

PRISON PROGRAMMING IN TEXAS:

DO WE PRACTICE WHAT

WE PREACH?

by

MOLLY BALDWIN

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2008

Copyright © by Molly Baldwin 2008

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my parents, Dennis and Kathleen Baldwin for all of their support and wonderful help with my education. Without them I could never have made it to where I am.

I would also like to thank my committee members Dr. Dobbs, Dr. Smith and Dr. Bing for their time and efforts. I would like to especially thank Dr. Dobbs for all of her help and patience with all of my questions, this thesis would not have been possible without her help.

November 21, 2008

ABSTRACT

PRISON PROGRAMMING IN TEXAS: DO WE PRACTICE WHAT WE PREACH?

Molly Baldwin, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2008

Supervising Professor: Rhonda Dobbs

Prison programming is an important aspect of the criminal justice system. Programming can be used to help solve many problems in the system. In this thesis, educational and life skills programs offered in public prisons in Texas are examined. Comparisons are made to the number of programs in women's and men's prisons. This thesis argues that Texas needs to offer more programming and that the Texas Department of Criminal Justice might not be living up to its mission statement in terms of the number of programs offered. Simply stated the educational and life skills programs that are offered in the Texas public prisons are not enough to promote the changes the state aims for as indicated in the TDCJ mission statement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Participation.....	1
1.2 Education	2
1.3 Issue.....	2
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
2.1 Current Attitude.....	3
2.2 Population Increase.....	5
2.3 Programming.....	6
2.3.1 Benefits of Programming.....	7
2.4 Parole.....	9
2.5 Men.....	11
2.6 Women.....	12
2.6.1 Creating Choices.....	16
2.6.2 Special Programming Needs of Women Prisoners....	18
2.7 Previous Research.....	20
2.8 Obstacles.....	22
2.9 Programs Available.....	23
2.10 Texas.....	24

2.11 Programs in Texas.....	25
3. METHOD.....	33
3.1 Research Design.....	33
3.2 Sample.....	34
3.3 Data.....	34
3.4 Analysis.....	37
4. FINDINGS.....	38
4.1 Programming in Women’s Prisons.....	38
4.2 Programming in Men’s Prisons.....	39
4.3 Comparing Programming Available to Men and Women.....	42
5. DISCUSSION.....	45
5.1 Policy Implications.....	46
5.2 Limitations.....	47
5.3 Future Research.....	48
REFERENCES.....	49
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Program Categories.....	35
4.1	The Number of Educational and Skills Based Programs Offered in Women's Prisons.....	39
4.2	Average Number of Educational and Skills Based Programs per Men's Prison by Population Size.....	41
4.3	Mean Number of Programs per Facility for Women and Men.....	42
4.4	Mean Number of Programs per Facility for Men's and Women's Prisons by Population Size.....	43

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At midyear 2007 America had 1,595,034 inmates in state, federal and private correctional facilities, (Sabol & Couture, 2008). In 1997, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that 40% of inmates in state and federal prisons and local jails had not completed high school or the equivalent (GED) (Harlow, 2003). The general population at that time had a non completion rate of 18%. It is estimated that 420,600 prisoners in state prisons in 1997 did not have a high school diploma or a GED, up from 293,000 in 1991 (Harlow, 2003). Although, there is not a more recent report available at this time, the evidence points to these numbers being worse at this point due to budget cuts and increases in prison populations. There are fewer programs available to prisoners as time goes on.

1.1 Participation

Participation rates in prison programming are on the decline. In 1997, 51.9% of prisoners reported participation in educational programs during their most recent incarceration where as in 1991 56.6% of inmates reported participation. Participation in these programs does not necessarily mean basic education; it can also mean vocational programming. Harlow (2003) also stated that 9 out of 10 state prisons offered educational programming for inmates and about 25% of inmates reported taking part in basic education and about 33% reported participating in vocational training (Harlow, 2003).

1.2 Education

Batchelder and Pippert (2002) report that, “the Correctional Educational Association in 1991 estimated that the illiteracy rate among incarcerated Americans was 75%” (p. 269). Another study estimated illiteracy among American prisoners at 50%, (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002). Whatever the correct number is, by any estimation, there are many prisoners in the United States that are functionally illiterate. These prisoners do not have even the most basic education required in this country. Since the 1980’s funding for programs has been cut and the number of inmates in prison programs has increased dramatically. It is likely that fewer people are participating in programs and that there is a waiting list for the people who wish to participate due to limited seats in classes and other budgetary constraints.

1.3 Issue

Today budgets for more beds and prison units are constantly increasing, while the budget for the provisions of education is decreasing, (Marquart et al., 1994, Ubah and Robinson, 2003 and Haulard 2001). In order to reenter society offenders released from prison need to have the ability to survive legitimately outside of the prison walls. Unfortunately, offenders are not receiving the help they need to establish such a life. They need to be able to get a job to support themselves and, in all likelihood, a family. It is hard enough for offenders to get jobs without having the further detriments of lack of education and a lack of marketable skills. It is time to address this issue. The revolving doors of prisons will remain that way until such time as society finds a way to send offenders out into the world with a chance at life on the outside.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are been several studies indicating that institutional programming helps offenders to “make it on the outside” and to reduce the rates of recidivism for those released from prison (Zgoba, Haugebrook and Jenkins, 2008, Batchelder & Pippert, 2002 and Carlson, 2001).

Historically, American society viewed offenders as ill and in need of treatment. The “medical model” was in style and programming was a large portion of the budget for prisons until about the mid 1970,s (Carlson, 2001 and Ubah & Robinson, 2003). There have been several changes in the way the criminal justice system works since that time.

2.1 Current Attitude

In 1974 Robert Martinson published the now famous article “What works? Questions and answers about prison reform.” In this article Martinson evaluated the programs available in prisons and their impact, he found that the programs were not effective in reducing recidivism. According to Ubah & Robinson, (2003) the interpretation of that article, that “nothing works” in terms of rehabilitative programming, had a huge impact on the field of criminal justice. It impacted research and practice. Many politicians and others who disliked programming took that article as justification for reducing or eliminating programs in prisons. Ubah & Robinson (2003), hold that Martinson’s article was a “carnival mirror” because it hid as much as it

revealed about rehabilitation efforts (p. 121). In fact in 1979, Martinson changed his tune, he re-examined the prior information and concluded that some programs were good and did have a beneficial effect. However, Martinson's "nothing works" is still used by many today to justify the lack of programming and the fact that money for programming is continually cut.

Around the time Martinson's article was published America began the transition from a rehabilitative to a punitive ideology. Since the 1970's, as a society, we have grown increasingly more punitive and are less concerned with the well being of offenders. Society is more interested in punishing offenders than in improving something about them. We have come to the conclusion that we cannot make prisoners "change their innermost selves through institutional programming" (Carlson, 2001, p. 26). Due to this attitude, society is not interested in "wasting" resources on programming.

According to Seiter and Kadela (2003), there have been many changes in the last two decades. Specifically we have shifted away from using parole, under the premise that parole makes for less punitive sentences. We used to have a strong focus on rehabilitation and on the transition back into the community however, in the last several years we have shifted to different goals, being punitive, deterring criminals and also on the prevention of future crimes. The prevention of future crimes is a goal in both ideologies; however the means and reasoning are different. Rehabilitative ideology prevents future crime by making offenders, better people and changing the way they live. The punitive ideology seeks to prevent future crime by incapacitating and deterring those who might commit future crimes. The emphasis is not on

helping prisoners or improving them some way it is on punishing them for the crime(s) they have committed and letting them know that repeating that behavior is unacceptable.

Seiter and Kadela (2003) also discuss Martinson's article and its long reaching effects. The early 1980's saw the demise of the "medical model" and the introduction of the "get tough on crime" initiative. The beginning of the war on drugs and the urge of society to be as punitive as possible can be traced to this period of time. Attitudes had been changing since the mid 1970's but changes in policy and practice began to take place here (Seiter and Kadela, 2003). Funding for programs was cut and the notion that prisoners are in prison to be punished not to have a good time or get improvement on the taxpayer's dime also kicked in at this time. Ever since these changes began we have become less interested in funding programs for prisoners. At the same time much of society has a hard time understanding why former prisoners continue to recidivate at a high rate.

2.2 Population Increase

Another issue that many states face is the problem of increasing prison populations and a need to control them. The state of Texas had a 300% increase in the number of prisoners between 1971 and 1990 (Marquart et al. 1994). According to Marquart et al. (1994), in order to cope with additional prisoners Texas has built several new prisons as well as increasing the capacity of some existing prisons.

