilitate three of the four quadrants. The bad administration might be replaced tomorrow. The next section introduces five levels of correctional education development, a modified sequence distilled from the nine historical periods that were introduced in the first essay.

50

Levels of Correctional Education

**Figure 2: Five Levels of Correctional Education in History**

| Level | Implementation Period in North America **and Attributes** |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | 1787 (first Sabbath school—Philadelphia); no longer officially operational. <br><br> **Level 1 (Sabbath school) correctional education was marked by a chaotic UL rationale for correctional education, UR reliance on volunteer tutors, LR Sunday school administration, and LL religious zeal professional identity.** |
| 2 | 1876 (Brockway's program at NY State's Elmira Reformatory) to the present. <br><br> **Level 2 (Traditional) correctional education is characterized by a "no change possible" UL rationale, UR instructional reliance on classroom discipline, a decentralized LR administration, and an LL "institutional staff only" approach to professional identity.** |
| 3 | 1930 (first bureaus in Federal Bureau of Prisons and NY State) to the present. <br><br> **Level 3 (Transitional) correctional education is characterized by a dialectical (conflict-oriented) UL rationale, a UR classroom management instructional paradigm, a bureau (consultative) model of LR administration, and a "related fields" pattern of LL professional identity.** |
| 4 | False start—1909 to 1923 (NJ's first correctional School district). <br><br> 1969 (Texas' and Connecticut's first correctional school districts) to the present. <br><br> **Level 4 (Correctional School District—CSD) correctional education consists of a Kuhnian (paradigm change) UL rationale, a developmental (cognitive-moral) approach to UR instruction, the CSD pattern of LR administration; teachers identify professionally (LL) as correctional educators.** |
| 5 | 1895 (George's Junior Republic established) to 1929 (Mutual Welfare League—Sing Sing's democratic management capability—outlawed); 1974 (Ayers'—and later Duguid's—Canadian postsecondary program fully operational) to 1993 (Canadian Federal Government stopped funding the program). <br><br> **Level 5 (Integral) correctional education, when it is evident, was characterized by what would now be called a Wilberian approach to UL rationale, a reciprocal model of UR classroom instruction, an integral approach to LR administration, and a universal citizenship pattern of LL professional identity.** |

The Figure 2 level concepts are situated in Figure 3 and subsequently explained.

**Figure 3:  An AQAL Model of Systemwide Correctional Education**

| *Subjective (UL)* | *Objective (UR)* |
|---|---|
| PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT RATIONALE | CLASSROOM OUTCOMES SUMMARY |
| Wilberian 5 | 5 Reciprocity |
| * | * |
| Kuhnian 4 | 4 Development |
| * | * |
| Dialectical 3 | 3 Management |
| * | * |
| No Change 2 | 2 Discipline |
| * | * |
| Chaos 1 | 1 Monitorial Method |
| Religious Zeal 1 | 1 Sabbath school |
| * | * |
| Institutional Staff Only 2 | 2 Traditional/Decentralized |
| * | * |
| Related Disciplines 3 | 3 Transitional/Bureau |
| * | * |
| Correctional Education 4 | 4Correctional School Dist |
| * | * |
| Universal Citizenship 5 | 5 Integral Education |
| PATTERN OF PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY | ADMINISTRATIVE CONFIGURATION |
| *Cultural (LL)* | *Social (LR)* |

The principles summarized in Figure 3 are explained according to levels in the next section.  Figure 3 is a systemwide model; it is intended to report and anticipate jurisdictionwide or systemwide changes rather than changes in individual classrooms or particular schools within a system.  Figure 3 radiates out from the center.  For example, all the highlights of Level 1 correctional education systems were generally experienced

together (chaos, monitorial method, Sabbath school, religious zeal). Then all the Level 2 highlights (no change, discipline, traditional/decentralized, institutional staff only), etc.

Figure 3 is a developmental sequence, an example of the sequences introduced in the first two essays. The general pattern and flow of the quadrants is the same as was introduced in the second and current essays. Two Figure 3 nuances relate to the UL subjective (rationale) and LR social (administrative) quadrants. Essentially, the subjective quadrant in Figure 3 emphasizes the view of how change unfolds in the correctional setting, especially educational change in confinement institutions. This emphasis reflects three related concepts that were explained in the first essay: the transformational imperative, social education hegemony, and the "attitudes, skills, and knowledge" priority (reverse of the local schools). The other nuance, in the social quadrant, is the emphasis on the administrative configuration of correctional education service delivery. Essentially, the social quadrant highlights the extent that educators are in charge of educational decisions at that particular step on the ladder—particularly decisions regarding curriculum, education personnel, and the education budget.

