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ABSTRACT
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Colleges and universities need to develop policies for those stu-
dents facing possible criminal court action, incarceration, probation,
or parole consistent with their missions and goals. Prisons have
generally failed to provide positive training for better opportunities
after punishment. Criminal justice officials know little about the
effect of rehabilitative approaches on persons assigned them through
the police and the courts. Society in general contributes to this
lack of understanding, endorsing the concept "once an offender always
an offender," and by institutional practices which limit an offender's
chances of finding suitable employment or housing. Institutions of
higher education can provide a valuable, realistic way of both removing
the stigma of being an offender and increasing the level of employabil-
ity.
A history, rationale, and basis for policy action regarding student offenders at the University of Massachusetts was developed by asking the following four questions:

What is going on for student offenders at the University of Massachusetts?

Why are things the way they are (for student offenders)?

What would be better (for student offenders)?

What can we do to make things better (for student offenders)?

To describe, "What is going on for student offenders at the University of Massachusetts?" involved a series of interviews and an examination of practices and programs relative to this student population during the years 1971 through 1977. The University's posture towards student offenders appeared to be neutral—neither encouraging nor discouraging involvement. Most action centered on the results of campus disciplinary proceedings; however, some convicted felons participated in on-campus educational release programs.

In order to discover, "Why are things the way they are for student offenders?" examined were those factors which inhibit the establishment of links between the justice system and higher education. An answer to this question centers on the extremes within which the criminal justice system has acted, ranging from a punishment focus in some instances to a rehabilitative model in others. Higher education is caught within the limits of diminishing resources, limits which are more keenly felt by the unfinished priorities of bringing minorities and the poor into higher education which found their roots in the 1960's. At the same time, new markets of more non-traditional students, including student
offenders, are becoming important to the future of institutions of higher education. These students, though, tend to have greater need for financial and counseling support, and flexible class hours. Higher education has been slow in responding to these diverse needs.

The primary information source for the third question, "What would be better for student offenders?", were those factors which facilitate the creation of useful links between the justice system and higher education. Movement in this direction is tied to the willingness and ability of institutions of higher education and the justice system to collaborate on policies and programs for student offenders. Under such collaborative arrangements student offenders can receive the benefits of academic and support services needed for successful matriculation.

The final question, "What can we do to make things better for student offenders?", examines ways in which the University can encourage creation of a policy for student offenders. Policy commitments leading to programmatic thrusts can enhance the chances of needed positive changes. These commitments should link on- and off-campus justice and human services resources. The University of Massachusetts and increasing numbers of higher educational institutions must promote the inclusion of offenders in society's mainstream. This inclusion must be viewed as a factor positively related to the goal of a better quality of life for all citizens.
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CHAPTER I

A NEED FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION AND
THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Introduction

In recent years an increasing number of post secondary students have been involved in legal situations with the police, courts, and correctional facilities. In addition, a growing number of incarcerated offenders possess high school equivalency diplomas adding to the potential number of offender post-secondary students. Prisons have failed to effectively change many offenders. Prison officials know little about what rehabilitative tools work with persons assigned to them through the police and the courts. Society contributes to the ineffective rehabilitation of an offender by attitudinally supporting the concept of "once an offender always an offender" by creating structures which sharply restrict an ex-offender's ability to find suitable employment or housing. Institutions of higher education can provide a reasonable avenue that both aids in removing the stigma of being an offender and increases the possibility of suitable employment. Colleges and universities have yet to articulate policies consistent with their mission and goals of educating post-high school individuals by including those students facing possible criminal court action, incarceration, probation,
or parole.¹

In order to provide a history, rationale, and basis for policy action regarding student offenders at the University of Massachusetts, four questions are the focus in proceeding sections of this paper.²

First, "What is going on for student offenders at the University of Massachusetts?" centers on administrative practices and programs relative to this student population from the years 1971 through 1977. University administrators and Department of Public Safety (campus police) personnel; program directors and justice system personnel who have worked directly with programming and placement of offenders; student offenders who have been incarcerated and in ex-offender status; and others not directly involved with student offenders but possessing relevant opinions to an historical perspective on the status of offenders during this period were interviewed regarding their understanding of the University's relationship to the post secondary offenders.³

Second, "Why are things the way they are for student offenders?" focuses on those factors that impede the creation of links between the

¹The term "student offender" will be used to refer to those students facing criminal court action, probation, incarceration, or parole.

²These four questions are based on a research approach useful for looking at social problems. Alice Rivlin, an economist who has played a major role in planning and budgeting procedures for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare developed this approach in Systematic Thinking for Social Action (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1971). Regarding social policy for a particular population the four relevant questions are: "What is going on?", "Why are things the way they are?", "What would be better?" and "What can we do to make things better?"

³University refers to the University of Massachusetts.
justice system and higher education. To answer this question a review of some areas of correctional education, racism, higher education, and programs utilized by the courts and correctional facilities for offender rehabilitation are reviewed. A survey of policies and programs for student offenders at other colleges and universities is introduced, and views of some persons interviewed in answering the first question cited above provides a further focus for this question.

Third, "What would be better for student offenders?" looks at those factors that facilitate the creation of useful links between the justice system and higher education. Further results of the survey on policies and programs for student offenders at other colleges and universities are used along with a literature review of programs utilized by institutions of higher education, the courts, and correctional facilities. As in answering the previous two questions some parts of the interviews with persons connected with or knowledgeable about offender policies and programs at the University also serve to answer this question.

Fourth, "What can we do to make things better for student offenders?" focusses on useful information gained from a review of practices, projects and policies that suggest a framework under which the University of Massachusetts can develop an effective policy for student offenders. These criteria guidelines are based on short and long range proposals suggesting roles of responsibility for University administrators, and students. The answer to this fourth question is meant as a springboard for action by University administrators. As an area of student affairs that has not received significant attention, these
conclusions are placed in the larger context of higher education and suggest some future directions for the development of useful policies for this population at other institutions.

Reactions of Institutions of Higher Education and the Justice System to Offenders

During the past forty years the primary focus of education in prisons has been on expansion of correctional education. The 1930's saw the creation of both the Federal Bureau of Prisons and an act calling for the movement of prisoners away from idleness and into prison industries, vocational training and education. Since then, increasingly, some form of correctional education has been a part of most federal, state and county prison and jail programs in the United States.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries education and training programs for prisoners were little more than meager attempts to approach the overwhelming problem of illiteracy. Within this context literacy training, especially in the form of Bible-reading, was considered crucial. Correctional education was in fact religious instruction carried out by prison ministers who felt that the acceptance of religion was fundamental to the adoption of a non-criminal life.

The movement toward higher education in prisons began as early as the 1860's, when Zebulon Brockway, a noted prison educator, realized the potential for post secondary learning in a small number of prisoners. By 1920, Austin McCormick had begun sponsoring correspondence courses in prisons which, while conceptually sound, found little success. This failure occurred at least in part because of a lack of
a framework for course selection. In 1925, the first collaboration between a correctional facility and institution of higher education occurred when the University of California extension division offered post secondary course work to inmates at San Quentin Federal Prison. Limited educational efforts continued until after World War Two.

Between 1950 and 1976, a number of post secondary institutions, including large universities and community colleges, took a proactive role in establishing educational offerings in the form of prison classes, extension courses, video-taped lessons, tutorial teaching and study or educational release.4 Early efforts at college programming were usually in the form of offering courses that did not lead to an Associate or Bachelor degree. Southern Illinois University introduced college level instruction to the State Penitentiary at Menard, Illinois, in 1953. By 1962, a small group of carefully selected inmates was allowed to follow the requirements to obtain a degree. It was felt that "a college education was a giant step forward in building the self-confidence necessary to enter society."5

---

4Educational release refers to educational programs for incarcerated individuals offered at a community education site such as a public or private college or secondary school. In such cases offenders are in most cases transported daily from the correctional facility to the school, and then returned to the correctional facility upon completion of classes the same day.

By the 1960's, the University of Kansas and Leavenworth Federal
Prison, the University of Maryland and Maryland State Prison as well as
the states of California, Texas, and Illinois had all developed some
kind of college course work offerings within the walls of a major cor-
rectional facility.

Project Newgate, begun in 1967, represents one of the most notable
efforts at post-secondary education for the incarcerated. With funding
from the Office of Economic Opportunity, and with the cooperation of the
Oregon State Higher Education System Division of Continuing Education,
the Oregon State Maximum Security Penitentiary, and Portland University
as the sponsoring institution, Dr. Thomas E. Gaddis developed the New-
gate model.

Unlike other piecemeal efforts, Newgate planners conceived a sys-
tematic, comprehensive approach to the education of offenders. The
goals included:

1. regular college classes taught by college faculty in the
   prison;
2. comprehensive counseling designed to improve the self-concept
   of inmates;
3. additional cultural and social activities beyond those normally
   offered in most correctional environments.  

In addition to these primary goals, Newgate faculty and counselors
developed a pre-college component for inmates not ready for college
work, and an outside prison component including college and/or job

---

6U.S., Office of Economic Opportunity, Newgate: A Way Out of
placement and help.

This more extensive approach to offender education spread to other colleges and universities nationally. Since 1967 the Newgate model has been adopted by the Minnesota Reformatory for Men (in cooperation with the University of Minnesota), the Bureau of Corrections and the Rockview Correctional Institution (in cooperation with Pennsylvania State University), the Penitentiary of New Mexico (in cooperation with Eastern New Mexico University), and the Ashland Federal Youth Center (in cooperation with Morehead State University).

About the time Newgate began its operation, Federal City College (now part of the University of the District of Columbia) "opened its doors as the nation's first land grand institution with a strong commitment to educational innovation and community involvement." 7 It was part of the college's responsibility to "translate the traditional rural concept of community outreach of the Morrill Act into programs with an urban problem solving orientation." 8 An important thrust within this commitment to urban community involvement was to the offender population concentrated in several correctional facilities in the District of Columbia area. The Lorton Prison became the primary focus for the College's offender educational efforts. Under the name "Lorton Project" several additional penal facilities became part of the expanded educational outreach.


8Ibid.
With a strong commitment to the education and betterment of blacks within the District of Columbia, and with a special emphasis on self-esteem, the comprehensive Lorton effort was launched. The Federal City College Lorton Project coordinated educational, training and work phases as part of a total program designed to complete a circle that is incomplete for many blacks, especially black inmates. The project has three levels. First is the institutional or in-prison phase, which includes education and work on the self-image; second is the job-readiness phase; and third is Project Start, which links inmates and parolees with specific educational and community job opportunities. The program helps create an environment of individual inmate success and a meaningful link between college training and the world outside of prison. Since many of the inmates participating in the program had been released before, one of the primary objectives of the Lorton Project was to help inmates place less emphasis on release as an end in itself, and more emphasis on release as the first step in a meaningful life. Rehabilitation now emphasized useful roles within the community as necessary to help persons recently released from prison.

Based on the Project's low recidivism rate of 15% over four years, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare adopted the Lorton Project as a national model. In addition, by 1973, six years after the Project began, over 500 men had been enrolled.  

\[9\] Ibid., p. 178.
Despite this rather encouraging progress in the post-secondary education of inmates over the past fifty years, recent surveys of prison education programs reveal that such efforts have only scratched the surface. Herron, Muir, and Dorsey in their 1973 survey found approximately 526,000 adults incarcerated in federal, state, and county correctional institutions, specialized medical treatment centers and various prison camps. Their survey included 305 major adult federal and state institutions, but excluded city, county and similar institutions in which the average short length of an inmate's sentence, or the nature of the institution, precluded opportunities for comprehensive prison education programs. The 305 institutions surveyed housed 210,183 prisoners. Two hundred eighteen of these facilities, or 71%, offered some kind of college-level instruction. Although the predominant type of instruction involves college faculty teaching courses in person, only 24%, or 52 institutions, offer full-time education, and 32%, or 69, will not excuse an inmate from his/her prison job to attend college classes. Forty-seven percent, or 101 institutions, offer an Associate degree and 12 institutions, or 5.5%, offer a Bachelor's degree.\(^{10}\)

Sylvia McCollum, an education specialist for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, estimates a slightly lower figure of 400,000 persons incarcerated in federal, state and local institutions. Of these, she estimates 150,000 are detained in local and county facilities, 23,000 in federal institutions and 227,000 in state prisons. Between 1% and 5%, or

\(^{10}\)Rex H. Herron, John T. Muir, and Dorsey Williams, National Survey of Postsecondary Education Programs for Offenders (Hackensack, N.J.: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, [1973]).
between 2,500 or 12,500, are actually involved in college programs. She determined that the Federal correctional system had about 4,000 inmates in college courses including 550 in some kind of educational release program. Assuming two courses per student, she estimates about 2,000 out of 23,000 federal prisoners are involved in a college program. In another survey, Dell 'Appa found that in 150 of 249 institutions surveyed, 6,400 of 109,161 prisoners, or about 6%, were involved in post-secondary education.

Data on the actual number of prisoners in higher education programs is inconclusive and conflicting at best. McCollum concludes that there really are no precise figures on the number of inmates currently involved in prison education programs, nor how many students receive an Associate's or Bachelor's degree. McCollum does believe, however, that the number could easily be doubled without putting undue strain on either the potential student or the available educational resources.

When considering the state of prison higher education programs, a close look should be taken at educational or study release. The Herron, Muir, and Williams study (1973) found that 144 of 305 institutions surveyed offered study release programs, and that 115 of these were


combined with inside-prison courses. Yet, in that same year, the Larry Jacques survey, which included responses from 133 institutions, determined that 113 prisons offered higher education programs, but that only about 1%, or 863 inmates, were attending classes on a college campus and returning to the correctional institution at night. This was true even though most of the facilities were medium and minimum security prisons.

An irony exists within the correctional education framework in which there is agreement among correctional administrators and educators that a high school diploma or acquisition of a General Equivalency Diploma is an acceptable level of educational achievement, but college course work, especially course work leading to a degree is not equally supported. Meaningful higher education programs that fully meet the needs of the incarcerated, those in release programs, and the paroled are slow in developing. The efforts of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, pilot projects supported by federal monies that encourage collaborations between corrections, education, and other community support

---

14Herron, Muir, Williams, "National Survey of Postsecondary Education Programs for Offenders."

15Larry L. Jacques, "A National Survey of the Correctional Education Programs Available to Inmates of Penal Institutions for Adults" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1973), p. 74. In his study, Jacques defines medium and minimum security prisons. For the purpose of this paper, minimum security refers to a prison environment where there are few signs of security such as a wall surrounding the prison or barbed wire fencing. Prisoners in minimum security environments can move on and in most cases off prison grounds without a correctional officer escort. Although the meaning of minimum and medium security prison varies from state to state, the major difference between medium and minimum security besides more visible signs of prison security, is the presence of a correctional officer with a medium security prisoner when he/she leaves the prison grounds.
services, encompass only a few of the correctional institutions and colleges in the United States. If more rehabilitative alternatives are to be offered to inmates, more collaborative efforts between institutions of higher education and the nation's prisons must materialize in order to offer reasonable educational programs to those inmates possessing a high school education.