Probation has been expanded to avoid prison for some offenders; unfortunately this did not reduce the demand for prison beds. More people are sentenced to probation now, but, many of those sentenced are offenders who would not have been sentenced to probation

before. These offenders would previously been ordered to pay a fine or do community service. Rather than decreasing the number of people going to prison there is an increase in the number of people being put in the system. This increase in people being placed in the system is referred to as “net widening.”

Texas also implemented some policies designed to prevent prison overcrowding. “The Prison Management Act (PMA) and the Ruiz Overcrowding Stipulation specified that the Texas prison system could not operate in excess of 95% of capacity,” (Marquart et al., 1994, p. 519). This policy made it necessary to clear beds faster in order to bring in new prisoners. Administrators could not take new prisoners until their capacity was low enough to prevent violating the new laws.

According to Marquart et al. (1994) they had to open the back door and let many prisoners out early in order to accommodate the new ones. Not long after that laws were put in place to create longer prison sentences and also to reduce the eligibility of some offenders for probation. All of these changes have had a dramatic effect on programming. This situation has made it very hard for the programs that are in prisons to succeed and virtually impossible for others to be developed. This is demonstration of the punitive ideology, it is more important that prisoners get in the doors than to monitor them after they are released or to make sure they are changing while in prison.

2.3 Programming

Many prisoners are not in prison long enough to complete a program. Some are technically there long enough but they are on waiting lists due to limited program capacity, and

by the time they get into the programs they do not have enough time left to complete them.

This is a challenge that many states face. The few programs they have are not operating up to potential because they are unable to work for the offenders in the way intended (Shearer, 2003).

2.3.1 Benefits of Programming

There is a large body of evidence that suggests that programming in prisons has a significant impact on the recidivism rates of those offenders who choose to participate in them. Aside from reducing recidivism, programs serve another very important purpose. They help prison administrators stay in control. Programs offer an opportunity to keep offenders busy which makes them easier to handle, (Carlson, 2001). "The point to be made is that the outcomes of institutional programming serve all parties well; staff, inmates and out society. Positive programming results in increased safety within the custodial environment, and in reduced recidivism," (Carlson, 2001, p. 26).

Carlson (2001) holds that prisoners who have something to lose are less of a behavior problem than those who do not. If bad behavior jeopardizes the opportunity to work or to participate in programs that make time go by faster, then prisoners are less likely to misbehave.

The U.S. Department of Education conducted a study in Texas in 1994. This study found that recidivism was lowered by 20% for those who completed a GED and a vocational training program. They also found that the recidivism rate two years after release for those with a college degree was lowered by 12% and that it was lowered by 20% for those who got their GED or a vocational certificate compared to those who did not do either (Carlson, 2001).

Carlson (2001) believes that it is very important to start with order. Order creates a safer environment in the prison and makes it much easier to have programs and to have a more normal environment which will make the transition to the outside easier. Foley and Gao (2004) argue that inmates who report participating in educational programs also report serving as role models for other prisoners and committing fewer infractions. Administrators are not the only ones who recognize a difference in behavior for those involved in prison programming, those in the programs also recognize it.

Batchelder and Pippert's (2002) study revealed that the vast majority of offenders (over 80%) would prefer to work rather than do nothing in prison. They also found that non-violent offenders express a greater desire to participate in continuing education programs after participating in a compulsory high school education program. In general prisoners want something to do and administrators want prisoners to be busy because it makes it much easier to manage the facilities.

The general idea behind prison programming is to ease reentry into society. Prison programs are designed to give prisoners the skills necessary to survive on the outside. Many prisoners leave and go home to families they need to support. It is widely known that it is very difficult for ex-offenders to find employment (Harris & Keller, 2005 and Freeman, 2003). When they do find employment it is often low paying menial jobs that do not pay enough to provide for a family. Ex-offenders are constantly being released into society and expected to live a legitimate life without ever being given any tools to do so. Many offenders return to a life of crime because they cannot make the money to live and support their families in a legitimate

way. It is important to consider their lives, what they will face and what skills they do or do not have (Harris & Keller, 2005 and Freeman, 2003).

According to Seiter and Kadela (2003), for most of the 20th century there was a large focus on preparing prisoners for the transition to the community after release. Specifically, there was an emphasis on having a plan for returning to the community. Offenders had to have a place to go, an idea of employment opportunities and the plan was generally checked by a parole officer prior to release. Before the changes of the 1980's parole was a very important and positive aspect of corrections.

2.4 Parole

Seiter and Kadela (2003) provide four reasons that parole was a positive rather than a way to be lenient. First, before the changes began it was common to use indeterminate sentencing, parole boards were charged with deciding when an offender should be released. As such, many dangerous offenders spent a longer time in prison than they do under the current determinate sentencing structures. Second, parole boards made sure that prisoners had a plan for when they were released. They had to tell parole boards where they were going to live and also what job prospects they had. Parole officers generally checked out the plan and anyone who did not have a solid plan was delayed until they did. Now we have no real checks in place for plans and even if someone does not have a plan we have no other option but to release them. Third, the possibility of parole was an incentive for good behavior.

As pointed out by Carlson (2001) it is important for the safety of institutions and the betterment of offenders to have incentives for good behavior. This encouraged prisoners to

participate in programs because parole boards looked favorably on participation in educational, vocational, work and drug or alcohol abuse programs. Lastly, parole created a framework for supervision and treatment after release. Parole allows us to follow up on offenders and to see how they are doing and if they need further treatment or a referral to a particular program or agency. Seiter and Kadela (2003), note that 15 states have eliminated parole and 20 more have limited the population eligible for parole. This provides less incentive to participate in the programs that are left.

The elimination of parole has actually served to reduce the amount of time spent in prison. In fact, "the state of Colorado abolished parole as a release mechanism in 1979 but reinstated it after finding out that the length of prison sentences served was decreasing, particularly for high-risk offenders," (Seiter & Kadela, 2003, p. 364). In 1977, over 70% of prisoners in the U.S. were released on discretionary parole and by 1997 only 28% were released on discretionary parole.

Twenty seven states have truth-in-sentencing laws. These laws eliminate parole and reduce the good time that can be granted to prisoners for participating in programs. Our efforts to "get tough on crime" are basically eliminating any preparation for release into the community for prisoners. We have removed incentives to behave and to plan for release. According to Carlson (2001) we have effectively changed prisons to places in which the entrance sign should read, "abandon hope, all ye who enter here" (p. 26).

Education is important for prisoners. It increases job opportunities on the outside which makes it less likely that they will recidivate. As mentioned above, many prisoners do not have a

high school diploma or a GED. According to Brewster and Sharp (2002), high school education is the most important to reducing recidivism and increasing an offenders chances of surviving post release. Their study found that the biggest reduction in recidivism was for those who completed a high school education while in prison, although, other education programs also helped.

Brewster and Sharp (2002), found that for both men and women completion of an education program means a better chance of being successful on the outside. They found that the completion of a GED or basic education program helped to bring offenders closer to equality with those outside of prison, which gives them a better chance at surviving. If they can compete with other people for jobs, they have a better chance of being able to succeed legitimately. It is important to also address the fact that there are essentially two prison populations to consider. Male and female prisoners are extremely different and they need to be considered separately (Rose, 2004).

2.5 Men

The male and female prison populations are very different. The characteristics of the male and female prisoners are different and as such they should be treated differently. Male prisoners are usually more aggressive in nature than female prisoners (Rose, 2004). Programs that are based in confrontation and that address anger management are appropriate to male prisoners however, they are problematic for female offenders.

Male prisoners are generally less concerned with the care of their children because they are not usually the primary caretaker for children prior to incarceration (Rose, 2004).

Educational and life skills programming is important to male prisoners as well as female prisoners. Male prisoners need basic education and life skills to succeed on the outside. Although male prisoners tend to have more programming available to them than female prisoners they still need more (Shearer, 2003).

Male prisoners tend to “do their own time,” they are not emotional and talkative in trying to solve problems. They tend to just go on with life. In many cases male prisoners are viewed as being easier to work with because although, they are more violent they are also more straight forward and less likely to be seen as devious (Schram, Koons-Witt, & Morash 2004). Men are also not likely to develop the close relationships that women tend to develop in prison (Schram, et. al, 2004)

2.6 Women

The female prison population is significantly smaller than the male prison population. However, it has grown faster than the male prison population in the last 25 years. In fact, it has grown by 500% in the last 20 years, while the male population has increased at a slower rate (Schram, et al., 2004).