Meaningful systemwide change is generally realized uniformly, often in response to improved systemwide LR administrative leadership. Figure 3 is therefore based on three applicable patterns. First, although uneven change or improvement may be realized in especially remote places (usually removed from the attention of systemwide supervisors), the systemwide changes for which the model is designed tend to be experienced almost simultaneously; systems tend to advance or retreat as single units.

Second, some systemwide improvements cannot be realized without the preliminary step of systemwide improvements in administrative configuration. For

example, it is unlikely that all the institutional schools in a system could lurch forward from a behavioral psychology base for instruction (in the UR objective quadrant) to a cognitive-moral psychology base without strong, enlightened central office education administration.  Improvements of this magnitude nearly always require that educational decisions (again, in curricula, education personnel, and the education budget) be preceded by assigning educators to education administration roles (the specific LR social approach is known as the correctional school district—Level 4).  In other words, meaningful curricular improvement cannot usually be attained in a Level 3 educational administration in which educators lack firm authority over educational decisions.  The Level 3 system cannot get there, cannot implement such curriculum improvements systemwide, without first being transformed into a Level 4 correctional school district.

Finally, although Level 1 correctional education is discussed in the following narrative, it is officially defunct, a result of the American peoples' separation of church and state aspiration.  This does not mean there are no publicly funded correctional education schools with pictures of Jesus placed prominently in every classroom; nor is it to ignore the fact that many such schools have official gospel choir groups that are largely employed singing to visitors; nor that there are no outside volunteers (and now faith-based, publicly funded services from outside agencies) who share a missionary view.  Rather, it is merely to report that these phenomena are currently anomalous, contrary to the general trajectory of official practice in most jurisdictions.

In summary, the three guiding Figure 3 principles are that (a) the model addresses systemwide concerns and is not designed for application in smaller units, (b) for some especially meaningful improvements the rule is that "you can't get there from here;" the

improvements cannot be approached seriously unless educators are first put in charge of educational decisions, and (c) Level 1 correctional education has ceased to be.  Having noted these caveats, we can now proceed to an introductory discussion of how correctional education looks from the various steps on this AQAL ladder.

Level 1 Correctional Education

The Sunday school prototype was invented by an English correctional educator named Robert Raikes, at Gloucester in 1781 (Carpenter, 1970/1851, pp. 111-112).  It was specifically designed "to educate and uplift the besotted, ignorant multitude and their children" (Rule, 1920, p. 136).  The purpose of Sunday schools was to help poor people acquire literacy, so they could read the Bible and be saved for Christ.  The Sunday school movement gained worldwide attention during the first half of the imperialist 19th century.

In confinement institutions, Sunday schools were known as Sabbath schools. They were organized by chaplains, largely because no one else cared if the prisoners learned to read.  The heyday of the Sabbath school model was 1787-1875.  Typically chaplains were volunteers, and they only had time to come into the facility after all their other duties were completed, on Sunday night.  Lighting was a terrible problem in those institutions; usually the Bible was the only book that was not contraband; individualized instruction (cell study) was the general pattern of service delivery. Perhaps the greatest innovations during this period were (a) the recruitment of community literacy volunteers, usually theological school students, and (b) tutor continuity to particular inmates, a vast improvement over the earlier system of rotating the tutors among the inmates each week.

The various attributes of Sabbath school (Level 1) correctional education were coherent.  In the UL subjective quadrant, chaplain impulsivity was a continuing problem,

essentially because the chaplain did what he wanted (chaos), since few others on the staff really cared about the activity.  In the UR objective quadrant the monitorial (tutor) method predominated.  The administrative configuration (LR social) was that of any other Sunday school.  And the Sabbath school SOT (LL cultural) was permeated with religious zeal.  Learning progress was measured by Bible verses memorized and recited; missionary types were recruited as tutors; a major theme was student self reports of religious conversions and announcements that they would cease being inebriated after release.  As noted earlier, the dynamics of Level 1 Sabbath schools, which are portrayed in Figure 4 below, are now officially defunct in the United States, despite some remnants in volunteer programs.

**Figure 4:  Level 1 Correctional Education**

| *Subjective (UL)* | *Objective (UR*) |
|---|---|
| PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT RATIONALE<br><br>5<br>  4<br>    3<br>      2<br>        Chaos 1 | CLASSROOM OUTCOMES SUMMARY<br><br>5<br>  4<br>    3<br>  2<br>1 Monitorial Method |
| Religious Zeal 1<br>  2<br>    3<br>  4<br>5<br><br>PATTERN OF PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY<br><br>*Cultural (LL)* | 1 Sabbath school<br>  2<br>    3<br>      4<br>        5<br><br>ADMINISTRATIVE CONFIGURATION<br><br>*Social (LR)* |

<u>Level 2 Correctional Education</u>

The attributes of Level 2 are introduced below.