Roles and Responsibilities of the
Criminal Justice System

Laws based on community norms and judicial legislative practices influence the behavior of most citizens. Law enforcement agencies, the courts, and the correctional system, each with a distinct role, administer the laws of this country. According to one commentator, "The administration of Justice is essential to an ordered society."\textsuperscript{16} Property, religion, and individual liberty must be protected while revenge or feuds must be controlled. There must be a balance between protection of self and harming others. The judiciary and other governmental agencies enforce this balance.\textsuperscript{17} Despite abundant evidence of justice discrimination against urban youth and minorities, most people assume that justice means enforcement of standards equally among citizens.

Increasingly, those agencies entrusted with the administration of


\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
justice have been criticized for their inability to deter crime. The fear generated by crime, especially violent and repeated crime, and the fluctuation in crime rates over the past decade, have brought considerable attention to court procedures and the length of incarceration of convicted felons. The concern over lenient enforcement of laws resulted in juries and judges scrutinizing accused felons in harsher ways. After a recent murder trial the judge noted a change in public attitude toward young, black defendants from Harlem:

I suspect it may be true that a few years ago my jury would have weighed . . . [the defendant's] guilt against its own feeling of collective guilt and brought in an acquittal. If so, not only has social guilt been overwhelmed by the fear of random, brutal violence, but faith in liberal solutions has also eroded. "Whatever they are doing now isn't working," . . . [the judge] said.

Twenty thousand Americans were victims of homicide last year; that's more than were killed in the last years of the Vietnam War. People are afraid to walk the streets.¹⁸

Increasing awareness of both the length of the average felon's incarceration and rates of recidivism have also aroused public concern. The judge in the case just cited noted that this offender, who was sentenced to a nine year maximum sentence, will probably be out in three years. A three year served sentence matches the national average, yet leaves no one satisfied.

Correction departments throughout the nation, as a result of concern over crime prevention by both individual citizens and state legislatures, are closely scrutinizing the effectiveness of rehabilitation and educational programs for offenders. Many, rather than looking at

the ability of new or revised rehabilitative structures as a means to crime prevention, simply assume such efforts do not work. With this attitude prevailing, punishment and restitution often replace rehabilitation as the primary goal of prisons. Commissioner Benjamin Ward, New York State Commissioner of Corrections, and various associate commissioners repeatedly stated at a 1977 conference on "Inmate Higher Education" that the primary responsibility of their department was to protect the public by holding prisoners in a secure environment. Programs involving higher education in prisons were described as a frill that had not been documented as any more or less effective than other rehabilitative efforts. In a state where recidivism rates range from 70% to 80%, this becomes a serious indictment of the entire correctional process. Under such circumstances, "punishment, control and permanent isolation" become an easily accepted solution to inmate rehabilitation.19

A brief profile of the general prison population may help focus attention away from a rigid acceptance of punishment or rehabilitation as the primary function of the criminal justice system. With few exceptions, black, other minorities and the poor are overrepresented in the prison population. As of 1970 approximately 135,000 blacks were incarcerated in federal, state and local prisons. Four percent of black youth aged eighteen to thirty-four and two percent of all black males were incarcerated. Blacks accounted for two out of five

prisoners nationally. Between 1960 and 1970 the prison population fell from 340,000 to 332,000, yet the black population increased from 38 to 43 percent.\textsuperscript{20}

In general, the prison population represents a microcosm of a growing underclass which is trapped in a cycle of poverty and hopelessness. A juror in an urban murder case remarked that the circumstances surrounding the case reflect those surrounding many such cases. "Both the victim and the defendant were young and black... As I reconstructed this case, a life of disintegrating streets of the city stood out in relief, a life that is less and less contained by social and economic barriers, and which exerts the strongest of claims on the children of the dispossessed."\textsuperscript{21}

Conversely, although the criminal justice system theoretically views the accused impartially, the higher one is on the socio-economic ladder, the less likely the chances of severe punishment or detention. Watergare illuminated this point. Spying, wire-tapping, and government invasion of privacy became less punishable offenses than car-theft or other crimes against property by the poor. So-called "white collar" defendants receive limited attention by the justice system. The crime of income tax evasion serves as an illustration. Delinquent tax violation has been cited as the most frequently committed federal crime. Yet, tax violators, when discovered, usually do not face arrest or


inprisonment. They simply pay their back taxes plus interest and a fine. On the other hand, a car thief cannot return the "borrowed" vehicle with interest and a court fine. On the contrary, if caught, imprisonment is probably inevitable. The car thief is believed to need punishment and rehabilitation. The tax violator, according to societal and judicial norms requires neither.\textsuperscript{22}

Although designed originally as a system to protect individual rights and provide a forum for fair and equal treatment, the role of the criminal justice system as a provider of these services seem doubtful at best. No single factor or person can be cited for the inequities and contradictions within our system. Yet no one can ignore the fact that the poor are more likely to be in prison while the genteel embezzler escapes with more lenient reprimands. Nor can one ignore the concern of persons who see the court process as a revolving door for offenders who are neither corrected nor rehabilitated while subject to the court process, probation, incarceration or parole.

Perhaps the greater concern ought to be the way in which the larger society reacts to and interacts with the justice system. As with many other social concerns we face in the closing years of the seventies, we tend to view the justice system as an issue apart, not integrally related to other problems.

Briefly alluded to was the incidence of poverty and racism in the emerging underclass. Clearly poverty factors are integrally connected

with the issue of court justice and the motives of crime. Not mentioned were the links between roles and responsibilities of other areas within the social order to provide a forum in which change and the rebuilding of the ideal of justice in America can be achieved. The question of whether or not the justice system can again establish its roles and responsibilities within a framework of equality for the poor and the rich seems to be dependent not on the debate between proponents of law enforcement and punishment versus leniency and rehabilitation, but on efforts by government and community agencies in providing meaningful jobs, substantial housing, and education for all that elect and need them. Yet to get beyond thoughts of meeting these needs as token gestures, there must be some understanding of the extremes within the society between the rich and the poor, or between most white and minority Americans. Just as blacks are overrepresented in prison, whites are overrepresented in colleges, and graduate and professional schools. Constant attention must be paid to such obvious inequities.

Roles and Responsibilities of Higher Education

While the justice system was beginning to place emphasis on education as a means of rehabilitation, higher education was broadening its perceived mission. Early American universities developed as a training ground for those who were to enter certain professions such as the clergy, law and medicine. With the development of the land grant college, higher education began a move away from elitism and toward an educational realm built on the college as an instrument of service to the community. With the passage of the G.I. Bill after World War Two,
the face of higher education changed. Military veterans went to college campuses with an eagerness to learn and a much clearer sense of personal missions and goals than traditional college students.

Following World War II higher education experienced a sharp period of growth. Less than five percent of all eighteen to twenty-four year olds were in college in 1944. By 1950 over sixteen percent of that age group were attending college. The growing affluence enjoyed by many Americans following the war was reflected in the growing number of colleges, and youth attending college. Publically supported programs, and public higher education in particular, operated from a perspective of unlimited dollar resources. New programs developed within four year institutions, and the community college movement offered access to higher educational opportunities for new student populations.

Costs for higher education increased faster than family income. Colleges did not begin to respond to this increasing financial crunch until the late sixties and early seventies. By the mid-seventies the financial plight of many post-secondary schools caused responses ranging from rising concern by college faculty and administration to the reality of closing institutions financially incapable of surviving. Many colleges and universities, public and private, find reassessment and reallocation of resources a necessary response to this crisis. Efforts to "trim the fat" included leaving faculty positions vacant, reducing non-essential student services, and eliminating some cultural activities.

Along with a fiscal crunch, people began to question the value of a higher education degree.

Parallel with concern over the financing of higher education is concern for enrollment. Partially as a response to rising costs of education, and partially due to other factors, the number of traditional 18 to 22 year-old full time students is decreasing. The graduate pool of the class of 1990 will be 25% lower than the class of 1978 based on birth rates in 1972.24 Although still generally supported by statistical research, the premise that a college education leads to a better paying job is losing some public support. In addition, a tight economy forces an increasing number of young people to use college as a back-up plan if a suitable job cannot be found. This clearly represents a turn-around from the situation a few years ago.

Recent history of higher education denotes many things besides college that impact on the role and responsibility of post-secondary education.25 Today's university serves many aspects of the community. As the stereotypes of women, minorities, the handicapped and the elderly dissolve, increasing numbers of non-traditional student populations will enter the educational mainstream. At the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, non-traditional students are described as "any student who does not fit the familiar pattern of the traditionally-prepared 18-21 year old student entering the University directly from high school, or


25Post-secondary refers to college.
transferring from a junior college, having met all of the admission criteria."\textsuperscript{26} People returning part-time, adults in surrounding communities, workers who only have limited hours they can devote to school, applicants possessing a familiar language other than English, and those who possess educational disadvantages based on inferior schooling but who possess academic potential are some sub-categories of non-traditional students.\textsuperscript{27}

Today's university, especially a large university, has a variety of students, faculty and staff such that diversity is the central theme of most campuses. No longer can higher education be described as a cloistered period between high school and adult life. Learning has become an acceptable life-long process. These facts make the potential service of student offenders at the University of Massachusetts a practical possibility.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has identified five primary purposes of higher education as a social institution moving toward the year 2000. First, higher education should provide the individual with an education within a constructive environment for growth and development. Second, colleges and universities should serve to advance the human capability of students and society at large. Third, they should serve as institutions advocating and practicing educational

\textsuperscript{26}Public Service Through Academic Excellence--A Report of the Commission on Missions and Goals of the University of Massachusetts Amherst, by Sarah Lawall, Chairperson (University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, 1975), p. 7.

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid.
justice. Fourth, post secondary education should preserve and illuminate the wisdom and achievements of the past. Finally higher education should serve as an evaluative tool for society for renewal through individual thought and persuasion.²⁸

Within the context of the Carnegie Commission's goals for higher education and recent trends in higher education, the goal of institutional advocacy and practice of educational justice deserves particular attention. Too often higher education is defined in static, rather than dynamic, terms. Too often colleges and universities respond only to the intellectual at the expense of the practical or realistic.

In a post-industrial age it becomes more difficult and less fruitful to respond to social, political, and economic issues except in a context which recognizes their interdependence. Post-secondary institutions must increasingly respond to the world in which the institution exists. Colleges must interface with community leaders on concerns that can help all those in a community experience a better life. Quality of life issues, aiding those that need support, and developing better health care delivery systems can be some of those dynamic issues on which collaboration can take place. Colleges and universities responded to Sputnik through increased research in mathematics and engineering. The civil rights movement and efforts toward educational equality resulted in increased minority student enrollments and affirmative action on college campuses. Although institutions of higher

education cannot respond to all social, political and economic concerns of this dynamic era, the role and responsibility of post secondary education must continue to encompass the concerns of the immediate community and pressing national and world conditions.

Creating Links Between the Criminal Justice System and Higher Education

When the criminal justice system, which is marked by confinement, and higher education, which has meant knowledge and research, attempt to create links, the task appears difficult at best. Philosophically, one seems to say, "we are going to get even with you," while the other seems to say, "we are going to expand your intellectual horizons." Both definitions are too restrictive and do not reflect the realities of an age of technology or a shrinking world in which a recognition of human needs increases in importance. Viewed another way, the public sees criminals and ex-offenders as abnormal, to be confined and put away, and higher education as an option only for those who earn a right to that horizon. Yet, both institutions claim the ultimate goal of reintegration of their constituencies into society in productive roles. Both institutions concern themselves with the socialization process, and building individuals that can do more than just survive the day to day influences on their lives.

The criminal justice system endorses rehabilitation as a viable means to outside-the-prison success for some offenders. More progressive correctional administrators and educators continue to cite the decrease in recidivism rates and the cost effectiveness of educational
programs as positive points when comparing a strict punishment modality with a modality that tries to balance punishment with education and training efforts. Reports from the Rehabilitation Research Foundation indicate that "there is a positive relationship between a person's involvement in education and training programs while in prison, post release employment in some jobs, and 'success' in staying out of prison." For some offenders, counseling, psychological encounters, therapy groups, family reunion programs, internship and community service while incarcerated or on parole, individually or in combination have been key to the internal attitudinal change needed by an offender who desires success in a non-prison environment.

On the other hand, a recidivism rate of 60-80% of young ex-offenders committing crime again does mark a failure in the system. The problem is far more complex than any narrow and disputed definition of abnormal criminal behavior patterns. In 1952, one researcher stated: "... criminal behavior is part of human behavior, however repugnant such an idea may be to many. ... The same elements that make up law abiding citizens also make up the criminal ... , it is easy to see why there is so much confusion in society." Although stated a quarter of a century ago there is still little evidence


confirming anything to the contrary. With the growing recognition of
"white collar" crime, criminal behavior is described less in terms of
a "criminal mind," and more in terms of the unfortunate position of
being caught.

The problem is also far more complex than the rehabilitation of an
offender in the criminal justice system alone. The Federal Bureau of
Prisons claim that over 95 percent of the country's prison population
return to society. 32 If this is true, and if we are also aware of a
60 to 80 percent recidivism rate one must ask: "What are ex-offenders
returning to?"

Discussed earlier was a profile of the prison population. In that
description blacks, other minorities and the poor were shown to be over-
represented. Edward Elwin, Deputy Commissioner for Parole Services of
the New York State Department of Corrections noted at a 1977 conference
on Inmate Higher Education that the process of reintegrating inmates
into society often means reintegrating them into a city, community, or
neighborhood where poverty, racism, ghetto societies, and unemployment
probably will be the norm rather than the exception. 33 Little sophis-
tication is needed to realize that these factors could contribute to
possible recidivism or failure as a citizen in a non-restrictive
environment.

The dilemma of criminal justice then is multifaceted. The courts

---

32 McCuen, America's Prisons--Correctional Institution or University of Crime, p. 1.

33 Edward Elwin, Speech given at Conference on Inmate Higher Edu-
and correctional facilities can only be partially responsible for a general failure in deterring crime, reintegrating ex-offenders, and protecting the public safety. Like so many other social concerns, solutions rarely are simple, automatic, or able to be accomplished by the efforts of only one institution. Change in a variety of areas needs to take place in order to implement lasting solutions. From the public's perspective, crime is not going away, and efforts to respond to the problem should be encouraged. Since some efforts by the criminal justice system have succeeded, those ought to continue. In addition, new and renewed efforts by federal, state, and local agencies, human service resources, educational institutions, and individuals must be undertaken. To make more than a dent in the problem, these efforts must be collaborative with each other and with the criminal justice system.