Unfortunately, programming and facilities for women offenders have not grown along with that population (Shearer, 2003). Female prisoners have always had fewer programs than male prisoners because they are viewed differently. As with males, female offenders benefit from programming offered in prison. They need education, training, therapy and other help to reduce their rates of recidivism.

Many programs for women do not address their specific issues. The programs that are available are often not gender specific. They are based on male offenders' needs; which sometimes makes them virtually useless to women. Society needs to increase the number of programs available to women and we need to make better programs.

Female offenders are different from male offenders in how they serve time and what works for them. Female offenders tend to be viewed as invisible in the criminal justice system (Covington, 2003). Women have special needs; female offenders are more likely than male offenders to be intravenous drug users, to engage in risky sexual behaviors and to have mental health problems than their male counterparts. "Of female offenders in state prisons, approximately 80 percent have substance abuse problems," (Covington, 2003, p. 128). Women offenders have higher rates of sexually transmitted diseases including HIV and AIDS (Shearer, 2003). Women also tend to be the primary caretakers and providers for minor children. They are often in a position of supporting a family without assistance from the father of their child or children.

It is more important for women to receive the appropriate therapy and counseling for overcoming their past. Many women abuse alcohol and drugs as a coping mechanism (Shearer, 2003). Programs must address the specific needs of female offenders. Another major difference is that in 1999, 67% of incarcerated women were mothers of minor children (Rose, 2004). Unlike, male offenders, female offenders who are parents tend to have strong connections to their children and are often the primary care giver for their children prior to imprisonment. According to Rose (2004) the female prisoners experience separation anxiety.

Many female prisoners are not interested in programs because they are worried about their children (Rose, 2004). According to Rose, (2004) women are more likely to participate in programming when they have been assured that their children are okay and not in need.

Historically, female offenders have been viewed as children rather than adults and are still often referred to in tones that suggest correctional officers are more like parents (Schram, et al., 2004), interviewed correctional administrators about their philosophies on women offenders and managing them. Most of the administrators interviewed felt that women should be treated differently from men and that women are very different in terms of their needs. The interviewees felt that women are more communicative, talk more and also tend to ask more questions. Women were viewed as more likely to question orders than men. Those questioned frequently stated that staff members need to learn how to communicate with offenders, women do not respond well to orders that have no explanation. Women want to know why they need to do something. They also said that listening was an important skill for staff members to have.

Another common theme is that women offenders are more emotional in general than their male counterparts. Women show their feelings and they need more time and care. The women try to talk out their problems and find solutions, which is considerably different from male offenders, who tend to just do their time. They also found that the interviewees felt programming is more important for women than security. They also reported that women have more medical problems and issues with children.

Staff members also felt that women are harder to work with and are more manipulative than men. Men are violent, they use shanks and fight while women generally do not this. Therefore, security is not as big an issue for them. Part of the reason security is not a big issue for women is the fact that, "Women are arrested and incarcerated primarily for property and drug offenses" (Covington, 2003, p. 130). Most of the interviewees stated that these should be viewed as differences rather than as negatives.

Unfortunately the differences are often treated as negatives (Schram, et al., 2004). Women are usually viewed negatively by correctional officers and prison staff for being emotional and for needing an explanation instead of just orders. They are also viewed as devious because instead of fighting like men they use their head to get around problems they face. Many correctional officers prefer to work with men because they feel that men are easier to work with and women are viewed as devious and too complex (van Wormer and Kaplan, 2006).

One last important difference between male and female offenders is the way they "do time," men tend to do their own time, relying on inner strength. Women generally reach out to their friends and family on the outside for support (Schram, et al., 2004). Women also fulfill their need for family and close relationships by developing "pseudo-families" in prison (Rose, 2004). Programs for women should address their unique needs and differences otherwise we are wasting valuable resources that could be directed toward breaking the cycle of offending.

2.6.1 Creating Choices

There have been some places that have made an effort to fix programming problems in prisons. A prime example is Canada and its “Creating Choices,” doctrine. In 1989 the Canadian government commissioned a task force to report on improving the conditions for federal female offenders (Macdonald & Watson, 2001). The recommendations of the task force were accepted by the government and largely implemented. The report dealt with federal inmates, those sentenced to 2 or more years. In Canada, there is separation of responsibility for prisoners, less than two years and they are the responsibility of the provincial government and more than that they are the responsibility of the federal government. “Creating Choices,” eliminated the one institution for all Canadian federal female inmates and created five smaller facilities in its place, including one for aboriginal women. The recommendations of the commission were also to develop programs specifically for women and to strengthen the community opportunities for women coming out of prison.

The mission of the Correctional Service of Canada “is based on the principle that society is best protected when offenders are able to re-establish themselves in the community under conditions that minimize their risk of re-offending” (Macdonald & Watson, 2001). According to the authors, women present a different range of problems than men, they have more interrelated problems and their cultural, environmental, psychological, and physical factors are different from those of men (Macdonald & Watson, 2001). “Creating Choices... established five principles of change: empowerment, meaningful and responsible choices, respect and dignity, supportive environments and shared responsibility” (Macdonald & Watson, 2001, p. 3).

The Canadian government built the new prisons that were designed to be as much like life in the community as possible (Macdonald & Watson, 2001). The prisons are made primarily of houses that stand behind main buildings that have offices, spaces for programs and other community areas. Another important aspect of these changes is that each institution has a “citizens advisory committee,” made up of volunteers, who come into the prisons regularly to observe, give advice and develop relationships to help facilitate an easier transition of the offenders after release (Macdonald & Watson, 2001). The “Creating Choices” doctrine has done a lot of good for female federal inmates in Canada, the recidivism rates have dropped and women are receiving the attention they need.

Unfortunately, like most programs “Creating Choices” is not perfect, its basic design failed to consider that some female inmates really cannot be dealt with in a way other than traditional prison. These women for whatever reason do not function well in the community model and Canada is challenged with finding a way to house them. They are planning to modify the current institutions to include these types of units (Macdonald & Watson, 2001). The biggest problem is that this program reaches only a very small portion of female inmates in Canada because the vast majority of women incarcerated in Canada are under provincial supervision. In fact, many federal inmates are housed in provincial facilities as part of trade agreements. These federal facilities handle less than 300 inmates all together.

In 2000-2001 the ratio of provincial female inmates to federal female inmates was 35:1; the vast majority of the female inmates in Canada are housed in 10 facilities that have none of the “Creating Choices” programs and advantages (Micucci & Monster, 2004). “Creating Choices”

has provided a foundation on which to build some great programs that will change the way female offenders are handled. It still needs some fine tuning but most of all it needs to be applied to the rest of the Canadian correctional institutions for women.

Creating choices is an example of programming that acknowledges the differences between male and female offenders and also tries to meet the unique needs of female offenders. There are not enough programs for men or women in prison in the United States. However, the male prisoners are better off, they are offered more programs than women and the programs are better suited to them. "The use of confrontational techniques and group settings, typically used in treatment models for men, are routinely not effective for women" (Shearer, 2003, p. 3).

Women do not generally do well in the confrontational setting. They are, according to Shearer (2003), threatened in such a setting and it makes it difficult for them to address their underlying issues. Most of the women in prison today are or have been victims of physical, sexual or psychological abuse in their lives. They are also more often than not substance abusers. In fact, according to Covington (2003) some form of abuse and substance abuse are precursors to crime for most women offenders. As a consequence they tend to have low self esteem and a need to please others (Shearer, 2003).

2.6.2 Special Programming Needs of Women Prisoners

It is important to use a different style of programming for women so they are able to get to the root of their problems. Women also need and want programs that address parenting. According to Shearer (2003) men are not very receptive to parenting classes but many women

feel that parenting skills are very valuable to them. This is important because a majority of these women will leave prison and regain custody of their children. The parenting classes, in conjunction, with substance abuse treatment have been shown to reduce abuse and neglect of children (Shearer, 2003). "A majority of these women claimed that parenting skills classes was 'very important' to their treatment program" (Shearer, 2003, p. 3).

Also according to Shearer (2003) many women come from families with substance abuse issues. He says that family interventions, even without the whole family, can be effective but this is rarely done in the prison setting (Shearer, 2003).

Male offenders receive educational and vocational training in prison. Although not all prisoners get or want these classes they are offered a much better range than female offenders. Unfortunately, the programming in men's prisons also falls far short of their needs. They are often trained in fields that are largely useless outside of the prison walls and there are not enough programs by a long shot (Seiter & Kadela, 2003 and Marquart, et al., 1994).