**Figure 5:  Level 2 Correctional Education**

| *Subjective (UL)* | *Objective (UR)* |
|---|---|
| PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT RATIONALE<br><br>5<br>4<br>3<br>No Change 2<br>1 | CLASSROOM OUTCOMES SUMMARY<br><br>5<br>4<br>3<br>2 Discipline<br>1 |
| 1<br>Institutional Staff Only 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br><br>PATTERN OF PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY<br><br>*Cultural (LL)* | 1<br>2 Traditional/Decentralized<br>3<br>4<br>5<br><br>ADMINISTRATIVE CONFIGURATION<br><br>*Social (LR)* |

Level 2 correctional educators usually assume that the authoritarian dynamics of the institution are morally correct, eternal, and monolithic—"no change" is possible.  With its proclamation that there is nothing new under the sun, this UL subjective rationale statement flies in the face of the transformational imperative.  In the UR objective quadrant the need for decorum and discipline abounds; according to this perspective it is more important that the class is orderly than that they necessarily learn anything.  The LR social/administrative configuration is alternatively described as traditional or decentralized.  This means that the warden or institutional superintendent is in charge of educational decisions (curriculum, personnel, budget).  The warden hires the principal

and the teachers, or sometimes the warden hires the principal and the principal implements the warden's guidelines in hiring teachers.

Usually all this means that the warden's educational ideology becomes the school's official or unofficial ideology. If the warden thinks that only vocational education makes sense for inmates, the entire school program may consist of vocational learning opportunities. If he thinks it would be great to have a large postsecondary program that will look good to outsiders, that is what happens. If, on the contrary, he thinks only the most basic academic learning opportunities are relevant for these inmates, a program like a local school elementary system emerges and is fully funded. The problem in all this, of course, is that the warden is typically not a qualified educator, or enlightened about education. If he was prepared as an educator, usually there are so many responsibilities on his plate that he cannot be closely involved in the program.

In the LL cultural quadrant, the correctional educator SOT is dominated by the "institutional staff only" pattern. Staff loyalty is usually to the warden and the institution, not to the education program, so they function more like baby sitters in the classrooms than like teachers, and they do not seem to care if they get reassigned to another unit within the institution. In general, Level 2 is remarkably primitive. Most correctional education in the United States at the turn of the 21$^{st}$ century is Level 2 or Level 3.

Level 3 Correctional Education

Level 3 correctional teachers tend to be conformists, and to believe that change unfolds through contradictory forces at work within the institution. The UL subjective quadrant is therefore labeled dialectical, because dialectics are seen to fuel change. In this view the universe is perceived to be dominated by opposite or dualist forces: good

58

and bad; light and darkness; us and them; this and that; oppositional interests of the sexes, races, or socioeconomic classes… These forces are in constant turmoil and recombination. This is the approach developed by Aristotle, Hegel, and Marx (thesis, antithesis, synthesis, though teachers are often not well versed in the history and philosophy of it all) adapted to education in the confined setting.

In the UR objective quadrant classroom management now becomes prominent. This approach is an improvement over the Level 2 focus on discipline, but management and instruction are really quite different, with divergent results on learning. Classroom management is typically implemented so various, individualized lessons can be pursued in the same space, at the same time, under the supervision of the same teacher. It is often called the IPI approach, individually prescribed instruction. This system can be used to great advantage. Unfortunately, in Level 3 it is often seen as a strategy to (a) separate the inmates so the teacher can dominate, and (b) make the room appear settled and quiet for the eyes of institutional staff. In the LL cultural quadrant, teachers tend to identify professionally as teachers, but of the various curricular areas rather than of correctional students (reading, math, the various trades, and so forth).

The Level 3 LR social quadrant is dominated by the transitional/bureau pattern of administrative configuration. It is transitional because it sometimes leads to a Level 4 administrative configuration. The first bureau was implemented in the Federal Bureau of Prisons by assistant director Austin MacCormick during the early 1930s, and about the same time in New York State by governor Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a friend of MacCormick's. The change from the Level 2 decentralized approach to the Level 3 bureau was quickened by the realization that some centralizing influence was needed—

59

Depression era institutional populations were high, special and vocational education programming was expanding rapidly, and the need for some sort of corrections-specific teacher preservice or inservice was recognized. A cadre of educational experts was therefore assigned to the system central office (Albany in NY; Washington, D.C. in the Federal system) to recommend in matters educational (curriculum, personnel, budget). This centralizing influence was intended to put some useful, uniform guidelines in place.