Post-secondary institutions and the criminal justice system can further cooperate in a manner that encourages hope and positive possibilities for those facing criminal court action, continued incarceration, probation, or parole. Specifically, the first section of this chapter documented the pool of the incarcerated and those on release programs who might meet the criteria for higher education.

Colleges and universities need to take increasing advocacy roles, specifically for student offenders and those in college accused of crimes. Developing policies that encourage collaborative efforts with the criminal justice system and which promote post-secondary educational programs for offenders seem logical for a number of reasons.

First, compared to other identifiable groups within prisons, the post-secondary inmate population tends to be the least serviced in
terms of educational opportunities. Inmates who have already received a high school diploma are quickly moved into unskilled labor jobs within the institution, vocational training, or at best correspondence courses.\textsuperscript{34} Second, there is a public interest in reintegrating student offenders into the mainstream of society. Offenders need to set a different life pattern. Educational opportunities presented in meaningful ways can have a positive impact on their lives.

Third, over the course of a lifetime an offender can cost the taxpayer more than $100,000. Imprisonment costs alone are high. The average cost per inmate per year is around $15,000, plus fixed costs such as building and grounds. In addition inmates do not pay taxes and usually do not contribute to society.\textsuperscript{35}

Fourth, community action groups are calling on institutions of higher education to respond more directly to communities. Community colleges that are located near correctional facilities have been more responsive to prison populations than universities, yet universities service a more diverse population, and have been leaders in breaking down barriers and stereotypes infringing upon the educational opportunities of a larger range of citizens.

Fifth, taxpayers and legislators are more closely scrutinizing the use of money designated for human services. In particular, a closer

\textsuperscript{34}This reference is to the majority of prison educational programs. As stated earlier, there are some exceptions.

look is being taken at the end-products of services. Collaborative efforts between human service agencies tend to be more cost effective. At a time when effective delivery systems call for meaningful cooperation among various agencies, joint efforts between educational institutions and the justice system receive added support.

Sixth, higher education promotes the concept of developing the whole human being, and humanness through intellectual growth, cultural enrichment, an emphasis on socialization, and a greater equalization of opportunity. The justice system ultimately shares this goal in the change process for offenders.

As the largest public institution of higher education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and as a land grant institution called to respond to the needs of the state and nation, the University of Massachusetts needs to develop policies that encourage collaboration with the justice system. Monthly reports from the University's Department of Public Safety note that since September 1974 the total number of criminal complaints per year averages 1,699. Of the average 206 resulting arrests, most are offenses committed by students against other students.\(^6\) A correctional administrator at a county house of correction has noted that over the past five years the number of student inmates enrolled in University Division of Continuing Education courses at the jail averages ten to twelve students per semester out of a maximum inmate population of 115. He also noted that at any one time a

\(^6\)University of Massachusetts Department of Public Safety Monthly Reports, monthly summary, January 1977 through May 1977.
half-dozen inmates are attempting to negotiate school release programs to go to the University or elsewhere. Such requests were rare prior to 1970.\textsuperscript{37}

The actual number of court-adjudicated students and student inmates attending the University is difficult to obtain. Estimates by University administrators, faculty members, and those affiliated with the University who have worked with pre-paroled and paroled inmates indicate that at any one time there have been close to two hundred such students enrolled on campus.\textsuperscript{38}

As an institution responsible for serving students, discovery of the number of student offenders loses some importance when one looks at a few individual cases of student inmates trying to continue their education in spite of incarceration. Without meaningful policy guidelines for helping students the negotiating process between the justice agency and the University relies on rumors, news reports, and innuendo about a student's behavior, popularity, grades and apparent motivation as well as the personal whims of those doing the negotiating. Specific guidelines for aiding students in such situations can focus negotiation

\textsuperscript{37}Interview with Merton Burt, Deputy Master, Hampshire County House of Corrections, Northampton, Massachusetts, May 1976.

\textsuperscript{38}Part of the problem in documenting this is that unless paroled or inmate students choose to identify themselves, the University has no way of knowing with certainty who these students are. This estimate is based on discussion with personnel at the University's Juvenile Justice Program, University Without Walls administrators, administrators who have worked with this student population in various capacities since 1970, through citation of estimates from justice system personnel in the Federal Probation Office, Springfield, Massachusetts, and corrections personnel at the Hampden, Hampshire, and Berkshire County Houses of Correction. Chapter Two more fully documents this estimate.
on the student's educational program as it reflects the logistical and policy needs of the justice agency and the University.

Already the University is providing educational programs for significant numbers of students in this target population. More formal efforts through the University Without Walls Program, the work/educational release programs from county correctional facilities located within an hour of the University, and contacts with the Federal Probation Office add support to the need for consistent, established policies regarding the offender's relationship with the University.

If the University is to continue to do a good job, then it must develop policies to help as many students as possible. Such policies must clearly attend to the kind of administrative detail that best insures the successful matriculation of these students.
CHAPTER II
WHAT IS GOING ON FOR STUDENT OFFENDERS?

Interview Design and Goals

The presence of offenders at the University of Massachusetts is by no means a new phenomenon. What is new is recognition of the special nature and needs of this population in both policy and programming. In order to discover "What is going on for student offenders," thirty interviews were conducted from four Student Offender Interview forms during the months of May through December 1977. Only those questions from each interview which applied to finding out the nature and scope of the relationship between student offenders and the University between 1971 and 1977 were used in addressing the question of this chapter. For the purpose of the interviews the term "justice system" referred to the police, judicial, and correctional systems created and authorized by either the federal or the various state governments.

The interviews had three objectives:

1. To obtain a comprehensive picture of administrative practices and programs at the University for student offenders from 1971 to 1977

2. To solicit the perspective of University administrators, faculty, staff, and program directors who have been directly involved

1Student Offender Interview will be referred to as Interview.
with, or indirectly affected by, student offenders on campus.

3. To determine in what ways off-campus agencies and justice system personnel have been involved with the student offender, and to obtain their perspectives on current University administrative practices concerning this population.

Interviews involved four categories. Form A of the Interview (Appendix A, questions 1-19) was administered to five campus administrators and Department of Public Safety (campus police) members who have significant contact with student offenders. Form B Interviews (appendix B, questions 1-14) were given to nine campus and justice system based offender program directors. Four student offenders were interviewed with Form C (Appendix C, questions 1-19). Eighteen persons designated as "other" received Form D (Appendix D, questions 1-13). These persons had some contact with or knowledge of issues related to student offenders. Lawyers, faculty, town police, and non-offender students are examples of those interviewed. In some cases additional questions were asked of those interviewed in light of the particular function of a person or agency. In other cases questions were deleted due to an unpredictable time constraint or the irrelevant nature of a question. In all cases an attempt was made to solicit information most useful to determining the University's involvement with offenders in the recent past.

Because a policy cannot be derived from one individual or point of view, interview results are presented in narrative form, pulling together perspectives presented in the four Student Offender Interview
What is Going on from the Perspective of Campus Administrators and the Department of Public Safety?

The relationship between accused students and student offenders and the University has historically taken place on an individual, situational, and ad hoc basis. The Dean of Students Office, the Admissions Office, the Office of Special Programs, and the Department of Public Safety have been the most frequent points of formal contact. Such contacts represent only minimal efforts to address this population in a systematic way. Little written information on either policy or programmatic matters exists regarding this population.

The University's most concerted efforts with college student offenders and accused students have occurred during the last decade. According to the Dean of Students, more than fifteen years ago the University held a negative position regarding offenders on campus except under exceptional circumstances. During recent years, more experience by administrators with their own students as offenders has altered that posture. The Dean of Students Office began by working with students known to administrators who had become offenders and then returned to the University after incarceration. The next step involved working with previously unknown persons who were offenders desiring to

2Because complete interviews have not been included in this chapter, the transcript of one interview is included in Appendix E.
become University students.¹

Usually, the accused, offenders, and ex-offenders come to the University's attention in one of three ways:

1. A student who is incarcerated at a prison either in or out of state might inform the University of his/her current status. Follow-up correspondence from the Dean of Students Office then indicates that when the person is released, is nearing parole, or has some other change in circumstances he/she should come by the Dean's office to discuss current status and future plans. Depending on the circumstances the Dean may request that a person have some means of support while completing school, support from within the justice system, or counseling on campus. If the person is just emerging from prolonged incarceration, some kind of written documentation or recommendation from a justice system agency indicating the belief that the person is capable of academic work in an institution of higher education, such as the University, may be required.

2. A University student commits a crime on or off campus which comes to the attention of the Dean of Students Office via the student, another campus administrator or the media. Dormitory residence area directors, the University police, a roommate, faculty member, friend, parent, or other affiliated person realizes and reports that the student has ceased participation in regular activities.

3. A number of persons affiliated professionally or otherwise with various parts of the justice system may inform the University of

¹Hereafter references to the Dean of Students will be the Dean of Students Office.
offenders with whom they are working, either professionally or as a friend interested in the correctional field or the justice process. A partial list of these persons includes: county sheriffs, correctional officers, Federal parole/probation officers, faculty who have taught courses in a county jail or state prison, clergy who work with offenders, and persons affiliated with formal University programs like University Without Walls.

Perhaps there is another group of offenders which the Dean of Students gains knowledge of. These students are those arrested in demonstrations. The anti-nuclear energy demonstration at Seabrook, New Hampshire during May of 1977 is one example. Currently the Dean of Students Office does not recognize this group as an offender population. In such cases the Dean's office, on an individual basis, has helped inform professors that some of their students might be missing classes or exams.

In addition to accused students and student offenders who are identified by themselves or others is an unidentified group of persons, who are primarily probationed, paroled, or ex-offenders. Under the present structure it can only be known in a limited way whether or not academic and support services at the University meet the needs of this group. The Dean of Students and a faculty member concerned with offenders and criminal justice estimate a minimum of two hundred offenders and ex-offenders on campus during any one of the academic years from 1971-1977.

Currently there is no written policy concerning the University's relationship with offenders beyond some sections of the Regulations and
Policies of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst--1977 (compiled by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost). These regulations refer to the student as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who is not exempt from abiding by state and federal statutes as a result of student status. "When a student has been apprehended for the violation of a law of the community, state or nation the University will not request or agree to a special consideration for the student because of his status as a student."

Another section of the policies which details regulations regarding the use of non-prescribed harmful drugs and picketing and demonstrating states: "Nothing contained in these regulations shall relieve any person or organization of the responsibility to comply with the laws of the Commonwealth and the regulations of the Alcoholic Beverages Control Commission, nor from any civil or criminal liability which may result by reason of any such violation." 5

The policies do, however, indicate a willingness on the part of the University to cooperate with justice system agencies in programs designed to aid the student. "The University will cooperate, however, with law enforcement agencies and other agencies in any reasonable program for the rehabilitation of the student." 6

4Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Provost, Regulations and Policies of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst ([1977]), p. 9.

5Ibid., p. 15.

6Ibid., p. 9.
In this regard most administrative personnel interviewed agreed that the University maintains a neutral posture regarding the admission of offenders and ex-offenders. The University neither encourages admission through specific recruitment from agencies working with offenders, nor discourages their admission through non-cooperation with a particular offender, justice system representative, or campus constituencies concerned with offenders. An admissions administrator pointed out that there is no written policy regarding the status of offenders in relation to the campus. There are no absolute academic criteria used in admissions, and no categories of offenses or sentences that mean absolute non-admission. Additionally, the fact that an individual is an offender does not give that person special consideration in admissions. Primarily, the University is interested in admitting students who can experience reasonable success on campus.

During the last decade, however, the University has, on an individual basis, cooperated with various justice system agencies on educational programs for student offenders. The Dean of Students Office has maintained contact with, and provides counseling space for, federal parole and probation staff to meet with their student clients. The office has also supported furloughs during which student offenders come to the University, has helped clear up academic records of offenders, and has served as liaison between the incarcerated and University faculty and staff. The Office of Special Programs has, since the spring of 1977, attempted to coordinate all higher education efforts at the Hampshire County House of Corrections including the teaching of classes in the jail and release program activities. The Veteran's Affairs
Office has served as a counseling agent to incarcerated veteran students located near Amherst.

The University maintains formal contact with the county houses of correction of Hampshire, Hampden, and Berkshire counties. The University's Admissions Office maintains the most consistent contact, since all incarcerated offenders must be admitted or readmitted through this administrative office. An admissions officer periodically receives calls from correctional facilities regarding academic eligibility and programs related to student offenders on educational release. If a person is academically acceptable, a decision on admission is made in cooperation with the Dean of Students Office. Certain categories of offenses are scrutinized more closely than others. In particular, an assault against a member of the University community or member of the surrounding community, arson, or a recent heroine conviction usually results in non-admission of an inmate.

Other than in the above-mentioned cases, the Admissions Office tries to make an admissions decision based on: (1) academic qualifications, such as past college records, high school transcript or the General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.)—typically the G.E.D. must be from Massachusetts, persons applying for full time admissions with a G.E.D. have their Scholastic Aptitude Test (S.A.T.) scores weighed more heavily in the admissions decision; (2) a recommendation from a correctional officer currently working with the individual; and (3) the offender's general readiness for an academic community and an academic program based on an interview. Approximately twenty-four identified offenders were admitted between 1971 and 1977.
Some offenders have been denied admission to the University either because they committed offenses within the categories previously cited, or because they did not meet the academic criteria. The most common kind of offender admission denial occurs when the University receives a letter from a potential student serving a sentence at a prison, and the content and style of the letter indicates that the person clearly does not fit into the University community. The University has also received applications from offenders with very poor grades. In such cases the applicant has been encouraged to take S.A.T.'s or some kind of extension course work to improve his or her academic profile.

The Department of Public Safety, "as a matter of courtesy" on the part of the Admissions Office, is informed when an incarcerated offender has been admitted to the University. This is done not only to inform them, but also to protect the student from possible police harassment. Under Massachusetts statute campus police can solicit information on the court of jurisdiction in which the student offender was sentenced. Beyond this involvement by and with the Department of Public Safety, students are not monitored in any way while on campus, according to administrators of the Department of Public Safety. Personnel from the correctional institutions have in some cases monitored their own students participating in release programs.

Most student offenders of which the Admissions or Dean of Students Office are aware are admitted as "special students." Such students are part-time, and are not in degree programs. In general, "special students" are felt to be persons who, for one reason or another, are not ready or able to attend full time study. Usually, each student
takes only six credits or less.