Female prisoners are even worse off than the men. The programs they are offered frequently are for, "low-paying jobs with little opportunity for advancement" (Shearer, 2003, p. 4). This is an especially big problem because many female offenders return to society needing to support their children without the expectation of help from the father. These women need training for a marketable skill so they can support and raise their children without needing to re-offend to support their families. Going back to the fact that female offenders tend to be less violent than male offenders it is important to note that the anger management component that is usually included in programs for men is not necessary or helpful for most women. In fact, women tend

to have trouble expressing anger (Shearer, 2003). "Women tend to respond more positively; to treatment that includes techniques that reduce feelings of guilt and self-blame, and that improve self-esteem and self-awareness" (Shearer, 2003, p. 3). Women tend to turn their anger inward as opposed to men who turn it outward (Covington, 2003). This is not to say that anger management is not a problem for some women however, it is not an appropriate basis of programming for women.

2.7 Previous Research

There is not a large body of research on the programs that exist and what is good and bad about them. It is important to consider programs and to learn how effective they are. Unfortunately, once funding is obtained it is guarded. This means that administrators are not always eager to have their programs evaluated because they could lose funding if the research does not produce a favorable result.

According to Lowenkamp, Latessa, and Smith (2006), "correctional interventions should focus on higher risk offenders; deliver cognitive-behavioral or behavioral interventions that focus on relevant criminogenic needs; attend to the qualifications, skills, and values of staff; and evaluate what they do (p. 577)." These authors further emphasize that it is important to measure the effectiveness of programs as they are implemented.

It is important to note that there is a correlation between "program integrity" and reducing recidivism (Zgoba, Haugebrook and Jenkins, 2008, O'Neill, MacKenzie and Bierie, 2007). If the effort is made to have programs, it should be done right. Further, correctional

officials need to make sure to target the right people using “the core principles of risk, need, and responsivity,” (Lowenkamp, et al., 2006, p. 588).

Burke and Vivian (2001) completed a study on college education for prisoners. They found that taking just one 3-hour course reduces recidivism rates for ex-prisoners. The completion of one college course was found to reduce recidivism by 21.9% for a five year period and there may be a further reduction for onsite courses as opposed to distance education courses (Burke & Vivian, 2001).

Brewster and Sharp (2002) found that longer programs tend to be better for reducing recidivism rates of offenders. This is because longer courses require more “investment” by the students so they learn more and have more to lose by not completing them.

Walters (2004) studied the use of psycho education instead of traditional psychotherapy for prisoners. He found that prisoners tended to respond more to psycho education because it is gentler and less threatening¹. In his research Walters (2004) found that it is important to target high-risk offenders. It is also important to address criminological needs (drug addiction, gang affiliation, etc) and to match interventions with offenders' learning style. Walters (2004) believes that the best results will come from these circumstances.

It is important to evaluate offenders and place in programs that will work for them. This is especially true for women offenders. As noted previously women have unique needs and problems that are not being addressed (Shearer, 2003). As with the female offenders it is

¹ Psycho-education is a way of training a person to recognize their own issues and to accept and deal with them. In terms of offenders it is important to address their psychological problems and to teach them how to deal with them (Walters, 2004)

important to make sure male offenders are in programs that are appropriate and in which they can participate successfully.

Between 30% and 50% of offenders drop out of correctional programming prior to completion of the programs, (Walters, 2004). In a study by Batchelder and Pippert (2002) on why offenders choose or do not choose to participate in educational programs, they reported that the key to employment post release is literacy. As mentioned above the illiteracy rate among inmates is estimated between 50% and 75%. This would indicate that one of the most urgent needs for programming is basic education.

2.8 Obstacles

Haulard (2001) lists six obstacles to prison programming faced by administrators. One, there is little space for educational programs in prison because most prisons were not designed to do anything but warehouse prisoners. Second, there are no teaching supplies; the prisons are not classroom ready with chalk, paper and other essentials for learning. Third, it is difficult to get staff and faculty to teach these programs because of low pay and a lack of understanding about working in a prison environment. Fourth, there is a high turnover of students. As mentioned by Marquart et al. (1994) many prisoners are not in correctional institutions long enough to complete a program. Fifth, there are several different agencies involved in educating offenders and sometimes they fail to work together or have different purposes. Sixth, it is difficult to schedule classes around security issues in a prison. This makes it difficult for the offenders to learn in this environment. According to Haulard (2001), in order for rehabilitation efforts to succeed they must include education.

2.9 Programs Available

Different states offer different programs within their prison system. Many offer basic education such as literacy and GED programs. Many of these programs are not easily accessible to prisoners. They may have waiting lists or prisoners may not know about them or how to take advantage of them. According to Foley and Gao (2004) most states offer basic education programs and GED programs for prisoners. They report a high rate of availability for these programs. However, they also report that the availability of vocational programs is significantly less.

Prisoners can get access to basic education in many facilities; however vocational programs are generally less available. The main goal of basic education programs is to develop basic skills and a mastery of the knowledge required for a high school diploma or equivalent, (Foley & Gao, 2004). Vocational programs focus on teaching a specific skill, hopefully one that will help the offender obtain a job after he/she is released from prison. Unfortunately not all vocational programs teach skills that can be used after prison.

There is another type of program that is worth mentioning, programs that focus on family. There is a program operating in New York City called, La Bodega de la Familia. This program works to strengthen whole families of prisoners, (Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001). This program is specifically designed to help offenders make it on the outside; it helps them to establish a support system. Most offenders leave prison and go to stay with family or friends until they can get on their feet. La Bodega de la Familia works with the family members who will be involved in the offender's post release life. They make sure that there is a leader who will

take responsibility for watching out for the offender and for reporting to the people at La Bodega de la Familia if there is something wrong. These families often receive counseling to help them adjust to life with the offender and they are also able to call on La Bodega de la Familia if they need other help. For example, if they are dealing with another government agency and they have a problem; La Bodega de la Familia will often help them. La Bodega de la Familia works with parole officers who are usually more patient and understanding with violations because La Bodega de la Familia steps in to handle the problems as they arise (Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001). This type of program is beyond the scope of this paper; however it is an example of what kind of programs can be created to help with the reintegration of offenders into society.

2.10 Texas

The state of Texas has an independent school district just for prisoner/students. The Windham School System offers, “basic adult and high school equivalency, bilingual, special education, and a wide variety of vocational classes (e.g. automotive, refrigeration, woodworking). Both class room and in-cell programs are available to prisoners” (Marquart et al., 1994, p. 522). The Windham School System is a huge system as it covers more than 45 institutions in the state of Texas. There are 47 state run prisons for men in Texas. This does not include privately run prisons. Forty-five of these prisons offer a literacy program, 29 offer special education, 45 offer CHANGES/Pre-release program, 15 offer English as a second language programs, 42 offer cognitive intervention (which is designed to help offenders change their thought processes), 9 offer a parenting seminar and 15 offer a life matters program (Texas

Department Of Criminal Justice, 2003). All of these programs are administered by the Windham School System.

Offenders are “selected for enrollment in WSD programs based on the Individualized Treatment Plan process,” (Texas Department of Criminal Justice, 2003, handbook). Admission is based on needs of offenders, release date and the availability of the program. The literacy program is a basic education program for adults functioning below the sixth grade level with a second level for GED’s. The CHANGES/ Pre-release program is a reentry program that focuses on life skills.

The same 45 Prisons that offer the literacy program also offer Project RIO. “Project RIO is administered by the Texas Workforce Commission in collaboration with the Local Workforce Development Board, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), the Windham School District and the Texas Youth Commission (TYC),” (Texas Workforce Commission, 2006, p. 1).

2.11 Programs in Texas

Project RIO is designed to help offenders obtain jobs when they are released from prison. The program requires involvement before and after release. This program is specifically aimed at reducing recidivism through employment. Offenders are assessed in prison and given a guide to follow while they are incarcerated in terms of programs to participate in and things they need to do to follow the career path they have chosen. The offender is evaluated and placed in the Windham classes and TDCJ or TYC programs as appropriate, (Texas Workforce Commission, 2006).

In addition to participating in programs, offenders also get help obtaining papers they need to get a job when they are released. Many prisoners do not have a driver's license or official identification card; they also do not have a copy of their social security card or Green card. They also need certificates of completion for any programs they completed while incarcerated. After the offender is released Project RIO staff members help him/her find a job, teach him interviewing skills and resume building. Further, there are special hiring incentives for companies that hire project RIO participants.