However, the system worked only intermittently, often depending on the personalities of the central office educators. The problem was that these new central office incumbents functioned as supervisors or consultants, without direct line authority to implement their plans systemwide. If a warden agreed to the improvements, everything usually went well at that site, but if the warden disagreed, he could simply tell the central office supervisor(s) not to interfere at his institution. As it played out, implementation of the bureau model was generally seen as a boon for educators because it represented an improvement in their authority over educational matters. Nevertheless, the results were very mixed. The Level 3 administrative configuration was innovative when it originally appeared in the 1930s, but it is a throwback today.

Level 3 included the enduring basic/marketable skills paradigm that was introduced near the end of the 19th century; it remains alive and well today. It was predated by Zebulon Brockway's work at the Detroit House of Correction during the 1860s, and implemented with great fanfare at New York State's Elmira Reformatory under his guidance during the 1870s, '80s, and '90s. Level 3 continued to be seen as the great innovation in correctional education until the late 1960s, and it still predominates. The quadrant terms that describe it appear in Figure 6.

**Figure 6: Level 3 Correctional Education**

| *Subjective (UL)*<br><br>PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT<br>RATIONALE<br><br>5<br>4<br>Dialectical 3<br>2<br>1 | *Objective (UR)*<br><br>CLASSROOM OUTCOMES<br>SUMMARY<br><br>5<br>4<br>3 Management<br>2<br>1 |
|---|---|
| 1<br>2<br>Related Disciplines 3<br>4<br>5<br><br>PATTERN OF PROFESSIONAL<br>IDENTITY<br><br>*Cultural (LL)* | 1<br>2<br>3 Transitional/Bureau<br>4<br>5<br><br>ADMINISTRATIVE<br>CONFIGURATION<br><br>*Social (LR)* |

Level 4 Correctional Education

Level 4, which has been proven to be far more effective than Level 3, is what most North American correctional educators aspire to implement. It is seen as the state of the art model. However, states are not rushing to implement Level 4 correctional education, a point which suggests decisions in correctional education are not always made rationally.

In the UL rationale or subjective quadrant Level 4 teachers apply a Kuhnian view of change, dominated by expectations about how ideas in circulation can change periodically through new paradigms. Thomas Kuhn announced this approach in his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* book, which has become increasingly popular since the early 1970s. Kuhn reported that every paradigm was flawed; the problems that the

paradigm could not solve were called anomalies.  At some point the community of practitioners becomes disenchanted with the paradigm because of these anomalies, and eventually moved on to a new paradigm, perceived to solve the most pressing anomalies and as many other problems as possible.  For our current purpose the most salient dimension of this approach to change is that it results from dialogue by qualified experts. Compared to Level 1 chaos, Level 2 no change, and Level 3 us/them dialectics, Level 4 Kuhnian/paradigmatic change is seen as a welcome improvement.

The Level 4 UR objective approach to teaching and learning is called developmental.  First, this term implies that teaching and learning are taking place (they were not necessary operational in the religiously-oriented Level 1 monitorial/tutorial method, Level 2 discipline, or Level 3 classroom management).  Second, the developmental approach means that the "attitudes, skills, knowledge" (reverse) priority is being pursued.  Development implies a host of cognitive-moral, humanistic dimensions—it is developmental in the sense of developmental sequences, which have been a focus of these essays.

The LR social administrative configuration is called the correctional school district (CSD), the hallmark of Level 4.  Released from the traditional tie to the warden's authority which still dominated the Level 3 bureau, the CSD represents a "real schools" approach, in that educators are in charge of educational decisions (curriculum, personnel, budget).  In the U.S., real schools are characterized by standards enshrined in statute and regulation and most often enforced through the state education department, professionalism—genuine educator qualifications from top to bottom and a system of authority in which educators report to other educators (rather than to a jailer), a strong

fiscal management system capable of taking in a wide range of grants and contracts, and community involvement through a school board. In all these issues, the true test of whether a CSD exists is the state department of education: if the state department recognizes publicly that the correctional education service delivery system has all the rights and obligations of an LEA (local education agency—a school district), then the system is a CSD.

Readers should not assume that CSDs are independent from the corrections system in all things. That would neither be possible nor desirable. Rather the CSD enjoys a semi-independence—again, in the three areas of curriculum, personnel, and budget. CSD teachers report to their site principal, who reports to the systemwide superintendent of education in the system's central office for matters related to curriculum, the hiring/firing/promotion of education personnel, and use of funds earmarked for education. The warden remains responsible for capital outlay and the physical plant, institutional security, inmate traffic, and all the rest that is not particularly the province of education. In this respect the principal sometimes has two administrators, the systemwide superintendent of education for matters related to education (curriculum, personnel, budget), and the institutional warden or superintendent for matters related to the confinement setting other than education. On the whole, this approach works very well, and is currently operational in approximately 21 states.