Once enrolled, continuation as a "special student" is not automatic. If there have been problems during the semester a student's attendance on campus can be suspended.⁷

Although full-time student ex-offenders have been allowed to apply for all forms of financial aid and to take advantage of all support services at the University, incarcerated offenders classified as "special students" cannot. Only limited financial aid is available, and this usually comes from non-University sources such as veteran's benefits and Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission funds. Personal counseling can be obtained through University agencies, especially those designed for "non-traditional students," but formal academic counseling through academic deans and advisors is not available to "special students." Admissions staff, other offenders, veteran support services, and offender interest groups on campus provide much of the academic counseling available to ex-offenders.

Campus administrators have primarily been involved with offenders that are already University students. The future status of such students depends on factors surrounding each case. Administrators determine an offender's educational future individually and on an ad hoc basis. Prospective student offenders, coming mainly from correctional facilities, are usually admitted as "special students" allowing

⁷After the spring of 1977 the educational release program with the Berkshire County House of Corrections was suspended due to a number of problems. The section of this chapter entitled "What is Going on from the Perspective of of Program Directors and Justice System Personnel?" offers further explanation.
for part-time non-degree study. Such arrangements, helpful at first glance, have inherent problems. "Special students" cannot receive financial aid or support services afforded full time students. Rather than allowing for viable programming this situation can inhibit meaningful levels of academic achievement and personal growth for some student offenders.

The Department of Public Safety, whose main task is to meet the security and safety needs of the campus, has had continuous involvement with both accused students and student offenders. One officer in the department has divided the evolution of involvement with offenders into four areas: first, involvement with incarcerated students; second, involvement with incarcerated students and students nearing parole; third, involvement, since about 1973, with students on release programs; and fourth, current involvement with the entire range of student offenders from the accused through the ex-offender student.

Locally, most crimes on campus in recent years have been committed by students against other students. Based on monthly reports issued by the Department of Public Safety, one officer estimated that approximately 90% of all larcenies, 90% of all aggravated assaults and 50%-60% of all motor vehicle violations are committed by students. According to crimes classified as Class 1 by the F.B.I., students commit approximately 90% of all felonies on the campus. These percentages represent a significant change from times prior to the early seventies in which

8University of Massachusetts Department of Public Safety Monthly Reports, monthly summaries, January 1977 through May 1977.
most campus crimes were committed by non-students and campus visitors.

Both a campus police officer and a residential area director note not only the seeming increase in campus crime and the apparent number of students facing criminal prosecution, but a change in the way dormitory staff and counseling agencies handle residential area offenders. Until the late sixties and early seventies the prevailing attitude on campus, both philosophically and in practice, was to try to handle most situations involving students who had committed criminal acts on campus through on-campus channels. This campus police officer cited the example of a Head of Residence who was badly beaten by a student. In this case the Head of Residence was encouraged not to prosecute because there was widespread belief that there were counseling and support resources on campus to help both her and the student. Now, however, potentially dangerous and accused students are detained by the Department of Public Safety. The majority of these persons are not locked up but rather taken to court, some released with probationary sentences.

A residential area director agreed that the situation for accused students, especially those living on campus and committing crimes either on or off campus, has changed. He cited a situation in which a student was charged with "malicious destruction of private property and drunk and disorderly conduct." This student lived on campus, although the crime was committed off campus. The area director noted that in such cases the attempt is made to try to assess if the behavior off campus will have any impact on campus, especially in the residence halls. Currently, in both policy and practice, a student is considered innocent
unless proven otherwise. Since the University does not have to operate under the same rules of due process as the courts, however, the primary concern has been not only with the safety of the other people in the dormitory, but with the individual's safety as well.

Residence area staff have tried to assess the implications of a student's criminal behavior and possible courses of response through the following steps: (1) conversations with the Head of Residence and Resident Assistants in an effort to discover possible steps that may be taken prior to possible action by the courts; (2) the student may be informed that the University is aware of the accused behavior, and be given some indication of how the University views "endangering behavior"; (3) disciplinary proceedings within the guidelines of due process within the residential area are initiated; and (4) in the case of rape or assault with a dangerous weapon more vigorous means may be used in facilitating a student's departure from campus. These steps may result in a student's removal from campus while court proceedings are completed under the "endangering behavior policy":

Students and staff have a clear and basic right to a safe environment. Ultimately, this can only be achieved through community-wide responsibilities and participation. Where prevention fails, there must be an appropriate administrative response to individuals who seriously endanger the health and well-being of others. To protect community rights, this response must be swift enough to prevent additional threats and suited to the seriousness of the endangering actions. To protect individual rights, there must be provisions for adequate evidence and due process.

The area director cited above was further concerned because the

---

9Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Office of Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Provost, Regulations and Policies of the University of Massachusetts, 25.
incidence of criminal and quasi-criminal behavior seems to be increasing with no clear policy delineating the roles and responsibilities of heads of residence, area directors, public safety, and other agencies which can be directly involved. This individual noted that incidents such as the throwing of beer cans out of windows and the threatening of persons with dangerous weapons have increased, as have incidents of psychological and emotional harassment of students by other students.

Another aspect of the student offender issue centers on the idea that a student is first a citizen and second a student. One of the most difficult things students, and at times their parents, must understand is that although the University is not by nature an institution designed for discipline or punishment, students are not exempt from civil or criminal liability under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There are many examples of this apparent misunderstanding. During the spring of 1977 a student was charged with making harassing phone calls to another student residing in the same residence hall. The student receiving the calls lodged a formal complaint and gave written permission for the Department of Public Safety and the phone company to place a "trap" on his phone in order to monitor all in-coming calls. The calls were traced to the room of two students, both of whom knew the student who had lodged the complaint. When the complainant discovered he knew the two students occupying the room from which the calls were apparently made, he attempted to have the charges dropped. The case went to court and the two students were placed on probation even though they contended they had not made the calls. The father of one
of the two probationed students made several contacts with the Dean of Students Office, campus Department of Public Safety, and the Legal Services Office in an attempt to reverse the action. He felt not only that his son was not guilty, but that the process of involving the campus police rather than other campus counseling and judicial bodies was incorrect. This case demonstrated that once a student lodges a formal complaint, and signs police forms, the case becomes an official action which cannot be resolved by more informal means.

It also sometimes happens that a student offender is accused of a felony off campus. In one such case, although the parents of the student agreed that students must abide by the regulations of the University and State, they were disturbed by the lack of involvement by the University in the case, especially in providing defense counsel or administrative representation in court for accused students. This case involved three University students accused of unarmed robbery of a small grocery store in a nearby town. Although these students were found not guilty, one Student Affairs Administrator questioned the lack of definition of the ways in which the University might be involved with the pre-adjudicated offender. If persons are identified as University students, and since the court process can affect a student's relationship to the campus, does the University have a responsibility to provide certain levels of support?

In addition, the same administrator raised concerns related to the treatment of offenders while on campus. Although agreeing that the University's posture regarding the student offender has been neutral, it was felt that persons serving offenders on campus need to be educated
regarding their own biases or misunderstandings about offenders in order
to best serve them.

Many practices have been noted within the relationship of University
administrators, the Department of Public Safety and offenders during
the period 1971-1977. The current administrative practices regarding
both accused students and student offenders is largely based on ad hoc
reaction to individual cases and precedent institutionalized through
thoughtful trial and error. Consistent with Board of Trustees policy,
and in some instances based on specific relationships with personnel at
the houses of correction or other justice system agencies, administra-
tors have taken a proactive role with offenders, but not in systematic
ways, based on any policy framework.

Ad hoc policies at the University's 18,000 undergraduate student
campus are useful for some situations. Without ad hoc policy the Uni-
versity could not function on a day to day basis. The Dean of Students
Office, Admissions Office, Residence Area Offices, and the Department of
Public Safety encounter numerous instances which require a response
based on what seems the best solution given the circumstances. These
situations are either not covered by codified policy or do not fit the
letter or intent of a particular policy. Specifically, many involve-
ments of the Dean of Students Office are based on such responses. A
vital role of that office is to handle the exceptional situations not
specifically covered by policy or functions of other University agencies.
Ad hoc policy allows problems to be solved and can positively influence
the daily flow of University concerns.

Some administrators and public safety personnel see weaknesses in
current ad hoc policy regarding student offenders. Whenever there are 18,000 young people living in one place, the likelihood of trouble increases. The University cannot expect to treat all pre-adjudicated students from an "in loco parentis" perspective. In addition ad hoc arrangements have meant few cases of deliberate intervention within the justice system on behalf of student offenders. Other weaknesses include limited efforts in identifying the most appropriate student offenders interested in a college education from within the larger pool, and increased chances of negative bias in handling offenders due to non-codified practices. These persons believed a codified policy can move the University towards a posture that demonstrates an effort to help rather than hinder the academic pursuits of student offenders.

What is Going on from the Perspective of Program Directors and Justice System Personnel?

For a number of years the University's involvement with offenders has included specific programs and contacts with correctional institutions and justice system personnel. The connection with the Hampshire County House of Corrections and its supporting agency, Hampshire Correctional Services, has included credit-bearing courses taught in the institution as well as educational and work release of inmates attending the University as students. For eight years there has been contact between the University and this correctional facility, although formal educational offerings did not begin until the early 1970's. During most semesters two or three courses have been taught within the jail for continuing education credit including English, Comparative Literature,
and Legal Studies. An inmate could receive up to six credits per semester. Throughout this period many people, wanting to teach a course, tutor, or be involved with this population in some other way, have come to the jail from the University.

A few qualified inmates have been placed on educational release. To qualify, the inmate must be screened by the jail administration with input from the inmate's Correctional Services caseworker; must demonstrate an ability and serious desire to handle course work; and in most cases take at least six college credits in the jail. An institutional administrator or Hampshire Correctional Services caseworker helps with admission to and registration at the University. The primary contact with the University has been through an Admissions Officer who determines the feasibility of admission.

Although supportive of educational release efforts and services the University can offer the offender who qualifies for college programs, staff working with inmates at the Hampshire County jail are critical of an apparent lack of coordination of efforts at the University. A number of University staff people are involved with inmates, but no individual is identified as the primary coordinator. Questions of policy and program can be directed to a number of people, often resulting in confusion. ¹⁰

The lack of key administrative involvement has also been echoed in concern over supervision of inmates and general enforcement of regula-

¹⁰Since the summer of 1977, the University's Office of Special Programs has worked at a coordination of efforts.
tions affecting offenders while on campus. One correctional adminis-
trator recalled an incident in which some inmates were granted permis-
sion to stay on campus for three days during the final examination
period to study in the library, and take exams under the sponsorship
of a faculty member. When the inmates returned to the jail they were
intoxicated, and correctional staff discovered one exam had been
followed by an informal gathering at which alcoholic beverages were
served. Such conduct has been and continues to be unacceptable to
jail administrators.

Supervision of inmates and coordination of programming through one
central office continues to be the major concern of this correctional
institution. In spite of these concerns, approximately twenty inmates
have participated in the program in the jail and out of the jail
(through release programs) between 1971 and 1977.

The Berkshire County House of Corrections has developed a range of
courses tied to the skill level of offenders. These range from drug
self-help to college-level education. The college-level program con-
sists of courses taught within the facility, and educational release
of inmates to a local community college, as well as the University. As
in other jail release programs, inmates are carefully screened for
interest, in-jail adjustment and attitude, and success in completed
courses.

Conceived by a consortium of persons and agencies, including the
Berkshire County Sheriff, staff from the Massachusetts Rehabilitation
Commission, the University of Massachusetts, and later on in the process
Berkshire Community College, the Model Education Program began in 1973.
The goal, according to a member of the program staff, was to address a wide range of educational needs of offenders, and to encourage higher education to begin to include non-traditional students in programming.

Although several features of this program were unique, one fairly new concept adopted was an attempt to meet the educational needs of both inmates and correctional officers. Inmates on educational release and selected correctional officers commuted to the University together for courses. As with other programs, the University's Admissions Office screened and accepted inmates for release programs based primarily upon academic record and recommendations from the correctional staff.

Between 1974 and the spring of 1976 Berkshire inmates were accepted through the University Without Walls program, but program directors found that many of these students could not handle full time course work. During the fall of 1976 through the spring of 1977, inmate students were admitted through the "special student" program in order to use the part-time student category of admission.

Although the program ran without any major problems until the spring of 1977, the educational release component of the Berkshire jail program was suspended by the University after that spring semester. A number of incidents surrounded the decision to suspend the program. First, it was alleged that misinformation was provided by a jail administrator on the criminal records of inmates originally screened as acceptable for admission to the University. The University has insisted on having accurate information on an inmate's most recent conviction, and a general idea of the inmate's criminal record, in order to be considered for admission. At least two inmates on educational release
during the spring semester of 1977, according to an Admissions Officer, were admitted based on inaccurate information as to their most recent criminal conviction. One of the student offenders had been convicted of attempted rape, an offense usually unacceptable for a release program admission. In addition, one inmate student committed a crime while out on furlough. The crime included forcing a University student to drive to a town near the campus for a drug pick up. Discovery of these factors resulted in suspension by the University of the release program component of the University's involvement with the jail.

Program administrators affiliated with the Berkshire program question the University's decision to stop the program. Many do not see the logic in making the decision based on an inmate student that commits a crime not while on educational release, but out on furlough. Also continued controversy revolves around the right of the University to require conviction record information in order to screen applicants for admission. Berkshire program directors feel there is a breach of trust between University administrators and correctional program administrators when inmates carefully screened at the jail must reveal criminal record information for admission. As of the spring of 1978, the question was unresolved and the program remained suspended.11

The University Without Walls (U.W.W.) program developed as a program that would meet the needs of "non-traditional" students. Because of its orientation towards older students with varied life experiences,

11The Criminal Offenders Record Information Act (C.O.R.I.) of Massachusetts protects offenders from misuse of their records.
U.W.W. became an obvious place to develop mechanisms to meet the educational needs of offenders and ex-offenders. Between 1971 and the present, U.W.W. has awarded at least eight degrees to inmates of the Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Norfolk. Courses taught at the jail and independent study sponsored by some University faculty made the degrees possible. All inmates involved in the program had a substantial number of college credits before U.W.W. became involved with the prison. That outreach effort on the part of U.W.W. ended due to a number of factors, according to a U.W.W. administrator. Those factors included lack of funding and a degree of non-cooperation by prison administration.

In 1975 a group of ex-offenders concerned with helping other offenders adjust to college life developed a proposal to provide the needed support and guidance to those attending higher educational institutions from the Berkshire County House of Corrections. The Department of Mental Health, through the Division of Drug Rehabilitation, funded the project and expanded its focus to include after-care support to ex-offenders attending the University from the Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin, and Hampden County Houses of Correction. University Without Walls assumed responsibility for the program, and since its beginning approximately 20 ex-offenders, both men and women, have been affiliated with the program. The program, called Project Reentry, has provided support, counseling, and in general helped serve as a buffer between the ex-offender and University administrative structure. Help with such things as financial aid forms, appropriate housing, and academic support are common practices. The Reentry staff has
worked closely with U.W.W. staff and University administrators in setting up guidelines for admission and submitting the names of appropriate students for admission.