TDCJ in conjunction with the Windham School System also provides many different vocational programs. They range from auto mechanics to plumbing to cooking/baking to web design. There is a limited opportunity here. Most facilities have at best three or four options for offenders and many times the programs they offer are closely related. For example, auto specialization for brakes and auto specialization for transmissions may be offered in the same facility. This makes sense in terms of shops and class rooms but it limits the opportunities for offenders in that facility.

In addition to the basic education programs 23 of the 47 facilities have access to academic college programming. Many of the vocational programs are administered by local colleges. The three most frequently offered vocational programs are construction carpentry, electrical trades and data processing. Sixteen of the facilities offer construction carpentry, 14 offer electrical trades and 9 offer data processing.

There are many different programs offered in the TDCJ system however, what prisoners get is largely determined by their facility. Also the capacity for these programs is

limited. Not everyone can participate in them even if they want to do so. All offenders must meet the requirements of TDCJ, the Windham School District and any college if the program is offered through a local college. All college expenses have to be paid at enrollment or upon release by the offender. As most offenders are poor it is not likely they can afford to pay for these courses.

The state of Texas has five public prisons for women. Three of these are co-located. Each facility houses a range of security levels and has some programming for the prisoners. The main prison is Gatesville which houses women at all security levels as well as the intellectually impaired, substance abusers and outside trustees (TDCJ, 2005.). Gatesville is co-located with Hilltop and Murray. All three offer several educational programs in conjunction with each other.

They offer a literacy program, Changes/pre-release program and Project RIO. They each offer at least one vocational program. They are also affiliated with the Central Texas College Academy (TDCJ, 2005). Gatesville offers: "Female Boot Camp (SAIP), Spiritual Growth Programs, Community Tours, Mentor Program, HIV Peer Education, MROP (mentally retarded offender program) sisters program, Woman to Woman Health Education Program, Domestic Violence Classes, and Bear the Burden, Toy Bear Project," (TDCJ, 2005). Most of these programs are self explanatory and Gatesville has the most programs of all of the women's institutions in Texas. The Bear the Burden program is a voluntary program in which female prisoners, as part of their laundry duty, make teddy bears for the Salvation Army, EMT programs and charities for abused and neglected children. Some of the offenders get a sense

of fulfillment and a connection to their own children by participating in the program (TDCJ, 12/2005).

Murray offers, "Spiritual Growth Programs, Prison for a Day, Community Tours, Pattern Changing, Anger Management, Storybook Project, Families in Crisis, Borderline Personality Disorder Group, Substance Abuse Education and Support Groups," (TDCJ, 2005). The Storybook project program allows mothers and grandmothers to read a story to their children/grandchildren. They pick a book and record it and the child then receives the book and the tape (Camino, 2006). This program helps to keep that vital connection between mothers and their children. They have also found that adults like to listen to the tapes too, to hear the voice of their loved ones (Camino, 2006). The tapes are a simple way to keep the connection. This is an important way for mothers to let their children know that they love them and miss them (Camino, 2006).

Families in Crisis is a program that is designed to help victims of abuse. It helps women cope with their situation and to make decisions about what needs to be done. Hilltop offers, "Spiritual growth Programs, Enterprising Girl Scouts Beyond Bars, Mentors Epiphany, Feral Cat Program," (TDCJ, 2005). Enterprising Girls Scouts Beyond Bars offers a way for mothers and daughters to remain connected and to receive help while the mother is incarcerated. The girls are in a Girl Scout troop just like any other except that they go together to visit their mother's in prison once a month (Neff, 2004). Troop 1500 is based in Austin and was established in 1998. It was modeled after a Maryland program (Neff, 2004). This is more than the regular Girl Scout troop. These girls receive counseling as individuals and in a group

setting. They also receive support and services that they need. They go to see their moms and share a meal and do girl stuff, after that they work on their relationships and deal with any problems, they also learn interpersonal skills. The program works on making sure that the daughters do not end up like their mothers.

There is a focus in the Girl Scouts Beyond Bars program on not dropping out of school, preventing teen pregnancy and breaking the cycle through making better choices. The program does not just help the girls, it helps the mothers make decisions and plans for when they are released and it provides help to those who are taking care of the girls in the absence of their mothers. The girls also benefit from having a group of friends who are like them. According to the author, "96 percent of the 45 girls have not been pregnant before the age of 18; 93 percent have not dropped out of school and 100 percent have not been arrested" (Neff, 2004, p. 2). Most of the mothers are doing better because of the connection they have with their daughters. The other two facilities in Texas, Mountain View and Hobby have less programming and they do not offer anything other than those previously mentioned. Texas has some good programs but more are needed.

There are a few other good programs in other states that could provide good models. One of those programs is in Indiana and it is called The Family Preservation Program. This program focuses on maintaining good family bonds and structures during incarceration. This program is offered at the Indiana Women's Prison, located just outside of the center of Indianapolis, it houses maximum security, death row and "special population" inmates. "Special Population" inmates include, "offenders with serious mental illness or developmental disabilities,

serious medical problems, and geriatric needs as well as juveniles sentenced as adults and pregnant offenders,” (Schadee , 2003).

The program is based on research that suggests that the children of offenders have more problems than other children and that they need help to have healthy bonds with their parents and care givers. The program is designed to stop family members from continuing to be victims, substance abusers and to stop mothers from abusing and neglecting their children (Schadee, 2003). “It is the project’s intent to decrease both the recidivism rate of these women and the number of children who follow in their footsteps” (Schadee, 2003, p. 3). There are four major components to the Family Preservation Program, “therapeutic education and support groups; parental bonding visitation; responsible mother, healthy baby prenatal and post partum coordination; and community outreach services” (Schadee, 2003, p. 3). All incoming pregnant inmates are put into the program, they are evaluated by a nurse and a customized program is created for them. Aside from dealing with mental and physical issues for the mom and unborn child the program addresses any other children that the mother has. There is one person who is there from beginning to end which really helps the expectant mother and those around her to develop a good relationship and have the opportunity to address all of their needs.

The parental bonding portion helps mothers and their children maintain good relationships. This program is the only one in the United States to host a summer camp behind the walls of a maximum security prison. This camp runs for five days in July, the children go to the prison form 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. for those five days. It is for children and grandchildren ranging in age from 5-12 years. The children that live out of town stay in housing provided by the

Children's Bureau. Special arrangements are made to ensure that all children can come to the camp regardless of where they live and their situation. The camp not only helps mothers and grandmothers to bond, but the children often develop close bonds with each other. In 2002, 54 kids went to the camp (Schadee, 2003). In addition, to the camp there is a teen day once a year as well as holiday parties. In 2002, 47 teens participated in the teen day. According to Schadee (2003) these programs are important because the mothers are becoming aware of the needs of their children and they are developing the necessary strength to deal with their problems. Offenders learn about parenting, support, child development and related issues. The last part, the outreach program "links mothers, care givers and children to a network of community resources," (Schadee, 2003, p. 6). Offenders use this program if they feel that their kids need something, an outreach coordinator works with the offender and the care giver to identify needs and to provide assistance and referrals to the places that can help. "The results of this program component have been so successful that care givers experiencing problems are calling the facility for assistance," (Schadee, 2003, p. 6).

The outreach program is important because it helps to take a load off the inmates; they know that things are okay for their kids, so they can focus on getting help for themselves. The outreach coordinator also maintains contact with the offenders post incarceration to ensure that all is going well. The Family Preservation Program addresses many needs of the female prison population. The women that go through this program are developing strong bonds with their children; they are learning how to be parents, getting help for their problems, getting an education and preparing for a new life.

Programs that address family issues are the most important because female offenders who are mothers are preoccupied by their children. Once they know that their children are okay and are not in need they can focus on other things like getting an education, vocational skills, life skills, etc. Female inmates need programs that will help them reenter society as productive people. As with men they are in need of education, job skills, life skills, mental and medical help. Female offenders however, need programs that are structured differently than those for men. They need programs that address their status as mothers and frequently care givers as well as their status as victims of abuse and as substance abusers. Most of the people that work in corrections believe that women have different pathologies from men and as such their programs need entirely different basis and methods. There are some that believe that men and women are the same but they are in the minority. In order, to help women we have to address their situation first.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The primary reason for conducting this study was to explore the programming available in the public prisons in Texas by discovering what programs are offered to prisoners. A comparison is made between the programming available to men and women and to assess what is being offered to promote change in the offenders in hope of successful reintegration into society. Another reason for conducting this study was to explore what the state of Texas offers in comparison to what the mission statement of the Texas department of criminal justice states.