As a result of this massive change in administrative configuration, correctional educators are free to identify professionally with the field of correctional education in the LL cultural quadrant. This correctional education SOT is a powerful force, as explained earlier in this essay. The Level 4 quadrants are displayed in Figure 7.

**Figure 7:  Level 4 Correctional Education**

| Subjective (UL) | Objective (UR) |
|---|---|
| PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT RATIONALE<br><br>5<br>Kuhnian 4<br>3<br>2<br>1 | CLASSROOM OUTCOMES SUMMARY<br><br>5<br>4 Development<br>3<br>2<br>1 |
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>Correctional Education 4<br>5<br><br>PATTERN OF PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY<br><br>Cultural (LL) | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 Correctional School Dist<br>5<br><br>ADMINISTRATIVE CONFIGURATION<br><br>Social (LR) |

Most correctional educators believe that the Level 4 CSD represents the highest stage of development that can be realized by a system.  However, the literature is replete with evidence of a higher stage, though it has only appeared intermittently.  That is the subject of the next section.

Level 5 Correctional Education

Whenever Level 5 has occurred, it has been an anomaly.  The barriers that inhibit Level 5 are not physical but perceptual, and therefore permeable.  Any system can enter Level 5 whenever the realization that prisoners are people is accepted systemwide.

The primary heroes of Level 5 integral or democratic correctional education were William George, Thomas Mott Osborne, and Katherine Bement Davis (all in New York State), Anton Makarenko (in the Ukraine, Soviet Union), and Doug Ayers and Stephen

Duguid (in British Columbia, Canada). Each of them managed institutional programs

and contributed to the literature: George and Makarenko for juvenile offenders, Osborne,

and Ayers and Duguid, for confined male prisoners; and Davis for confined female

prisoners. Each of these leaders was idealistic and open-minded, and also savvy about

the earthy realities of politics. Some of them were inhibited by the social and cultural

orders of their context.

Interested readers may consult George's professional autobiography (1909), and

Tannenbaum's political biography of Osborne's prison reform career (1933—it has an

Introduction by Franklin Delano Roosevelt). Additional resources are Freedman's

interpretation of the history of women's reformatories (1981), Makarenko's *Road to Life*

trilogy, and Gehring and Eggleston's statement on the Canadian democratic paradigm

(1986).

Each Level 5 leader applied the transrational approach that was introduced above:

rationality tempered with intuition. Osborne even reported that he would not put together

a theory to explain why prisons could be managed effectively through the democratic

approach. He believed that any such theory would eventually "bump into a fact" and be

disproved (1924, pp. 44-49), despite the fact that he had managed three different

maximum security prisons himself, precisely by putting elected inmates in charge.

Ultimately, the anomaly could not be disproved (it had already happened); that is why it

was covered up (the "hidden heritage"). Overall, the issue of democratic success is very

similar to the "self-fulfilling prophecy" familiar to correctional educators in the

classroom. It depends on a leap of consciousness that will be discussed below, although

that leap would certainly be facilitated if it occurred in a modern Level 4 CSD.  For now, we will continue our tour around the quadrants, this time in Figure 8.

**Figure 8:  Level 5 Correctional Education**

| *Subjective (UL)*<br><br>PERSONAL ENGAGEMENT<br>RATIONALE<br><br>Wilberian 5<br>4<br>3<br>2<br>1 | *Objective (UR*)<br><br>CLASSROOM OUTCOMES<br>SUMMARY<br><br>5 Reciprocity<br>4<br>3<br>2<br>1 |
|---|---|
| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>Universal Citizenship 5<br><br>PATTERN OF PROFESSIONAL<br>IDENTITY<br><br>*Cultural (LL)* | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5 Integral Education<br><br>ADMINISTRATIVE<br>CONFIGURATION<br><br>*Social (LR)* |

The UL subjective quadrant was characterized by clarity of thought—teacher confidence, inherent feelings of personal security, and a mature or social activist approach.  These teachers' purpose was to transform the world and to help students who were interested in transforming their personal situations.  They were prison reformers in the truest sense, focusing on the <u>correcti</u>onal purpose of transforming the institution into a school, consistent with the principle of social education hegemony.  The term applied herein to that kind of thinking is "Wilberian."