In order for any offender to become a student through Project Reentry, he/she must first be accepted through U.W.W. Reentry staff examine the past criminal record, assess incarcerated institutional behavior, and require a supportive recommendation from an appropriate corrections staff person and social service agency as part of the admissions process. Also reviewed is the academic background of the applicant, which could include transcripts as well as "work/life equivalents to the demands of college work."\(^{12}\)

While Project Reentry is flexible, severe communication problems, a notable drug dependency, pending criminal or legal action or domestic instability can disqualify an applicant for consideration as a Reentry student. Project Reentry staff work closely with correctional institution educational coordinators, jail administrators, and community support agency personnel in seeking appropriate inmates for college work.

Through on-going contact between the U.S. Probation Office in Springfield, Massachusetts and the University, Federal probationers and parolees have received assistance in admission to the University. Probation staff review pre-sentence reports and other information in order to determine the educational needs of a client. Offenders with

\(^{12}\) Project Reentry uses admissions criteria of the University Without Walls Program. Since U.W.W. focusses on non-traditional students, work/life experiences are considered along with academic qualifications for admission. Such experiences include employment, volunteer work, and community involvement.
poor academic records are asked to attend a community college prior to attempting admission. Details of course work and other support are developed collaboratively among a probation officer, administrator at the University and the client offender.

Most program directors and justice system personnel interviewed support efforts by the University to work with offenders. They agree that college programs can provide educational opportunities not only as part of the academic world, but also through cultural activities and life experience important for the development of self-confidence and community acculturation.

Those interviewed displayed some criticism of current administrative practices. One criticism raised by at least half of those interviewed revolves around confusion as to just what the policy is, and whether that policy includes guidelines beyond admission. Does the policy support counseling and financial aid services? Some offender clients coming to the University through these programs have reported feeling "shadowed" by University police, yet Department of Public Safety staff persons interviewed reported no shadowing or monitoring of offenders on campus. Any kind of shadowing was criticized by most program directors.

As previously mentioned some correction system personnel disagree with the administration's insistence on knowledge of an offender's past criminal record in order to be cleared for admission. Others interviewed question the University's naiveté in not anticipating possible problems which might be likely to develop in serving the offender population.

Most persons interviewed believe the University, as a public institution serving the Commonwealth, should develop a policy based on serving
offenders in specific ways. Policy, they feel, should be based on an institutional commitment to serve this population, not simply the result of efforts of particular faculty or staff obtaining grants to work with offenders. Finally, a recurrent theme mentioned by those interviewed reflected the need for a policy to be grounded in an official attitude adopted by the University and not simply the interest or influence of one or two individuals.

What is Going on from the Perspective of Student Offenders?

Among the population of students currently attending the University are those facing criminal court action, those on probation, incarcerated, on parole and ex-offenders. Interviews with the student offenders and other informal contacts have indicated varied treatment from the University as perceived by the offenders.

Most student offenders interviewed have histories of involvement with the police and the courts. One such offender, Nathan (false name), recalled that growing up in a factory town with both parents working, left much free time to be with friends and get into trouble. On one tragic night, after drinking for a few hours, he ran into an acquaintance with whom he shared mutual negative feelings. Verbal harassment led to a fight. When it was over Nathan walked away, while friends of the other youth attempted to lift him from the ground. Nathan's adversary died several hours after the fight. Later the police arrived at Nathan's house and arrested him for manslaughter.

Once the trial was over, the guilty verdict proclaimed, and incarceration begun, Nathan thought his life was over. Adjusting to
institutionalized life at a county jail was not difficult for Nathan. What was difficult was the day to day routine in which the same faces, the same noises of doors slamming, bells ringing, and people shouting surrounded his entire existence. Nathan had a high school diploma and was a prisoner of good conduct, so in-jail educational programs were made available to him. Successful completion of a couple of courses in the jail led to an opportunity to take courses at a local community college, and finally educational release to the University of Massachusetts. Upon parole, Nathan decided to continue his education at the University. Through help from some friends and a counselor at the University, residence hall arrangements, course selection, and financial aid applications were filed so that Nathan could begin the semester. His first feelings while on campus were that he was widely known to be an ex-offender. Although motivated to study hard, he found the University as distracting as it was helpful. He found study in the residence halls particularly distracting. Fear of asking questions in class, and fear of establishing close relationships with those besides other ex-offenders he knew or discovered on campus were also concerns. Primarily through the support of another ex-offender with whom he has lived during the past year, a helpful faculty member, and his own ambition, Nathan should receive his bachelor's degree in psychology in May of 1978.

Another offender, Peter (false name) has encountered similar experiences at the University, but in this case was admitted through Project Reentry and University Without Walls. He described the adjustment problems as difficult for most offenders. Classes with 500
students, the big library, and the difficulty in getting things like financial assistance add to the confusion. He cited Project Reentry as a necessary place for counseling and support for himself as an ex-offender from an urban area.

Although the two cases cited above represent examples of student offenders not connected with the University prior to admission through a correctional facility, matriculated students who have become offenders cite different problems. Two such persons were interviewed. One completed his bachelor's degree on educational release from a county jail; the other, incarcerated at a state correctional facility, would like to be readmitted as a student to complete his last two years at the University. Both students were charged with the same armed robbery. In one case Will (false name) eventually received a sentence of three to five years in prison, but the judge directed that his sentence was to be carried out at a correctional facility near the University so that he could complete his education. In the second case, which was eventually heard at a different time than the first case and with a different judge, Sam (false name) received a five to nine year sentence which did not include any recommendation for educational programming.

The intent of this explanation is not to debate the wisdom of the court or the criminal justice process, but to cite experiences of two offenders of the University. As a student, Will was academically sound, quite popular, played on an athletic team, was involved in campus activities, and was known by a number of people on campus. Persons at the University, knowing Will, reacted with letters and shows of support
during the initial phases of his arrest and trial. The case for both students received a substantial amount of press coverage, and apparent support from the University community. Specifically, letters related to his character, abilities as a student, and desire to pursue his education were received by the court, and key state government and Department of Corrections officials. Will believed this influenced the court. He recalled that the judge was impressed with his resume, grades and support letters. He believed these factors helped him get into a local correctional facility and back into school sooner. He estimated that two hundred persons, primarily University supporters, were in court during his trial.

Sam, Will's co-defendant until the cases were separated, believed his lack of visibility as a student, and lack of support from key faculty or administrators were negative factors in obtaining levels of support similar to Will. Once the cases were separated his case did not receive as much publicity and his trial was held during the summer months when it was difficult to gather University supporters.

Although these four offenders possess divergent views on the University's administrative response to them as offenders or ex-offenders, there are a few common threads. All of them agree that the University needs to further explore ways to pursue policy and programs related to offenders. All agree that the University needs to pursue something more positive than what was described by one offender as a low-profile neutral position regarding offenders and ex-offenders.\textsuperscript{13} What the

\textsuperscript{13}Interview, 9 August 1977.
University administration did for these four offenders included letters of recommendation based on an academic profile and comments on character if the administrator knew the student, and in one case attendance at a hearing and willingness to answer questions related to a student's status. Regarding admission, although two persons got through the admission and one the readmission process, all felt that, having been incarcerated and out of the mainstream, additional administrative support, especially regarding course selection and financial aid, would have been helpful.

Other matters raised by one or more of the offenders included: (1) the need for some degree of immediate aid to the accused student, including an active search for those affected and discussion of academic plans in order to determine the best level of support; (2) the need for more legal help—Student Legal Services that aids University students in legal matters is limited in what it can do; (3) administrative aid funds to allow the student to obtain such things as transcripts while in prison; (4) more academic counseling; and (5) an assurance of protection from monitoring or "shadowing" by police while on campus.¹⁴

Although only four student offenders were interviewed, estimates by campus administrators, offender program directors, Department of Public Safety staff, and offender students range from twelve to 200 such students on campus in any semester between 1971 and 1977. Ninety

¹⁴Student Legal Services (S.L.S.) is a student-supported legal advising and defense service offered to University students. S.L.S. is further discussed in the following section of this chapter.
percent of those persons interviewed indicated knowledge of at least twelve to twenty offenders.

What is Going on from the Perspective of Others Not Connected Programmatically with Offenders on Campus?

The scope of the student offender issue goes beyond those aspects specifically linked with administrative services or programs pursued through a justice system agency. A number of persons, including on- and off-campus lawyers, other University administrators, faculty, and program directors for younger offenders, have gained perspective on this issue.

The Legal Services Office, founded by the Student Senate, has, since the late sixties, provided legal services to accused students and student offenders. Historically, most offenses handled through this office were misdemeanors, and lesser offenses in which the student is likely to go to trial and receive a continuance without finding sentence or placement on probation. Most crimes by students are committed against other members of the University community. Most larceny is committed in the dormitories or the University Store. Most off-campus crime involves petty larceny or some kind of disorderly conduct. University of Massachusetts students are rarely involved in felony cases, according to two attorneys in the Legal Services Office. When the Legal Services Office first began serving students, it did not represent students in court. One lawyer estimated having seen up to forty or fifty students a day. Primarily, office time was spent giving
advice to the accused, recommending competent lawyers the student might seek as defense counsel, and working both with the Dean of Students and University police on specific incidents. Rarely were students represented in court.

Currently, most cases involving the Legal Services Office involve disorderly conduct, breaking and entering, alcohol-related offenses, assault and battery, and other crimes of a similar nature. About 90% of these cases, worked out in pre-trial dispositions with the prosecution, result in a continuance without finding rather than conviction and sentencing. About 10% to 15% of these cases include some sort of counseling through an on-campus agency such as Psychological Services or Room to Move, a campus drug counseling agency, as part of the disposition.

Two of the four Legal Services attorneys handle clients accused of criminal offenses. Although at the time of this interview one of these lawyers had been on staff less than one year, between them the two lawyers presented approximately 200 cases between April 1974 and July 1977.

The largest population handled by the Amherst police includes students of the University and Amherst and Hampshire Colleges. According to an Amherst police officer most crimes committed by students are misdemeanors involving motor vehicles, alcohol, vandalism, petty larceny and the "college prank." Approximately 75% of police department activity involves students or is oriented toward one of the three colleges. Of approximately 1100 arrests made each year (or three arrests per day), 70% of these involve male students or their guests.

Since police reports are considered by judges in determining
sentences, the Amherst police have considerable influence over the eventual treatment of students by the courts. The courts tend to use leniency in many cases involving students, according to one policeman.

Although agreeing that the college campuses should be concerned with offenders, the primary concern raised by another police officer involved the issue of treatment of felons on campus. He cited problems regarding programs for felons in which there are group homes or halfway houses. Offender programs draw other offenders not related to the program, and the home or halfway house becomes a place for offenders to gather. At times problems are caused not by offenders in the program, but by their friends or visitors who do not share the necessary respect for people's rights or property.

Members of a District Attorney's staff agree with Legal Services staff and an Amherst policemen that most student crimes involve larcenies, and that most crimes are committed by students against other students. Drug-related offenses, high in number during the late sixties and early seventies, have steadily decreased. One District Attorney staff member noted that the courts have made an effort to consider an offender's student status as a positive factor in recommending and sentencing. Through education a student establishes a helpful track record. This individual also believed at times the use of student status exploits the court process through undeserved leniency. Some students have come to recognize this and use it to their advantage.

A Public Defender's Office has had limited contact with student offenders; however, the few contacts noted by a member of the Massachusetts Defenders Committee are noteworthy. The Public Defender's Office
serves primarily persons characterized as economically poor minority and white persons who have been accused of felonies. This office serves only adults. Less than 5% of its clientele are either actual or potential college students. Half of the clients are white and half are Hispanic or black. Since 1971 the members of The Massachusetts Defenders Committee interviewed recalled the cases of three students. All were minority males and all were represented on drug charges. All three cases involved the selling of drugs. In two cases the judges involved considered student status in determining sentence. In one case in particular, the judge fixed the location of incarceration so as to allow the greatest chance of matriculation through the University.

Although agreeing in general that judges are likely to consider student status as a positive factor in deciding upon appropriate sentence, the public defender staff member found some judges to be much harder on students because of a feeling that they have had advantages and should know better. He recalled a case in which a student was charged with selling a small amount of Valium, a prescription drug. His lawyer pleaded "good conduct" for his client, noting that he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa in school. The student, however, was found guilty and sentenced to five years in prison. In giving the reason for the sentence the judge cited that student status should have put the offender beyond committing such a crime.15

Involvement with offenders is also a function of a parole office.

15Undoubtedly there were other factors in this case including a tendency by some judges to give stiff sentences to drug offenders.
Like the public defenders office, involvement with students tends to be minimal. Specifically regarding the University, three of the five officers interviewed have or have had student clients attending or planning to attend the University. Most clients had previously attended college and looked to the University as a place to finish their degrees. New client students had discovered a particularly helpful counselor, administrator, or faculty member who aided in their admission process, course selection, and other support necessary in handling an institution as large and diverse as the University.

Although generally supportive of college programs and efforts by area colleges to meet the parole needs of offenders, staff members were critical of the University and other public service agencies which accept, or counsel offenders without understanding the dynamics of the offender population. Support many times involves more than simply giving an ex-offender a list of services, names and phone numbers. Project Reentry was cited as an important element in recognizing the individual attention some ex-offenders need, but administrative support through policy and action—especially in training staff in providing services to offenders—is also an important element.

Periodically, faculty and administrators were involved with offenders. One faculty member has found that offenders on release and ex-offenders are very interested in classes on prisons and the law. Besides learning more about the institution of criminal justice, these courses seem to serve as places to meet other student offenders on campus. Through such courses informal contacts between offenders have evolved into informal and formal support mechanisms.
as other "special populations," need models of success. An upper-
classman or even an offender who is a semester ahead of another offender
can provide a significant impetus towards academic success.

Opinions on present administrative practices are diverse. Most
interviewed knew nothing about such practices. Most of those who knew
of administrative practices, and agreed with the present ad hoc adminis-
trative arrangement, cited flexibility and an ability to handle each
offender's case individually, which the lack of a coherent written
policy gives those who are most involved with offenders. One person
cited the "fuzziness" of these practices as helpful because those who
need to know something about these practices can find out through
others who have dealt with similar situations.