3.1 Research Design

This study compared the mission statement of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice to the education and skill based programming available in the public prisons to determine whether or not there is an identifiable link between the two. Data was collected from the website for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) in April of 2008. The website provides information on all of the prisons in Texas, including population size and institution type as well as programs available to prisoners. Information for each prison was reviewed and a spreadsheet was created showing the population size, location, type of population and programs offered at each of the public prisons in Texas. The mission statement for TDCJ was also obtained from the website and read as such;

The mission of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice is to provide public safety, promote positive change in offender behavior, reintegrate offenders into society, and assist victims of crime. (TDCJ website)

Based on the information publicly available, the main question explored is whether or not TDCJ is making educational programs available to prisoners that would actually, “promotes positive change and works to help reintegrate offenders into society.” This was explored for both male and female prisons.

3.2 Sample

The sample consists of 5 public prisons for women and 47 public prisons for men in the state of Texas. All the data examined is derived from the Texas Department of Criminal Justice website. Although there are many private prisons in Texas, only public prisons were included because they are funded from the same source and governed by the same state policies. There are also many private prisons, state jails, boot camps, and other correction institutions in the state of Texas. For the sake of making meaningful comparisons and manageability, this study focused on only one type of institution, public prisons.

3.3 Data

For the purposes of this study, the programs offered in each of the facilities were condensed into five types. Education, vocational, college vocational, project RIO, and apprenticeships. The categories and the various programs included in each category are identified in Table 3.1. The educational category includes four programs literacy, special education, Title 1 and ESL. The literacy program is a basic education program available to prisoners who read below the sixth- grade level and is also available for prisoners working toward a high school diploma or GED. The special education program is basic education for prisoners with disabilities. There are five programs included in the life skills category. These programs are designed to help offenders make better decisions in terms of situations they face and also aid in anger management and impulse control. CHANGES/Pre-release teaches offenders about being responsible citizens. They are taught about legal responsibilities, maintaining health, employment, money management and other life skills.

There are 29 vocational programs offered in the public prisons in the state of Texas. They range from computers to cooking skills. There are eight automotive vocational programs

as well as seven construction oriented programs. The college vocational programs are fewer in number but are generally duplicates of non college vocational programs. The vocational programs were divided into non-college vocational and college vocational because offenders are required to pay for the latter. The fact that vocational programs that are administered through a college have fees that must be paid by the prisoners affects the availability of programs for offenders. Most offenders cannot afford to pay fees while in prison and they also have difficulty paying them post release.

Project RIO is offered in all of the public prisons with the exception of 2 men's facilities (Rudd & Central). RIO stands for re-integration of offenders; it is administered by the Texas workforce commission (TWC). TWC works with local workforce boards, the TDCJ, the Windham school district and several others to administer this program. This program offers pre and post release services to prisoners. It is designed to help offenders gain employment with the goal of reducing recidivism. Prisoners are assessed before they are released as to their needs and skills; they are then placed in the appropriate programs while incarcerated. After release, Project RIO staffers help offenders on an individual basis to search for jobs, to prepare for interviews and make sure they have the necessary skills. Project RIO also offers special incentives to employers who hire former offenders. Lastly, there are 10 apprenticeships available in the Texas public prisons. They also have a wide range from cooking to computer skills to automotive skills.

Table: 3.1 Program Categories

Label	Men's Programs	Women's Programs
Education	Literacy, Special Education, Title 1, and ESL	Literacy, Special Education, Title 1, and ESL
Life Skills	CHANGES/Pre-release program, Cognitive Intervention, Parenting Seminar, and Life Matters	CHANGES/Pre-release program, Cognitive Intervention, Parenting Seminar, and Life Matters, and Personal & Family Development
Vocation (Not offered through a college)	Business image management & multimedia, Business computer information systems II, Heating/ ventilation/ air conditioning/ refrigeration,	Custodial Technician, Business Computer Information Systems II, Computer Maintenance Technician, Landscape Design, Construction and Maintenance,

Table 3.1 continued

	Automotive Mechanics, Automotive Collision Repair & Refinishing, Auto Specialization (Electronics), Auto Specialization (Air conditioning), Auto Specialization (Brakes), Auto Specialization (Engine Performance), Auto Specialization (Transmission), Mill and Cabinet Making, Diesel Mechanics, Bricklaying, Interior Trim and Cabinet Making, Computer Maintenance, Construction Carpentry, Plant Maintenance, Culinary Arts, Major Appliance Service Technology, Electrical Trades, Diversified Career Preparation, Truck Driving, Landscape Design/ Construction Maintenance, Custodial Technician, Piping, Small engine repair, Horticulture, Painting and Decorating, Auto Body, Plumbing, Sheet metal, and Welding	Automotive Specialization (Brakes), Paint & Decorating, Business Image Management & Multimedia, Food Services, and Construction Carpentry
College Vocational	Junior College Academic, Junior Colleges Vocational Construction Carpentry, Junior College Vocational Horticulture, Junior College Vocational Computer networking, Junior College Vocational Computer repair, Junior College Vocational Drafting, Community College Workforce, College Vocational Diesel mechanics, College vocational data processing, College vocational Web authoring, College vocational food service, College vocational desktop publishing, College vocational air conditioning & refrigeration, College vocational culinary arts and hospitality, College vocational auto mechanics, College vocational auto transmission,	Central Texas College Academic, and Tarleton State University Academic

Table 3.1 continued

	College vocational Auto Body, College vocational Welding, College vocational Truck Driving, and College vocational Electronics	
Project RIO	Project RIO	Project RIO
Apprenticeships	Apprenticeship Cook/Baker, Apprenticeship Graphic Designer, Apprenticeship Combination Welding, Apprenticeship auto body repair, Apprenticeship automotive technician specialist, Apprenticeship Cabinetmaking, Apprenticeship Computer programming, and Apprenticeship/ Horticulture	Apprentice: Computer Peripheral Equipment operator, and Apprentice: Graphic Designer

There are limitations in the sample. In considering only public prisons all of the Texas prisons have not been researched. Any conclusions drawn can be applied only to the public prisons in the state of Texas. This information will not apply to a significant number of prisons in Texas, including federal and private contract facilities as well as other types of publicly-run institutions. There are other types of programs available in the public prisons, such as, drug treatment and other programs that are not designed to provide basic education or life skills for prisoners.

3.4 Analysis

To compare the programming offered to the mission statement, the average number of programs offered for the prisons was examined separately for the men's and women's institutions. The exploration of the programs offered was intended to determine whether or not a judgment could be made that there are sufficient programs to help offenders develop skills necessary to succeed and to assist in the reintegration of offenders into society as the mission statement suggests. There is not as much disparity between the women's and men's numbers of programs as was expected.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this chapter, the researcher will explore the programming available in both men's and women's public prisons in Texas. Descriptive data will be presented regarding the programming in each institution, with comparisons made between men's and women's prisons.

4.1 Programming in Women's Prisons

Table 4.1 shows the number of education and skills based programs in public women's prisons in the state of Texas. As shown in the table, Murray offers ten education and skills based programs, 3 educational, 3 life skills, 1 vocational, 2 college vocational and Project RIO. Mountain View offers 12 educational and skills based programs, 2 educational, 3 life skills, 4 vocational, 2 college vocational and Project RIO. Hobby offers, 15 educational and skills based programs, 2 educational, 4 life skills, 6 vocational, 0 college vocational, Project RIO and 2 apprenticeships. Hilltop offers 10 educational and skills based programs, 2 educational, 3 life skills, 2 vocational, 2 college vocational and Project RIO. Gatesville offers 7 educational and vocational programs, 2 educational programs, 3 life skills, 1 vocational, 0 college vocational and Project RIO.

In terms of the number of educational and life skill programs offered, there is similarity across all five prisons, with 2-3 educational programs and 3-4 life skills programs. There were more differences in terms of the vocational and college vocational programs available. Murray and Gatesville each only offer one vocational program (custodial technician for Murray and construction carpentry for Gatesville). Hilltop offers two, Mountain View four and Hobby offers the most vocational programs at six programs. For college vocational, there is less variation although, there are two institutions that offer no such programs (Hobby and Hilltop) while the

other three each offer two college vocational programs. All five of the women's prisons offer Project RIO. Only one of the institutions (Hobby) offers apprenticeships (graphic designer and peripheral equipment operator).

Table 4.1 Number if educational and skills based programs offered in women's prisons.