This confidence and enthusiasm informs classroom practice in the UR objective quadrant in a profound way—through reciprocity (the Golden Rule, karma, "what goes

around comes around"). Level 5 correctional teachers were hooked on learning and development themselves, a condition they shared with the students in their class. Thus, the prevailing characteristic of teaching and learning was "teacher as student and student as teacher," a diminishment of the traditional, one-way pattern of classroom interaction. Although it predates them, this approach was consistent with Freire's "problem-posing method," Kohlberg's postconventional interactions, and Piaget's formal operations. The boundaries of the classroom and its participants were expansive.

The milieu permeated the LR social quadrant, though not necessarily through a structure that can be labeled an administrative configuration. Essentially, Level 5 personnel found ways of negotiating, overcoming, or transcending the barriers that separated "inside" from "outside," in a sense neutralizing the impact of the walls or compound. Visitors from outside communities frequently appeared in the school and at school activities, often escorted by inmate guides; external resources (money, books, exhibits, cultural services; human resources such as volunteers) passed in and out of the school regularly, almost as if the physical boundaries were entirely permeable.

The LL cultural quadrant was marked by a truly democratic emphasis, even in a setting that was designed to be repressive. Students and teachers had opportunities to shape school policies, frequently through elected bodies with structural safeguards to delineate their powers and constraints. Further, the unstated outcome of all teacher/ student interactions was to foster a universalist or worldcentric orientation—the opposite of the egocentric "do your own time" approach that dominates Levels 2 and 3.

The result of all this was that Level 5 schools were havens for intellectual and moral development, with activities tailored for those from the lowest to the very highest

level of ability, achievement, and experience.  The next section suggests how Level 5 came to be.

<u>Leaps of Consciousness</u>

The thing that inhibits us from making the leap to Level 5, the only reason we are constrained by our self-fulfilling prophecy, is that we expect prisoners to act in clever, evil, manipulative ways.  So did the Level 5 leaders—except, they also intuitively knew that, when trusted as a group, the same inmates would rise to the occasion.

Why?  One part of the answer is because they were each capable of much more than was traditionally expected of them, as implied in Wilber's center of gravity concept.  This is the idea that each of us has multiple "selves" and abilities; it is just the average among them that we expect to become manifest.  For example, one person might be a moral reprobate, an intellectual genius, and of "average" emotional proclivities.  But when we encounter that person we interact with one personality, not three.  The person's attributes appear to be the confluence of the three.  We encounter that person's "center of gravity," the result of those three selves working together, in one person.

Another part of the answer is that institutions can be structured to bring out the best or the worst in people.  The overwhelming record of prisons and juvenile facilities is that they have tended to bring out the worst.  However, consistent with the center of gravity approach, institutions can be structured to bring out the best.  Apparently, the advantage of the Wilberian/reciprocal/integral/universal Level 5 milieu is its ability to bring out the higher selves of inmates, thereby subverting the lower selves.  All this has been proven to work—more than 20 times, in seven nations—but it requires a transrational leap of consciousness.

Sorokin was a sociologist who proclaimed that "The only source of…self-evident…postulates and axioms is intuition" (1985, p. 684). If we consider it seriously, we will realize the truth of Sorokin's claim.

One never sees the term Eureka! (I have found it!) without the exclamation point that signifies an intuitive "aha." Eureka! transcends rationality, without negating rationality. Einstein, who said that he could not have discovered relatively through knowledge alone, conceived the theory while stepping on a trolley. Why? Perhaps because he had long been immersed in the issues, and then somehow, when his mind was at rest, it all came together. Epiphany seems to come from nowhere, or from everywhere—the important element for us is that it emerges intuitively.

Sorokin called it "mystic intuition" (1985, p. 684). Those who are interested should consult his great book, pp. 684-692 for various examples of this principle in action. To identify how it applied in correctional education, we turn to Level 5 exemplars George and Osborne, who became aware intuitively that democratic management principles could be applied "inside."

> Suddenly George was jolted…he later wrote 'Our Glorious
> [American] Republic in miniature—a Junior Republic—and
> I recall shouting at the top of my voice, I have it—I have it—
> I have it; and like a school boy I ran as fast as my legs could
> carry me, and told my mother. I felt it to have been a God-
> given idea.' (George, in Holl, 1971, p. 100).

Osborne's sentiment was similar when he wrote about prison democracy. We can almost hear him singing in joy with the words

> …the thing works…the thing works….In Auburn prison for
> more than two years, in Sing Sing prison for more than a
> year, the new system has been in operation and the thing
> works. (Osborne, 1975/1916, pp. 222-233; emphasis in
> original).