Others see confusion in current practices. As in earlier sections
of this chapter, individual biases in administering practices was cited
as a primary criticism of an ad hoc, non-written policy. Two persons
interviewed expressed concern about the role and/or lack of role of the
University police in these practices. This concern centered around
the issue of either encouraging or discouraging the practice of monitor-
ing offenders while on campus. Questions about accused students' under-
standing of their rights and the possible consequences of their actions
were raised with respect to the campus police. Other confusion on
present practices includes: (1) the role (or lack of role) of ex-offenders
in establishing policy regarding offenders; (2) the right of the Univer-
sity to know certain things about the criminal history of an inmate
seeking to come on campus through release programs; and (3) whether or
not present practices support counseling and other mechanisms to enhance
the academic program.

All persons interviewed expressed support towards offenders being served on a college campus. Some University personnel expressed concerns over budget as a primary obstacle to expanding present administrative practices into a more extensive policy and program. Agreement existed especially around the idea of codifying policy.

**Summary of Practices**

The University's involvement with offenders has ranged from the removal of students from campus due to disciplinary action, to acceptance of convicted felons on campus as participants in release programs. More recently, ex-offenders attending the University have linked with other offenders in efforts to provide support unique to persons who have been involved with the criminal justice process through arrest, trial, sentencing, and incarceration.

The Policies and Regulations of the University have provided some guidance as to student conduct and possible reprimand through disciplinary proceedings. These policies also suggest collaboration with the criminal justice system in rehabilitation programs of student offenders.

The University's posture concerning students facing possible criminal court action, incarceration, probation or parole can be described as neutral—that is, neither encouraging or discouraging involvement with the student offender. Few efforts are made to explain this posture or make it helpful. In practice, however, the University has used ad hoc policy in working individually with offenders
on a case by case basis.

Although supportive of the present administrative ad hoc practices which encourage individuality, many persons within the four groups interviewed expressed dissatisfaction with this loose structure. Student offenders and program directors both on and off campus cite the need for the University to take a more decisive stance on service to offenders.

The University has the greatest difficulty with reference to the student who has committed a felony rather than a misdemeanor. A number of questions can be raised regarding this difficulty. One implication revolves around a class structure which encourages efforts by white and middle class individuals to bargain down a plea from a felony to a misdemeanor in order to be viewed as having committed a crime acceptable to many institutions such as colleges or universities. Blacks, other minorities, and the poor in most cases are not allowed this bargaining privilege.

A neutral policy seems insufficient. Some administrators and faculty interviewed cite the need for policy or administrative practices to be more clearly linked with current programmatic priorities. The most common thread, however, involved the idea that the University should continue to concern itself with offenders, and that it should explore ways to be concerned in the most useful ways with a population that is and has been present on the campus for a number of years.


CHAPTER III
WHY ARE THINGS THE WAY THEY ARE?

Chapter Design

Policies and programs supported by University administration reflect community expectations regarding the offender as criminal, and current trends in thinking regarding the effectiveness of rehabilitative efforts carried out by the criminal justice system. Members of the community as taxpayers and as "responsible citizens" possess certain expectations of higher education. Traditionally higher education has served as a vehicle to prepare middle class populations for community roles. Beyond serving the middle class, who, how and why higher education should serve in particular ways is within the scope of community influence. In order to understand "why are things the way they are for student offenders," explored are some trends in the justice system's treatment of offenders, and in the role of higher education as influenced by community expectations.¹

If student offenders are to function in the University environment they must be accepted as members of the college community. In order to determine if such a consensus exists, a variety of knowledgeable people were asked:

¹Community refers to both the general population in the United States, and to those specifically living within areas surrounding the University of Massachusetts.
Do you think student offenders should be served on a college campus? Why or why not?

What advantages and/or disadvantages do you see for the University in having a policy on student offenders?²

In addition, student offenders need to know that there are efforts to include them in wider policy that can impact on a number of institutions of higher education within the state of Massachusetts. To discover if this might be a future trend, a few individuals were asked:

Do you think the legislature may act more favorably in budgeting University monies if they could see strong collaborations in human services such as between the University and the county jails?³

Because a policy for student offenders must reflect the thoughts of more than one individual, the answer to these questions is presented as a narrative that brings together the divergent views of those interviewed.

The Student Offenders Questionnaire, sent to sixty-five colleges and universities nationally, elicited information related to a particular institution's policy or administrative actions regarding the student offender. The responses give some perspective on the current actions of institutions of higher education towards this population.

The Criminal Offender and the Community

The way in which the criminal justice system treats offenders is tied both to our sense of democracy and justice, and the whims of

²These questions are taken from the Student Offenders Interview cited in Chapter II. Appendix A, question 20; Appendix B, questions 15 and 16; and Appendix C, questions 20 and 21 cite these questions.

³Student Offenders Interview (Appendix D, question 17).
justice personnel based on public demand and political/governmental influence. These factors contribute to the current state of all correctional education, and the opinions held regarding offenders by all facets of the community. American society, to a large degree, is based on a system of rewards and punishments. As such, the American public tends to form opinions about who should be rewarded and punished. Specific punishments and rewards have developed over time. As an example, consider part of the prisoner right issue. "No court has ever directly held that a prisoner has the right to rehabilitation even though penologists do not disclaim the relevance of rehabilitation in the overall prisoner program."¹ Inherent in this statement is the notion of rehabilitation as a reward not necessarily available to the incarcerated even though most return to communities.

During the sixties, in the forefront of the civil rights movement were numerous calls for righting the injustices of racism and class structure. Out of this, during the early seventies, prison reform and especially rehabilitation were spin-off issues related to human rights. Since the civil rights thrust, local government officials have funded numerous social reform programs. Halfway houses, pre-release centers, pre-trial diversion programs, and police-community relations were initiated as acts of reform within the criminal justice system.

In 1972, the Massachusetts Omnibus Prison Reform Act was passed, calling for the kind of programming cited above. As a result of this

bill's passage, the Department of Correction contracted for higher educational services from the University of Massachusetts at Boston. At the time the Department envisioned dozens of pre-release centers and extensive community-based activity. Education at the college level would mainly focus on educational release programs.

Since the early 1970's, the hopes for rehabilitative programs have faded. Neighborhoods are more resistant to zoning changes for halfway houses including group homes for alcoholics, mental retardation clients and criminal offenders. Perhaps the criminal offender, though, has taken the brunt of the backlash from the 1960's. Newspaper stories have amplified this controversy. Such accounts note neighborhood objections to group homes, especially those for ex-offenders. Fear appears to be a common ingredient of protest. According to one story, the families in the community of a proposed residence "are worried about the effect... the residence will have on the safety of the children in the area; property values; and on parking."\(^5\)

Apparently Massachusetts and other states want felons locked up and off the street. The prison inmate housing capacity, however, has reached its saturation point within Massachusetts. By the spring of 1976 over 90% of Massachusetts state prisons were operating at maximum capacity. In light of this situation, Commissioner of Corrections Frank Hall noted: "... the rise in the prison population which has created overcrowding, was due to a sharp increase of the number of

persons sentenced for criminal offenses in the closing months of last year.\textsuperscript{6} Prison populations have grown even larger since 1976. Massachusetts prison officials began a thorough review of potential communities in an effort to locate a site for another 500 to 800 beds to alleviate the overcrowding in existing prisons. Communities however have continued to resist any effort to build or locate a place for this facility near homes, schools, or places of public habitation.

Much of the literature disputes claims that any particular treatment method, including punishment, significantly reduces recidivism. Specifically, one noted work analyzed 231 evaluation studies of correctional treatment which had utilized adequate research designs. The researchers found "that there was very little evidence in these studies that any mode of correctional treatment had a decisive effect in reducing recidivism."\textsuperscript{7}

Paradoxically, considerable evidence exists demonstrating that smaller prison facilities, group homes, and pre-release centers have proven to be at least as effective as punishment in deterring future crime. Community groups are fighting against their own self interest by not supporting efforts designed to both hold offenders and reintegrate them into society.

Pre-release centers combine release time during the day with completion of a sentence. LeClair evaluated the rehabilitative effects of

\textsuperscript{6}'Crowding in Prisons Getting Worse, Hall Warns,' \textit{The Boston Globe}, 17 March 1976, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{7}D. Lipton, R. Martinson, W. Judith, \textit{The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment}, (Praeger Publishers, 1975).
two pre-release centers in Massachusetts based on reduction in recidivism. The centers were located in two communities in Boston and Shirley, Massachusetts. In the case of these two centers, he "concluded that pre-release program completers at Boston State and Shirley, when taken as two separate populations, both had statistically significant reduced rates of recidivism when compared with similar types of inmates who had not participated in pre-release programs." In this case recidivism was based on no re-incarceration up to one year after release.

Recidivism is often used as a measure of programmatic success; yet some research disputes the use of recidivism rates as the primary measure. There exists a number of complex and sometimes unknown factors which may affect potential recidivism. Support systems while in prison, prospects for a useful job or education beyond prison are some of these factors. Also recidivism research discounts other positive influences of correctional programming such as enhancement of self-concept, and a recognition of a lifestyle that does not have to be criminal.

In spite of the current debates on recidivism as a measure of success, and successful versus unsuccessful correctional programming, much of the public currently supports any and all methods to get criminals off the street and into prison without consideration of the


fact that over 90% of those incarcerated eventually leave prison. National concern about crime has caused government officials to look at the merits of the determinate versus the indeterminate sentence.\textsuperscript{10} Inequities in the sentencing of offenses even for those who have committed the same crime, crimes committed by parolees, the unpredictability of parole causing prisoner unrest, and the general feeling that rehabilitation as a correctional tool is not working has fostered this concern.\textsuperscript{11}

Perhaps the most important and unsettling outcome of this current trend is that if rehabilitation and reform are not working, prisons should simply detain offenders in a secure environment at the least possible cost to the taxpayer. A Senate Judiciary Committee believes one of the revisions in the current criminal code should be "to make fixed sentences by the judge the rule, rather than the exception."\textsuperscript{12} The public wants proof that correctional programming is successful. They want to see that their tax monies are both punishing offenders and deterring future crime.

A major problem with current demands on public officials to institute policies and programs which encourage a high degree of "law

\textsuperscript{10} In receiving an indeterminate sentence an individual begins incarceration with no set release date. While incarcerated, a review committee determines when a prisoner may possibly be released. With a determinate sentence an offender knows the maximum and minimum incarceration period at the time of sentencing.


\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 26.
and order" is that it once again ignores important facts related to the profile of inmate populations. The current trend ignores the fact that most people in prison can be characterized as poor, minority, under-educated, and with few marketable skills, while the administrators of justice tend to be white and middle class. Trends in criminal justice treatment of offenders continue to mainly affect the underclass American society above all.

All the facts . . . whether overt racism in prosecution and sentencing or unconscious and indirect racism acting through cultural and economic channels, contribute to the differences in judicial and prison statistics between blacks and whites. At every stage in the law enforcement process, from arrest to parole or execution, a greater proportion of the defendants or prisoners is black than at the previous stage.\(^1\)

In Massachusetts alone, according to a Department of Correction survey taken in 1974, approximately 35% of state imprisoned inmates were members of minority groups, and 90% of those were black.\(^2\)

Community thought on the treatment of offenders influences all facets of the criminal justice system, including post secondary education programs in prisons. Strict screening and other criteria are applied in determining who is eligible. In a survey taken on college instruction in United States prisons, about half of forty-six prisons which responded had prison college-level programs. Most of the classes were offered within the institution. Primary screening devices used
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\(^2\) Massachusetts Department of Correction, *A Description of the Residents of Massachusetts Correctional Institutions, January 1, 1975*. Pubn. 8355-47-200-11-75-CR.
for inmate participation included: (1) ability to pay tuition, (2) inmates being both "qualified and deserving," (3) possession of a high school diploma, (4) sufficient grade point average, (5) consideration of inmate's criminal record, (6) good prison behavior and good correctional record, (7) approval of course instructor, and (8) high school average of at least grade "C" level.15

Screening increased when an inmate was considered for an educational release program. Besides meeting college admission criteria, those given outside prison clearance to attend courses on campuses tended to be model prisoners, or those who have enjoyed considerable attention in the prison college program, earning the trust and support needed for taking classes at a college campus.

Intense screening of inmates for release programs has not eliminated a community's need to monitor or criticize these efforts. Those living in special release centers or attending campus day classes report being monitored by community members and local police. A group home is identifiable by many individuals, and often offenders on release programs must gather at specific locations to meet rides returning to a prison. Such locations become the targets for harassment of offenders by some of those insensitive community members.16

Criticisms of programs intensify when offenders affiliated with a
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15Stewart Adams, College Level Institution in U.S. Prisons: An Exploratory Survey (University of California, School of Criminology, Ford Foundation, [1968]).

higher education program commit a crime. One "failure" involved a parolee who had been in college for two years before coming to California. During his first semester at Berkeley he committed armed robbery. It was later discovered unofficially that due to a federal freeze on financial aid monies, the student did not get an expected loan. A second individual completed most of the academic year as a marginal student, but in his last quarter collected Educational Opportunity Program monies without going to classes.\(^\text{17}\)

The public, rather than criticizing offenders individually, tend to condemn an entire program causing public leaders to call for stricter guidelines or the end of programs. Such attitudes parallel thoughts by some correctional leaders who look at higher education programs as successful only if paroled or ex-offenders are not re-arrested for a crime.\(^\text{18}\)

Beyond questions of rehabilitation versus correction and punishment is an attitudinal concern experienced by some taxpayers over the concept of a "criminal getting a college education." Parole officers and prison education program directors find they are many times confronted by an attitude which holds the image of "commit a crime to go to college," or are subjected to scenarios in which individuals pay


taxes to pay police, the court officials, and prison personnel to get criminals off the street, not to send them to college. This attitude is held by some correctional officers as well. These attitudes add to the dilemma surrounding just what is acceptable or unacceptable for correctional programming.

It is clear that the public has some contradictory thoughts about offenders. The incarcerated need to learn useful roles to avoid crime in subsequent community life, yet many taxpayers do not want offenders on release programs for education or job training. Perhaps the more important issue is a fairly common public attitude of not wanting to know that prisons exist. Prisons represent society's failure to in many cases adequately provide the education, jobs and support systems necessary for maintaining a sense of self worth, and goals that can be accomplished in non-criminal ways. The biggest crime may not be the law broken, but our inability to help those incarcerated break out of a cycle of mistrust stimulated by public disdain of anyone who has ever been in prison.