Prison	Max Population	Educati on	Life Skills	Vocation	College Vocation	Project RIO	Apprentice-ships
Murray	1313	3	3	1	2	1	0
Mountain View	645	2	3	4	2	1	0
Hobby	1342	2	4	6	0	1	2
Hilltop	341	2	3	2	2	1	0
Gatesville	1498	2	3	1	0	1	0

4.2 Programming in Men's Prisons

Table 4.2 shows the men's public prisons condensed by population and the average number of each category of education and skill based programs per prison. All but two of the men's prisons (Central and Rudd) offer Project RIO. Prisons with fewer than 1,000 prisoners averaged .08 educational programs, 1.6 life skills programs, 1 vocational program and 0 apprenticeships per facility. Prisons with a population between 1,001 and 2,000 prisoners averaged 2.8 educational programs, 2.4 life skills programs, 2.7 vocational programs, 1.4 college vocational programs and .3 apprenticeships per facility. Prisons with a population between 2,001 and 3,000 averaged 1.9 educational programs, 2.5 life skills programs, 3.3 vocational programs, 1.7 college vocational programs and .4 apprenticeships. Prisons with a population between 3,001 and 4,000 averaged 2.2 educational programs, 2.6 life skills programs, 4.8 vocational programs, 1.4 college vocational programs and .4 apprenticeships. The only prison with more than 4,000 prisoners (Coffield) offers 3 educational programs, 3 life skill programs, 5 vocational programs, 4 college vocational programs and 0 apprenticeships.

In general as the population size goes up so does the number of programs available, especially for life skills and vocational programs. In terms of vocational programming the

smallest population prisons averaged the least with only 1 per prison and the highest average was in the 3,001 to 4,000 group, while Coffield offered 5 vocational programs. There is less variation in terms of apprenticeships although the smallest (0-1,000) and largest (Coffield, 4,000+) had 0. The middle 3 (1,001-2,000, 2,001-3,000 and 3,001-4,000) averaged between .3 and .4 per facility.

Table 4.2 Average Number of Educational and Skills Based Programs per Men's Prison by Population Size

Maximum Population	Prison	Education Average	Life Skills Average	Vocation Average	College Vocation Average	Project RIO Average	Apprenticeship Average
1-1000	Boyd, Central, Jordan, Rudd, and Vance N=5	.08	1.6	1	.8	.6	0
1001-2000	Boyd, Briscoe, Clemens, Dalhart, Daniel, Darrington, Goree, Hightower, Huntsville, Jester III, Luther, Lynaugh, Neal, Pack, Powledge, Ramsey, Roach, Scott, Stevenson, Stringfellow, Terrell, Torres, and Wallace N=23	2.8	2.4	2.7	1.4	1	.3
2001-3000	Connally, Eastham, Ellis, Ferguson, Hughes, Lewis, McConnell, Polunsky, Robertson, Smith, Stiles, Telford, and Wynne N=13	1.9	2.5	3.3	1.7	1	.4
3001-4000	Allred, Beto, Clements, Estelle, Michael N=5	2.2	2.6	4.8	1.4	1	.4
4000 +	Coffield N=1	3	3	5	4	1	0

4.3 Comparing Programming Available to Men and Women

The mean number of each category of educational and skills based programming offered in men's and women's public prisons in Texas is displayed in Table 4.3. Women's prisons average 2.4 educational programs, 3.2 life skills programs, 2.4 vocational programs, 1.2 college vocational program, 1 project RIO and .4 apprenticeships. Men's prisons average 2 educational programs, 2.4 life skills programs, 3 vocational programs, 1.5 college vocational programs, 1 Project RIO and .3 apprenticeships.

The men's prisons have a higher average number of programs in all of the categories except apprenticeships. On average the women's prisons offer .4 apprenticeships per facility (although as mentioned previously Hobby offers 2 and the rest offer 0) than the men's at .3 programs per facility, this is not a statistically significant difference. In general the averages are similar. The greatest difference is in the life skill programs, men's prisons average 3.2 per facility and women's only 2.4 this difference is significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 4.3 Mean number of programs per facility for women and men

Facility Type	Educational	Life Skills	Vocational	College Vocational	Project Rio	Apprentice-ships
Women's	2.4	2.4	2.4	1.2	1	.4
Men's	2	3.2**	3	1.5	1	.3

** $p < .01$

Table 4.4 shows the average number of programs offered in men's and women's prisons with populations between 0 and 2,000. The highest population for a women's public prison in Texas is 1498 (Gatesville). Men's prisons with a population of 0-1,000 average .8 educational programs, 1.6 life skills programs, 1 vocational program, .8 college vocational

programs, .6 Project RIO and 0 apprenticeships per facility. Women's prisons with a population of 0-1,000 average 2.5 educational programs, 3 life skills programs, 3 vocational programs, 2 college vocational programs, 1 Project RIO and 0 apprenticeships per facility. Men's prisons with a population of 1,001-2,000 average 2.2 educational programs, 2.4 life skills programs, 2.7 vocational programs, 1.4 college vocational programs, 1 Project RIO and .3 apprenticeships per facility. Women's facilities with a population of 1,001-2,000 average 2.3 educational programs, 3.3 life skills programs, 2 vocational programs, .7 college vocational programs, 1 Project RIO and .7 apprenticeships per facility.

The differences in averages for educational programs and life skills programs for men's and women's prisons at the 0-1000 population level are statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level. The other differences at this population level are not statistically significant. The difference in the averages in life skills programs at the 1001-2000 population level is significant at the $p < .05$ level. The other differences in the table are not significantly different. In terms of programming averages compared to population women's facilities have higher averages of programs per facility than men at the 0-1,000 prisoner population level. With exception of apprenticeships which are both zero the women's facilities average more programs in every category. However, the opposite is true at the 1,001-2,000 prisoner population level. Again with exception to apprenticeships at .7 for women and .3 for men and also life skills in the larger population facilities at 3.3 for women and 2.4 for men, the men's facilities have a higher average number of programs per facility although, the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 4.4 Mean number of programs per facility for men's and women's prisons by population

Facility Type	Max Pop.	Facility Names	Educational	Life Skills	Vocational	College Vocational	Project RIO	Apprenticeships
Men's	0-1000 N=5	Byrd, Central, Jordan, Rudd and Vance	.8	1.6	1	.8	.6	0
Women's	0-1000 N=2	Mountain View and Hilltop	2.5	3	3	2	1	0
Men's	1001-	Boyd,						

Table 4.4 continued

	2000 N=23	Briscoe, Clemens, Dalhart, Daniel, Darrington, Goree, Hightower, Huntsville, Jester III, Luther, Lynaugh, Neal, Pack, Powledge, Ramsey, Roach, Scott, Stevenson, Stringfellow , Terrell, Torres, and Wallace	2.2	2.4	2.7	1.4	1	.3
Women's	1001- 2000 N=3	Murray, Hobby and Gatesville	2.3	3.3	2	.7	1	.7

*p<.05

The data provided here indicate that there are both similarities and differences in the programming made available to men and women in public prisons in Texas. Both men and women are offered similar types of programs. The education, life skills and Project RIO programs are the same for both sexes. There is variation in amount of programs offered and also in the vocational, college vocational and apprenticeship programs. In general women are offered fewer programs per facility, however difference is not significant.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the programming available to male and female prisoners in public prisons in Texas. A comparison was made between the programming available to men and the programming available to women. The state of Texas, in its very vague mission statement promotes positive change for offenders as well as easier reintegration into society. This statement was compared to the data from this study. A mission statement is defined as “a summary describing the aims, values, and overall plan of an organization or individual” (dictionary.com).

The mission of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice is to provide public safety, promote positive change in offender behavior, reintegrate offenders into society, and assist victims of crime (TDCJ website).

Judging by the counts of the information provided on the TDCJ website, the number of education and life skills programs offered to prisoners in each facility examined is relatively limited. In the women’s prisons, the total number of programs ranged from a low of 7 (Gatesville) to a high of 15 (Hobby). The range for the men’s prisons was greater, with a low of 1 (Byrd and Vance) and a high of 18 (Ferguson). The programming provided in the public prisons by state of Texas seems limited. As such I do not believe that the state of Texas is living up to its Missions statement in trying to positively change offenders and to help with reintegration into society.

The findings of this study indicate that the state of Texas is perhaps not doing enough in terms of education and skills based programming to promote positive change or reintegrate offenders. There simply are not enough programs offered in the public prisons in Texas to effect a big change in the prison population. The state of Texas offers very few programs that

are designed to help reintegrate the offender into society. In fact, there are only two, Project RIO which is a program to assist offenders in obtaining employment post release, and a program called Changes/Pre-release, this program is designed to help prisoners prepare for release back into society. There are of course other programs but there are only those two specifically designed for reintegration.