For our current purposes, however, we need only focus on the lip service Americans give to democracy, even though our national politics only apply that concept in very safe or modest ways; it is rarely evident in our workplaces and schools, almost never in our families and churches. Certainly, in most institutions, genuine democracy is far a field from the normal, everyday reality. Nevertheless, we are all—inmates and staff alike—familiar with democratic theory. From this perspective, the leap from levels 2 to 5 is less dramatic than it first appears. We can leap toward our aspirations precisely because we are so familiar with the theory, despite the fact that the theory is usually expressed only as lip service. As predicted by Wilber's center of gravity concept, we are all free to express our highest selves, if only given useful objective, social, and cultural prompts. If we experienced those prompts, if we moved the field of correctional education in the direction of our aspirations, our work might be quite a bit different than it has today.

A Few Professional Aspirations of the Field of Correctional Education

Most correctional education problems fit the theme of former California warden Kenyon Scudder: prisoners are not recognized as people, and therefore they do not deserve educational services. Within the institutions this problem is called the anti-education bias. Integral Correctional Education (ICE) proposes several partial solutions to this problem.

● Prison schools should be "real schools," with all the statutory and regulatory rights and obligations of other schools.

● Although correctional education is offered in confinement institutions, it is a field of education rather than of criminology or criminal justice.

● Correctional education has structural links with prison management, but is historically and conceptually more closely aligned with prison reform than with prison management

70

(it is part of the effort to reform prisons and prisoners).

● A combination of pedagogy (the education of children) and andragogy (the education of adults) is appropriate for confined students, along a continuum on which learning activities can be individualized to help meet the personal needs of each student.

• The traditional "knowledge, skills, and attitudes" formula of local schooling should be reversed—"attitudes, skills, and knowledge."  Alternatively, this is the transformational imperative ("it don't mean a thing if it ain't transformational—for educators as well as learners"), or social education hegemony (the purpose of all institutional programming should be social or reintegrative education).

• Institutional education can be reciprocal rather than unilateral—"teacher as student and student as teacher."

● The "hidden heritage" of prison reform and correctional education should be made accessible to institutional teachers (the literature on democratic prison programming implemented to foster social learning in prisons/juvenile institutions—the literature that was deliberately "covered up" by prison authorities over the last century.)

• Inmate learners are capable of assuming responsibility for aspects of their own education.

• The best civilian teachers are required to teach the worst students (certified/ credentialed according to regular state department of education standards, with specialized teacher education experiences tailored for correctional educators); teacher enthusiasm helps fuel student enthusiasm for learning.

• Educators should be responsible for educational decisions rather than jailers, especially in the areas of curriculum, budgeting education funds, and personnel— hiring and firing of educators.

● Correctional education curricula should be driven by relevant research, not by the whims of top decision-makers.

Summary, Conclusion, and Some Information about ICE

These three essays have begun the process of introducing Wilberian thought to

interested readers.  The first essay focused on general concepts, the second on the

quadrants, and the third on introducing an all quadrants, all levels (AQAL), explanatory

model of correctional education.  That model can be used to evaluate and report on the

progress and problems of correctional education, and it is capable of explaining and predicting advances and retreats in the development of correctional education systems.

Wilber's books (there are over 20) are replete with concepts, models, and approaches that have not been considered in the three essays. The books are all in print, accessible to anyone who wants to take the time to study and learn. However, they do not discuss anything related specifically to correctional education. Hence the establishment of ICE, Integral Correctional Education, a domain branch of Integral Institute (II), the umbrella organization Wilber established to apply integral, orienting generalizations to various, specific fields or disciplines.

Integral Correctional Education is the only operational branch of II in a field of education. Interested persons can learn more about ICE by contacting Thom Gehring, at (909) 537-5653, or at tgehring@csusb.edu; or Margaret Puffer at mjpuffer@mol.net . Thom directs the Center for the Study of Correctional Education (CSCE) at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) and Margaret is a senior fellow of the Center.

Integral Correctional Education has many organizational links. It is

● A branch or domain of Integral Institute, the organization which disseminates the integral message throughout the various professional disciplines, occupations, or schools of thought.

● ICE is also a Special Interest Group (SIG) of the International Correctional Education Association (CEA—this SIG was formed at the Baltimore 2004 CEA conference).

● ICE is an initiative of the CSCE, which is located at CSUSB. The Center has formal, global alliances with the

  • National Institute for Correctional Education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania,

  • International Forum for the Study of Education in Penal Systems,

  • Australia CEA,

72

• Japan CEA,

• European Prison Education Association, and

• New Zealand CEA.

● The Center also has formal local alliances with

• Tri-County CEA (TCCEA—Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, California),

• Prison Reform/Correctional Education Research Discussion Group, which meets in conjunction with TCCEA, and

• Region VII CEA (California, Arizona, Hawaii, Nevada, and the nation of Mexico).