**Higher Education and Community Expectations**

Unlike the nineteenth century when society held the belief that a college "education was positively related to economic well-being," institutions of higher education are in a rather peculiar position with respect to the public of, in a sense, trying to prove their worth rather than enjoying a traditionally assumed value.\(^1\)\(^9\) This is in part due to

the number of college graduates exceeding the number of jobs for college-trained individuals, and the inability of colleges to adjust to the educational needs of individuals approaching the year 2000. Another related factor is an attitude maintained by much of the American public that higher education is a right available to upper middle and upper class Americans. For the poor and lower class American, higher education remains a privilege that must be earned if financial aid and work arrangements can be established to help maintain the student in school. If higher education is to emerge from this dilemma of decreasing public confidence, the need for new educational offerings in line with future jobs, and needed moves away from elitism, colleges and universities must begin to face these issues with a recognized need for change oriented programs.

Although traditional learners, age 18 to 24, will continue to be the major population in our nation's colleges and universities, increasingly mature adults and taxpayers are going to school for the first time, or are returning for further professional development or career-change training. The traditional student pool for the class of 1978 will have declined by 25% before 1990. Future learners in college may be older than traditional students. Already, industry is moving towards providing sabbaticals in which they finance the education of a single parent with children approaching college age, or an older citizen wishing to use retirement as a time of leisure learning.

Since a college degree cannot be equated with a large income to the extent that it once could, the future test of higher education, as reflected in community demand, is whether or not the society will accept
higher education for its contribution in promoting the whole human being and humaneness, rather than as a tool designed primarily to advance the economic gains of a college graduate.

The significant contribution the growth of higher education can make in the future is the fulfillment of individual personalities, to the enrichment of the culture, to the greater equalization of opportunity and attainment, and not to the growth of the Gross National Product. The question is whether a society that has been conditioned to value higher education for its economic benefits will, at last, value higher education for its contribution to the development of individual human beings and to the creation of a human society.²⁰

Clearly, one major issue is a need to further equalize educational opportunities. The community's reaction to this need, especially as it relates to higher education, is increasingly important. The most publicized educational research emerging from the 1960's presented a mixed but negative message about gains educationally and economically for minorities. As an example, black Americans gained economically, but still lagged behind white Americans. Americans still live in a society in which the poor and minorities remain at the bottom of the educational and economic ladder. Rather than retreat, retrenchment, and less emphasis on affirmative action, institutions of higher education can move toward a broader base to better meet the educational needs of all learners, including experienced learners, workers that tend to be over age 25, parents looking for new jobs or new skills, minority Americans of all ages, the elderly, the handicapped, bilingual Americans, and other new student markets.

The ability to prepare persons for what, in some ways, is an unknown future, in which there is less and less need for a "so-called" labor class, is critical. One author of two studies on school-to-work transition raised two central questions educators should be asking themselves: (1) "What is it that students will need to cope with work and life in the future?" and (2) "What competencies will they need to succeed in such activities as work, leisure, and family?" The purpose of higher education should be to prepare people not for just any kind of work, but work involving the emerging, systematic problems which beset society. At all levels of public and private institutions there is a growing need for people capable of undertaking divergent and holistic thinking about alternative solutions to the problems of the future. "Traditional," vocational, and liberal approaches to higher education are inappropriate to solving problems. All of them have gone wrong in that they have prepared people for the jobs and tasks of the past.

The imperative to prepare students for new careers, largely in the area of human services, becomes more important in viewing a movement away from traditional approaches in higher education. Institutions of higher education must become laboratories for working with all aspects of life. In a human services approach, a public health student would use college curriculum and practicum experiences to view the profession from the human and technical sides while learning how each part
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22 Ibid.
interfaces with other parts. Training would focus on community health systems and preventive medicine.

Although the honeymoon period of higher education is over, the real question is whether society is ready to accept a refocus of higher education away from traditional priorities. There are few indications that society, or even colleges and universities, are ready for the kind of refocus needed. Higher education is slow in giving up past traditions. As an example, although there are numerous two year colleges which have catered to the transitory young student and the older adult seeking educational opportunities, there remains a higher community value placed on a four year college degree. Financial aid and other support necessary to meet the needs of new non-traditional student markets, although more prevalent, continues to be very time consuming procedurally and in some cases difficult to obtain. A lack of day care centers and course schedules designed to meet the needs of parents responsible for children within a household remain an inhibiting factor in seeking a college education. The community and higher education policy makers, rather than considering the educational process as one of possible life-long learning, continue to design education around the student age 18 to 24.

Against this backdrop is a potential, but from society's perspective, even less viable, student market, in the offender and the ex-offender. Correctional education, and the struggle in moving towards a framework which encourages action on the needs of offenders in returning to society with marketable skills and feelings of self-worth, has met with public opposition. An acceptance of basic education in
the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics led to an acceptance of
the need for at least a high school education for incarcerated offend-
ers. For most community members this growing recognition of the need
of education for offenders has stopped at the doors of the college.

In addition to this situation, offenders share a need with other
non-traditional students for financial aid, flexible course offerings
and support services. Often, offenders require more of this support
than do other non-traditional students. Offenders, in addition to
adjusting to college life, must also adjust to acceptable ways of
behavior in the community, a community that in many cases does not
want them in colleges and universities.

With public opinion questioning the value of a college education,
increasing costs and other pressing concerns, attention to the offender
and higher education becomes a less viable issue. Current attitudes
held by the community of higher education, as not readily adjusting to
new student markets, and the hesitancy of higher education in training
students for new kinds of jobs adds to a less than hopeful picture for
offenders. Meaningful links between higher education and offenders will
not happen until institutions of higher education see themselves in the
position of change agencies that are willing to accept offenders as
part of their student population.

Some University of Massachusetts Community Views on the Student Offender

Because public attitudes influence current relationships between
offenders and institutions of higher education, several questions were
asked of knowledgeable persons regarding offenders and the University of Massachusetts. These questions focus on if offenders should be served on a college campus, advantages or disadvantages to the University's development of a policy on student offenders, and state legislative reactions to collaborations between a college and a justice system agency.23

Most persons interviewed agreed offenders should be served on a college campus. Most, however, made such statements with caution or some element of reservation. Program directors and justice system personnel in particular looked upon the University as having a role of serving the people of the Commonwealth, and as an educational institution that should have an interest in special populations which have historically lacked opportunities educationally and economically. They see the University as having the resources and expertise to take a bigger role as an option in the positive change process most offenders need. Some program directors and justice system personnel also see education as the only viable rehabilitative tool.

Other program directors and justice system personnel expressed reservations about offenders being served on a college campus. One correctional officer noted that most offenders are not qualified for college programs. Many that have the educational qualifications cannot handle the freedom of a college campus. They need some kind of fairly constant supervision. They need support mechanisms as well that are going to help them through psychological traumas that in some cases,
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23 These questions are cited in the Student Offenders Interview, Appendix A, question 20; Appendix B, questions 15 and 16; Appendix C, questions 20 and 21; and Appendix D, question 17.
at least at first, may be encountered daily. Other program directors questioned to what degree the University can be a rehabilitative tool. They feel the University has taken on the role of educator, parent, and counselor for everyone. Yet, for some people it simply cannot support the psychological and emotional needs of offenders and other non-traditional students.

One justice system person expressed perhaps the most conservative view of all those interviewed, citing the importance of offenders "paying their dues" to society before being eligible for any kind of auxiliary program. This individual expressed grave reservations with correctional institutions doing anything in the educational realm beyond basic reading, writing and mathematical skills. He emphasized the need for offenders to leave prison only after having served most or all of their sentences, and only with a job or a marketable skill.

Student offenders interviewed, most of whom arrived at the University due to the help of some specific person who took a particular interest in them and provided the support necessary to handle the transition from offender to civilian non-offender status, see colleges and universities as crucial in offender rehabilitation. One offender described the role of corrections and education as rehabilitative in which there must always be, no matter what offense the individual committed, a relationship between what a person does in prison and what the person will hopefully do upon release.

Student offenders more than any other group interviewed cited

24 Interview, 3 March 1977.
equal treatment among offenders and other students as imperative. One student ex-offender noted that offenders should be served because they are seeking the same things in life everyone else is. Ex-offenders should not have to go through life carrying the burden of being an ex-offender.

The most diverse views on whether or not offenders should be served on a college campus were held by others not connected programmatically with offenders. Although no one suggested offenders should not be served, most noted restrictions on offender admission based on the type of crime, the degree of commitment to an educational program on the part of the offender, and the ability of the University to provide necessary support in times of budgetary scarcity as key factors. One individual working in an attorney's office summed up much of the concern over categories of crimes used in considering whether or not an offender should be served on a college campus when he noted that, if the student committed rape, murder, or grand theft, or in most cases any student still incarcerated should not be served on a college campus, especially one such as the University.

Some justice system people thought educational release was just a way out. This concern was echoed by a parole officer who indicated in his more than twenty years of experience in parole that most offenders are not college material. To an offender almost anything is better than sitting in a cell block. Most people in prison are men that see any opportunity to be out of the cell block as an opportunity to meet women. Once an offender has been released, he believes they decide they no longer need their education. He could only cite five or six
parolees in twenty years who had done well.\textsuperscript{25}

On the other side of the coin, a prison education director summed up the perspective of over a dozen interviews in seeing the college environment as a change-agent environment. He noted that colleges can serve as an important reintegration step back into society. The student offender on a college campus can serve as a model essential for the reintegration of others (their peer offenders) into the mainstream of society. Those possessing this perspective see the college environment as a new environment, different and positive, as opposed to the environment under incarceration, that is essential to showing and developing different life patterns. Probably more than prison itself a college can contribute to a medium of expression prison denies. It can do a lot to support an individual's self concept. College is an atmosphere that is generally more tolerant of a person's past history. It can provide an environment of educational and vocational alternatives. A college can do one important thing prisons seemingly cannot do and that is bring about positive change. Prisons are supposedly designed to do this but do not. He thought most incarcerated individuals have experienced the culmination of failure. Colleges provide an atmosphere in which the rewards are immediate, like getting good grades, which is so important to changing the self image.\textsuperscript{26}

One University faculty member, although supportive of the above-mentioned perspective on a college's potential role with offenders,

\textsuperscript{25} interview, 23 November 1977.

\textsuperscript{26} interview, 4 November 1977.
interjected a word of caution. He noted that too often there is the assumption that a college environment is somehow a normal environment for a student even if the student has deep psychological and emotional problems. He cited a similar parallel with students that are psychological or mental health cases. Many times psychiatrists not connected with the University simply believe that because someone is or was in college that this is the most stable and normal environment for their client. Yet these psychiatrists fail to realize how unhealthy a University environment may be for some people who are already unstable, because everything they do is graded or criticized in some way. Also if a student is taking five courses it is like having five different parents (professors), depending on the student's schedule. Each of the professors (parents) treat the student in a different way. Also, he was not sure if any student offender who has exhibited a problem like a drinking problem should be in a place where there are several places on campus to obtain liquor. He was also concerned that the University has its own peculiar set of psychological, emotional, and intellectual strains which affect any student.  

Most persons interviewed cited ways in which offenders should be served. These ranged from endorsing current admissions criteria to court representation, or an Office of Offender Affairs which would be part of a new office on campus related entirely to the special needs of these non-traditional students.

One senior administrator at the University noted that he did not
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27 Interview, 17 November 1977.
believe in prisons. He believed there are too many of particular kinds of people that go to prison. Part of the reason people are in jail is because they cannot make it in society, and society is unwilling to accommodate them. One way the University can treat the fact that the prison system is not working is to offer a counterbalance to that system. This administrator went on to suggest that the University needs to look at itself as a human service agency in which it provides the offender with the capacity to see and make choices and alternatives similar to the so-called normal population.

Many persons interviewed suggested that a college environment must provide adequate support for offenders, and serve as a buffer between an offender's incarceration and University life. Financial aid systems were also frequently noted as important in order to adequately serve the offender. A less frequent response was that there needs to be some kind of centralized offender service center, providing, among other things, education of the University community on the importance of serving the student offender. An acceptance of non-traditional criteria and routes of access to the University was also cited. The perceived advantages and disadvantages on the part of the University in actually developing a policy on student offenders cited by those interviewed provide another insight into "Why things are the way they are."

Most persons interviewed cited as a major advantage of a written policy the availability of criteria which those working with offenders could use as guidelines for their own action regarding student offenders. It would move the University beyond a neutral perspective which
can at times be discriminatory to offenders. A formal policy that students, faculty, and staff all devise was thought of as superior, because people could look at it and buy into it. They could see that it is part of their responsibility and obligation and not just the obligation of a few people. Such a written statement could note the relationship between criminal justice mechanisms, rehabilitation, and the University from which strengths and limitations can be spelled out.

Others noted that a written statement can move the University into a position from which to consider programmatic concerns. A policy could institutionalize something like a Project Reentry, as noted by several of those interviewed. It could encourage the recruitment of serious students that happen to be student offenders.

Another advantage cited by a number of those interviewed was that offenders would be able to see the University as a real option to them. It would note organization and a committed thought, something most offenders need to see in order to feel that people at the University know what they are doing. A policy, as noted by two program directors, forces us to point resources to address the need where it might not otherwise happen. Over half of those interviewed looked at a written policy as promoting further commitment to non-traditional students, a greater student mix, or a way of better meeting the needs of a traditionally "handicapped" group in the community.

Some persons interviewed, although not denying the needs for a policy, felt such a policy above all needed to be realistic. Since policy must in some way be linked to action, a realistic perspective
on services available to offenders and restructuring of resources must be considered.

One justice system staff person questioned the whole concept of a policy. The individual noted a possible uncertainty over how to look at policy. If it is policy in terms of a statement of commitment that is one thing, but if it is rules and regulations beyond what is state and Federal statute, this individual did not think it was needed. Another justice system person indicated that knowledge of how a person becomes eligible for educational release, and the criteria used in state statute is needed before doing anything. Also suggested was that this is an issue for the state legislature to decide.

Persons who cited "disadvantages" to the University's development of a policy cited ways in which a policy can lock the University into rigid guidelines in which such things as categories of offenses can move practices away from any level of individuality. Once you have a policy you have guidelines, once you have guidelines it can become easy to rule people out because they do not meet the criteria. Others cited the risk of dealing with people who have track records of unacceptable adjustment to societal structures.

Parallel to this are considerations of how such a policy will look to the surrounding community. Several persons noted the disadvantages as mainly political. People in the community around the University may indicate there is enough trouble with people stealing hub caps without knowingly having hardened criminals attending the public University. Other opposition might be that establishing such a policy simply is not good for the public trust.
A number of persons cited fear of losing momentum in serving student offenders if the policy somehow fails, or if someone commits a crime on or off campus in spite of the policy. Another fear raised was the formation of such a policy in a vacuum which does not include persons in the criminal justice system, at least as advisors to the policy.