The state of Texas offers some educational programming and some vocational programming. There are in total 4 educational programs offered by the state and only one of the public prisons offers all 4. There are 4 life skills programs including one of the reintegration programs and only 3 prisons offer all 4. Throughout the public prison system there are 33 different vocational programs that are not administered through a college and one prison has six and all of the others have no more than 5. There are also vocational that are administered through colleges, this means that the prisoners have to pay the fees while they are taking the class or after release. There are 20 college vocational programs and the most any prison offers is 3. All but 2 of the prisons offer Project RIO. Lastly there are 8 apprenticeship programs and most of the prisons do not offer these programs.

As reported in chapter 2, somewhere between 50% and 75% of prisoners in the U.S. are functionally illiterate, there is no reason to think that it would be drastically different from national average. Given this, it is disturbing that basic education is not offered in all of the facilities examined. The state of Texas moreover, does not offer very many options for prisoners to receive vocational training. As was also mentioned previously, facilities that offer more than one type of vocational program tend to offer very similar ones because of space considerations.

5.1 Policy Implications

The state of Texas needs more programs to meet the expectation set forth in the mission statement. If the Texas Department of Criminal Justice wants to positively change

offenders and help them reintegrate it needs to offer more education programs and also more programs focused on re-entering society. It would also be a good idea to increase the number of vocational options available to prisoners. Although, there are several different vocational programs offered statewide, only a very few are available in each prison. The programs that are administered through colleges should have special options for prisoners, for example additional help with gaining employment post release, so they can repay the fees.

No matter what if the state of Texas wants to improve prisoners and thereby decrease recidivism it will require more money. Better funding would allow for more of the programs and possibly better distribution of opportunities. The state will need to do more than just provide better and more programs. There also needs to be a focus on the educational system for children. Something should be done to change the large number of prisoners who are functionally illiterate. Society should be able to prevent this. Also in addition to education and vocation it is important that the prisoners learn life skills to manage their lives and to make better choices in the future. Lastly, it is also necessary to increase the use of programs like Project RIO to help offenders gain employment post release. There are many things that can be done to reduce the prison population and the rate of recidivism. It is necessary to do this because eventually we will run out of places to store prisoners; there is a finite amount of space to build prisons.

5.2 Limitations

There are two major limitations to this study. First, the sample did not include all of the prisons in the state of Texas. The findings can only be applied to the public prisons in the state of Texas. Second, I chose to use only the information available to the public via the Texas department of criminal justice website. I do not have information about the number of prisoners who can and are participating in the various programs. I do not know the capacity of the programs and as such, I am unable to say just how inadequate or adequate they might be in terms of availability. It is possible that some of these programs in prisons with populations of 3,000 or more only serve 30 prisoners. In all likelihood improving programs may start with

increasing their capacity. It is also impossible to assess who participates in these programs and whether or not they recidivate at a lesser rate than those who do not. Although, as mentioned in the literature review studies in the past have shown that prisoners who participate in programming tend to recidivate at a lower rate than those who do not.

5.3 Future Research

There should be future research that goes into more detail than this study. Future research should look at the capacity of programs. Budget should also be considered. This study did not look at the budget for programming in my research. Another possibility for future research is a more in-depth look at the vocational programs offered and their practicality. It is also important to have research on the effectiveness of these programs on reducing recidivism. It would be interesting to research the structure of the programs offered in the women's prisons and whether or not they are appropriately designed. As mentioned in the literature review female prisoner have different needs and characteristics than their male counterparts and as such they need different types of programs. Lastly, an exploration of other states and other types of programs and institutions would be valuable in evaluating the state of programming for prisoners.

REFERENCES

- Batchelder, J. S., & Pippert, J. M. (2002). Hard time or idle time: factors affecting inmate choices between participation in prison work and education programs. *The Prison Journal*, 82(2), 269-280.
- Brewster, D. R., & Sharp, S. F. (2002). Educational programs and recidivism in Oklahoma: another look. *The Prison Journal*, 82(3), 314-334.
- Burke, L. O., & Vivian, J. E. (2001). The effect of college programming on recidivism rates as the Hampden County House of Corrections: a 5-year study. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 52(4), 160-162.
- Carlson, P. M. (2001). Something to lose: a balanced and reality-based rationale for institutional programming. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5(4), 25-31. Retrieved September 8, 2007, from Criminal Justice Abstracts
- Covington, S. (2002, January). *A woman's journey home: challenges for female offenders and their children*. : U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Foley, R. M., & Gao, J. (2004). Correctional education: characteristics of academic programs serving incarcerated adults. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, 55(1), 6-21.
- Freeman, R. (2003, May). *Can we close the revolving door?: recidivism vs. employment of ex-offenders in the U.S.*: New York University Law School.

- Harris, P. M., & Keller, K. S. (2005). Ex-offenders need not apply. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21(1), 6-30.
- Harlow, C. W. (2003, January). *Education and correctional populations* (NCJ 195670). Retrieved November 20, 2006, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/>Ubah and Robinson (2003)
- Haulard, E. R. (2001). Adult education: a must for our incarcerated population. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 52(5), 157-159. Retrieved November 02, 2007. from Criminal Justice Abstracts.
- James, S. J., & Karberg, J. C. (2003, August). *Census of state and federal correctional facilities, 2000* (NCJ 198272). Retrieved November 2, 2007 from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs>
- Lawrence, S., Mears, D. P., Dubin, G., & Travis, J. (2002, May). *The practice and promise of prison programming*: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Latessa, E. J., & Smith, P. (2006). Does correctional program quality really matter? the impact of adhering to the principles of effective intervention. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 575-594.
- Macdonald, M., & Watson, L. (2001). Creating choices, changing lives: the transformation of women's corrections in Canada. *Corrections Today*, 63(1), 70.
- Marquart, J. W., Cuvelier, S. J., Burton, V. S., Adams, K., Gerber, J., Longmire, D., et al. (1994). A limited capacity to treat: examining the effects of prison population control strategies on prison education programs. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(4), 561-531.

- Micucci, A., & Monster, M. (2004). Its about time to hear their stories; impediments to rehabilitation as a Canadian provincial correctional facility. *Criminal Justice*, 32, 515.
- Neff, N. (2004). Beyond Bars. . Retrieved November 13, 2006 from <http://www.utexas.edu/features/archive/2004/girlscouts.html>
- O'Neill, L., Layton Mackenzie, D., & Bierie, D. M. (2007). Educatinal opportunities within correctional institutions: does facility type matter? *The Prison Journal*, 87, 311.
- Rose, C. (2004). Women's participation in prison education: what we know and what we don't know. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, 55(1), 78-100.
- Schadee, J. (2003). Passprot to healthy families. *Corrections Today*, 65(3), 64.
- Schram, P. J., Koons-Witt, B. A., & Morash, M. (2004). Management strategies when working with female prisoners. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 15(2), 25-49.
- Seiter, K. P., & Kadela, K. R. (2003). Prisoner reentry: what works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49(3), 360-388.
- Shapiro, C., & Schwartz, M. (2001). Coming home: building on family connections. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5(3), 52-61.
- Shearer, R. A. (2003). Identifying the special needs of female offenders. *Federal Probation*, 16(1), 46-51.
- Tdcj. (2005, 12). *Texas Department of Criminal Justice*. Retrieved November 13, 2006, from Texas Department of Criminal Justice Web site: <http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/pio/page88.html>

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. (2003, May). Retrieved November 2, 2007, from Texas

Department of Criminal Justice Web site: <http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us>

Texas Workforce. (2006, March). *Project R/O*. Retrieved November 2, 2007, from Texas

Workforce Commission Web site: <http://www.twc.state.tx.us/svcs/rio.html>

Ubah, C. B., & Robinson, R. L. (2003). A grounded look at the debate over prison-based education: optimistic theory versus pessimistic worldview. *The Prison Journal*, 83(2), 115-129.

Van Wormer, K., & Kaplan, L. (2006). Results of a national survey of wardens in women's prisons: the case for gender specific treatment. *Women & Therapy*, 29(1/2), 133-151.

Walters, G. D. (2004). Predictors of early termination in a prison program of psycho education. *The Prison Journal*, 84(2), 171-183.

Zgoba, K. M., Haugebrook, S., & Jenkins, K. (2008). The influence of GED obtainment on inmate release outcome. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 375.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Molly Baldwin obtained a B.A. in criminal justice from the University of Texas at Dallas in 2005 and an M.A. in criminology and criminal justice from the University of Texas at Arlington in 2008. She also has research interests in the correctional programming arena and would like to pursue that in the future. Lastly, she is considering going to school to get a Ph.D. in the future. She would like to teach at some point in the future.