● It has formal and informal alliances with the independent correctional education associations in North America—those which are not components of the CEA:

• In Virginia, with the Department of Correctional Education Association,

• In Alberta, with the Alberta Correctional Education Association, and

• In Arizona, with the Arizona Correctional Education Association.

The Center also has strong working relationships with the California Youth Authority and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Thus, ICE members are uniquely positioned to access systems that provide correctional education services to confined learners, as well as the researchers and scholars who support those systems. On the CSUSB campus, the Center is working to develop a new Department of Transformational Education, with masters and articulated/joint Ph.D. degrees in correctional and alternative education.

# References

Carpenter, M.  (1970/1851).  *Reformatory schools for the  Children of the perishing and dangerous classes and for  Juvenile offenders*.  Montclair, New Jersey:  Patterson Smith.

Freedman, E.  (1981).  *Their sister's keepers:  Women's  Prison reform in America, 1830-1930*.  Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gehring, T., and Eggleston, C.  (June, 1986).  Correctional education paradigms in the United States and Canada.  *Journal of Correctional Education*.

George, W.  (1909).  The Junior Republic:  Its history and ideals.  New York:  D. Appleton and Company

Holl, J.M.  (1971).  Juvenile reform in the Progressive era:  William George and the Junior Republic movement.  Ithaca, New York:  Cornell University Press.

Kistler, K.  (1995). *A study to establish the need for a correctional-specific professional development curriculum*. Los Angeles, California:  Pepperdine University (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation).

Kuhn, T.S.  (1970).  *The structure of scientific revolutions:  Second edition, enlarged.  Chicago: University of Chicago.*

Makarenko, A.S.  (1973).  *The road to life:  An epic in education*.  New York:  Oriole.  (Three volume set.)

Osborne, T.M. (1975/1916).  *Society and prisons:  Some suggestions for a new penology*.  Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.

Osborne, T.M.  (1924).  *Within prison walls*.  New York:  D. Appleton.

Rule, L.V.  (probably 1920).  *The city of dead souls and how it was made alive again*.  Louisville:  Kentucky Printshop.

Sauter, R.  (1999).  *A study to identify the special concerns and curricular needs of the professional correctional educator of youthful offenders*.  Los Angeles, California:  Pepperdine University (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation).

Sorokin, P.  (1985).  *Social and cultural dynamics:  A study of change in major systems of art, truth, ethics, law,  and social relationships*.  New Brunswick, New Jersey:  Transaction Books.

Tannenbaum, F.  (1933).  *Osborne of Sing Sing*.  Chapel Hill:  University of North Carolina Press.

**Biographical Sketches of the Authors**

Thom Gehring is co-founder (with Ms. Margaret Puffer) and domain host of Integral Correctional Education, which is a branch of Integral Institute and a Correctional Education Association Special Interest Group. He has been a correctional educator since 1972, in NJ, VA, NY, CA, and in other systems as a consultant. He has served as a teacher, counselor, researcher, administrator, and professor. Originally prepared as a secondary history teacher, Thom earned his M.Ed. in Adult Education, and his Ph.D. in Urban/Correctional Education, from Virginia Commonwealth University (dissertation on correctional school districts). He manages the Core courses that are in the masters of arts degree, with emphases in education at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). Along with his wife, Dr. Carolyn Eggleston, Thom directs the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at CSUSB. A co-founder of the San Bernardino Ken Wilber Study Group (with Ms. Margaret Puffer; the Study Group is also known as the Junta—named after Ben Franklin's 18th century discussion group), Thom advocates Wilber's books for people who are interested in gaining clarity about their personal and professional aspirations. Thom can be reached at (909) 880-5653, or at tgehring@csusb.edu.

Ms. Margaret Puffer is a teacher in the Alternative and Correctional Schools unit of the Orange County, CA Department of Education. Margaret is a correctional educator with 17 years of experience. She establishes and implements collaborative education programs between parole agents, community-based organizations, and county agencies in Southern California to promote successful community transition and employment for youthful parolees. Previously she (a) served in partnership to create school library media center programs in alternative and correctional education settings, (b) obtained State library development entitlement funds for alternative and correctional programs, and (c) worked as a teacher in a residential juvenile institution. Margaret obtained her BA in History and Education from Monmouth College (IL), and her M.Ed. in Special Education, with an emphasis in learning disabilities and emotionally disturbed/behavior disorders, from the University of Minnesota. Margaret is (a) past president of the Tri-County Correctional Education Association (Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties, CA), (b) a senior fellow of the Center for the Study of Correctional Education at California State University, San Bernardino, and (c) a board member for the National Institute for Correctional Education at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. She can be reached at mpuffer@mol.net.