In general, practical things like money, time, and manpower were cited as disadvantages to implementing a positive policy, but in a rather lengthy interview a University faculty member found the major fault with policies in general as tending to prevent us from doing the intelligent thing. Policies should generally be avoided because they are based on last week's mistakes and can prevent administrators from being functional. This faculty member prefers guidelines, checklists, and consultations which can protect people from their biases. These guidelines should include procedures for such things as admission consultation, and cite one person who is ultimately responsible for making a judgement regarding offenders. He noted if his daughter was in college with an offender and, "one of them messes up," he would want to know who is responsible and who can act.\footnote{Ibid.} One important additional concern was that the problem with policies is that many times they are not revised or updated when appropriate.

A third question raised was in regards to whether or not the state legislature may act favorably in budgeting University monies if they
could see strong collaborations in human services such as between the University and the county jails. Persons answering this question were about evenly split in their opinions. Some persons, including a state legislator, felt that the legislature clearly needs to become aware of its role in dealing with offenders. Collaboration among public agencies can be seen as better use of tax dollars. The current attitude, however, is an eye for an eye, and protection of society by providing prisons and jails. Some legislators know of nothing to do with offenders but to lock them up. Other legislators see a need for change. Some see prisons as a waste of human potential and resources. The legislature needs to justify the idea of having prisons at all. These kinds of collaborations can force consideration of this and other issues.  

In disagreement with this perspective are some justice system personnel who see offenders in prison as a constituency which has always had a difficult time politically because there is no reason to support a group of people that cannot pay taxes and vote. Elected officials tend to support what their constituents want, and currently the public wants little to do with offenders.

Among the fifty-eight persons interviewed, there is a wide variety of opinions and perspectives on the student offender, all of which potentially impinge upon the current status of student offenders at the University of Massachusetts. Arguments and confusion as to if and in what ways offenders should be served on a college campus presented

29 Interview, 6 June 1977.
reflect the community's view of the offender and higher education. When taken as a whole, one begins to realize the complexity of factors that can influence the University's potential to move into a broader framework of working with offenders.

**Student Offenders Questionnaire: An Introduction**

**Background.** To be most effective, offender rehabilitation must in part take place outside of the correctional facility or justice system agency. Education can be an important form of rehabilitation. Institutions designed to educate individuals should facilitate education of all people. In order to maximize the total educational environment, colleges and universities should take on the role of educating college interested offenders in programs based primarily at their campuses. In particular, public institutions of higher education, designed to meet a wide needs range of individual citizens, should work with other public services such as state justice system and correctional programs in meeting the educational needs of its clients.

The **Student Offenders Questionnaire** was designed to investigate what has taken place to create this needed link between justice system agencies and institutions of higher education. The **Questionnaire** was designed to survey the policies and programs related to student offenders as another way of looking at "Why are things the way they are for student offenders?"

30 The **Student Offenders Questionnaire** will be referred to as **Questionnaire**.
Schools surveyed. Sixty-five colleges and Universities were selected for the study. These schools were selected based upon the following criteria:

1. Every public four-year and two-year college in Massachusetts, and some four-year and two-year private schools based on geographic location was used. Thirty schools were selected based on these criteria.

2. A number of schools in New England were selected since the dissertation is particular to the University of Massachusetts as a New England school. Fifteen schools were selected based on this criteria.

3. Ten schools were selected from New York and New Jersey as states neighboring New England.

4. In order to get a national perspective, twelve schools were selected from the following states based on geographic location:
   a) California for the West
   b) New Mexico for the Southwest
   c) Georgia for the Southeast
   d) Illinois for the Midwest
   e) Washington for the Northwest
   f) Maryland for the East

Since the University of Massachusetts is a four-year public university, only schools in this category were selected.

5. Finally, ten schools were selected for their experimental, or
exemplary programs.\textsuperscript{31}

**Questionnaire.** The author developed and administered the Student Offender Questionnaire (Appendix G). Questions were reviewed by several University of Massachusetts administrators, offender program directors, and School of Education Faculty before administering the Questionnaire. Based upon helpful comments of these individuals the author adopted the final questionnaire for this survey.

The Questionnaire was divided into three parts: (1) "Background Information," (2) "Policy Information," and (3) "Program Information." Eleven questions were asked regarding what policy actions college administrators are taking in relation to student offenders. The purpose of the "Policy Information" section was:

1. To learn/benefit from what has already been done in relation to student offenders.

2. To get a more comprehensive idea of what higher education administrators feel about this population as a particular constituency.

Five "Program Information" questions were asked in order to:

1. Discover what programs are in existence

2. Gain insight into programmatic trends

3. See which student offenders are provided services and under what circumstances.

Administration of the Questionnaire. The Dean of Students or the Dean

\textsuperscript{31}A list of schools from which usable questionnaires were received is included as Appendix F.
of Admissions of sixty-five colleges and universities received the
Student Offenders Questionnaire. An enclosed cover letter from the
Dean of Students Office at the University of Massachusetts stressed the
importance of the survey (Appendix II). In addition, an instruction
sheet defining terms and instructing the respondent on the question-
naire was also enclosed. The questionnaire was designed to obtain
policy information, and information related to programs based pri-
marily at the respondent's college or university and not at a justice
system agency (Appendix I).

Respondents were asked to complete and return the questionnaire,
and to include a copy of their policy for student offenders if they
had one in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided by the inves-
tigator. Two waves of questionnaires were sent in order to obtain the
best results. Within a six week period, forty-eight of the sixty-five
survey schools returned usable questionnaires. With a 78 percent
response, the investigator proceeded to analyze the results.

Treatment of the results. Data gathered from the instrument were
calculated. Based on the questionnaire, the responding schools were
divided into four groups, A, B, C, D, based on their response to ques-
tions eight and seventeen. Question eight in brief reads: "Do you
have a written policy [for student offenders]? Yes or No." Question
seventeen in brief reads: "Does your institution provide specific
programs [for student offenders]? Yes or No."

Table 1 indicates that Group "A" includes 28 schools that had no
written policy and no programs. Group "B" includes seven schools that
### TABLE 1

**BREAKDOWN OF SCHOOLS IN THE SAMPLE**

Total number of questionnaires = 48

---

**Question 8: "Do you have a written policy?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Group D</td>
<td>Group C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Group A includes twenty-eight schools that had no written policy and no program.

Group B includes seven schools that had a written policy but no program.

Group C includes seven schools that had no written policy but at least one program.

Group D includes six schools that had a written policy and at least one program.
had a written policy but no programs. Group "C" includes seven schools that had no written policy but at least one program. Group "D" includes six schools that had a written policy and at least one program.

The groups were so divided in order to see in a general way what kind of institutions had policies and/or programs. No effort is made in the treatment of this data to compare the policies and/or programs of two-year versus four-year colleges (as an example), or to make statements indicating that a certain kind of school is more likely to have policies and/or programs. Rather, the statistics used were purely descriptive in order to gain information needed to help University administrators decide if a policy is needed for student offenders, and if so, what the policy should include.

A number of questions in the Student Offenders Questionnaire were presented as either open-ended, or questions in which the respondent wrote in a response rather than circling one or more appropriate answers. In such cases the investigator developed categories based on the kinds of information provided by respondents to a particular question. Also included are a number of questions in which more than one response was appropriate. This was done as a tool in gaining the broadest perspective on a question given the intended use of the data.

Introduction to findings. The data presented in this sub-section was collected from a survey population which consisted of 48 two-year and four-year public and private universities and colleges. The data reported represents findings based on the "Background Information"
section of the questionnaire, questions 1 through 5. The answers to these questions are most relevant to this chapter and are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 presents a summary of background information elicited from questions 1 through 5 of the questionnaire. The table shows percentages calculated from frequencies of responses to each question by each of the four groups, A, B, C, D. Forty-six or 98% of the responding schools served full-time students, but many also served some combination of part-time, residential, and commuter students. Schools with programs and written policies (group C), and schools with policies and programs (group D) have the highest number of minority students. Group C had 57% and group D had 67% of their total undergraduate population consisting of at least 11% minority students as noted in the second question. Also group D schools had the highest number of students receiving financial aid.

All schools with policies and programs (group D) encourage the admission of student offenders, and 43% of those schools responding in group C (programs and no policy) do likewise. Of the total number of schools responding to the survey, 30% or 14 schools could not respond definitively with either "encourage" or "discourage" as a choice. Those responses are included in the category of "Other." Since the option to explain a response was given, half of those giving an explanation indicated their institution neither "encouraged" or "discouraged" the admission of student offenders, or that their institution had no policy. Question 4 of Table 2 indicates these results.

Group D schools primarily encouraged the continued enrollment of
### TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A N = 28</th>
<th>Group B N = 7</th>
<th>Group C N = 7</th>
<th>Group D N = 6</th>
<th>Total N = 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- What population does your institution attempt to serve?*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time students</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- What approximate percentage of your current full-time undergraduate enrollment represents racial minority students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 percent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 percent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 percent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50 percent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 percent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Indicate the approximate percentage of students on your campus receiving financial aid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 percent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 percent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-35 percent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50 percent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75 percent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 75 percent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Does your institution encourage or discourage the admission of student offenders? (Circle one of the underlined.) If appropriate, explain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Does your institution encourage or discourage the continued enrollment of students facing action by the justice system? (Circle one of the underlined.) If appropriate, explain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All questions are based on the institution's undergraduate enrollment.
students facing criminal court action with 67% of their total doing so. Group B schools with written policies and no programs report 57% of their total as discouraging the enrollment of students facing criminal court action. Seventeen schools or 35% of the total of all groups indicated something other than the two requested responses. Seven of the 17 schools or 41% reported neither encouraging nor discouraging the continued enrollment of student offenders. Other responses included "no policy," "that what is done depends on the individual circumstances." Table 2, question 5 summarizes these findings.

In both questions four and five a number of respondents, 30% and 21% respectively, did not reply to the question. Only 41% of the total in question four and 43% of the total in question five clearly indicated a position of encouraging or discouraging the admission or continued enrollment of student offenders.

Some results. Although conclusive statements are difficult to make, schools with the highest minority enrollments and in which the most significant amounts of financial aid are given tend to be the schools that are more likely to have programs or a combination of a written policy and programs. Those schools also tend to be either urban schools or large public institutions. Given the present incarcerated population, these results seem consistent with efforts to meet the educational needs of the prison population which has a large percentage of minorities. These results also reflect a reality of minimal efforts to develop comprehensive connections between colleges and justice system agencies.
Less than half of the schools responding had definitive responses on either encouraging or discouraging the admission or continued enrollment of student offenders. Administrators do not see the need for concerted efforts to definitively address this population. Although ad hoc actions are functional for day-to-day college operations, the lack of helpful administrative action regarding the student offender ignores the potential interface of that institution with justice system agencies. When one thinks again about "Why are things the way they are (for accused students and student offenders)?" perhaps one answer is that most institutions of higher education have not made a decision to involve themselves as a possible community resource in the change process of offenders through higher education.

On the other hand, since location near a correctional facility can have a greater influence on whether or not a college or university has a policy or programs, some of the institutions responding may not feel they have access to a pool of incarcerated offenders. Three schools, however, did not fill out the questionnaire, but responded through letters in which they stated that their college or university to the knowledge of the respondent did not have student offenders on their campus.

**Summary**

"Why things are the way they are for student offenders" seems to involve a combination of ideas that go back to the practical tradition
of reward for those who uphold the law and punishment for those caught breaking it. A community that wants safe streets on the one hand, yet behaves as if most offenders do not or should not return to the community after incarceration reinforces this reward/punishment pattern.

The extremes within which the criminal justice system has acted, swinging from a punishment focus in some instances to a rehabilitative model in others, further complicates the situation. In the midst of this variation is correctional education, which at times is influenced more by public reaction to crime than by any deliberate effort to institutionalize goals and directions for offenders as individuals who return to community life. Because trends in the criminal justice system influence the treatment of offenders, their experience in the process of these changes becomes a critical issue.

Higher education is faced with the limits of diminishing resources and unfinished (yet often questioned) programs which find their roots in the 1960's, especially regarding attempts to move minorities and the poor into colleges and universities. Higher education is further faced with declining enrollments of traditional high school graduates coming right to college. New student markets of more non-traditional students are increasing at colleges and universities. These students, though, tend to have a greater need for financial and counseling support, and class hours that will accommodate special needs, such as care of families and full-time jobs. Post-secondary education is also undergoing a transition regarding notions of what is useful to teach students as we move towards the end of the century.

Within this morass of unpredictability, trends and movements within
the criminal justice system, correctional agencies, and institutions of higher education, are student offenders who need the unique services of each institution. Corrections agencies are needed as legitimate institutions in correcting past behavior. Institutions of higher education can be helpful to some offenders in providing a needed educational environment, and a transitional setting for some offenders. The present situation in both the criminal justice system and higher education is confusing and in many cases discouraging to proactive change in the lives of students who are offenders and offenders who desire higher education.

In a local sense, many opinions were expressed by members of the University community on whether or not offenders should be served on a college campus; what advantages or disadvantages there are for the University in designing a policy in relation to offenders; and how the Massachusetts legislature might react to collaboration between the University and justice system agencies. Most persons interviewed believed the University ought to serve offenders in some way, but ultimately raised the issues of availability of resources, fear of jeopardizing a safe community, and other perceived complications that might be encountered in relation to offenders. Only a few persons interviewed looked at the University as having an obligation to provide educational options to offenders.

Further support for the tenuous position of higher education in relation to offenders was seen in the findings on the "background information" section of the Student Offenders Questionnaire. Most schools surveyed could not respond definitely to a stance of either
encouraging the admission or continued enrollment of student offenders, and less than half the schools surveyed had policies and/or programs related to the student offender. Combined, these factors make the present situation for student offenders muddy and inconclusive at best.

From a narrow management point of view it seems easy to separate all human services including justice system agencies and institutions of higher education into their own functioning bureaucracies. Yet, with at least 25% of both state and federal budgets going to human services, functionally it does not make sense to have bureaucracies that do not have areas of overlap, or that operate in conflict with each other. Rather than continuing to reinforce systems and attitudes that work against target populations such as student offenders, collaboration between the justice system and higher education can and should help move this population into useful positions in the society's mainstream.
CHAPTER IV
WHAT WOULD BE BETTER?

Chapter Overview

Most institutions of higher education and criminal justice system agencies have not cooperated on well thought out educational programs for offenders. To move into a posture of meaningful collaboration regarding student offenders it is helpful to ask, "What would be better for student offenders?" Within the context of this question, the major results of the "Policy" and "Program Information" sections of Student Offenders Questionnaire will be presented. In addition, a literature review of some programs, policies, and trends focusses on practices that can encourage links between the justice system and higher education. Finally, if student offenders are to function within the University's environment, attention must be paid to elements of a policy for student offenders. In order to determine what might be included in a policy and who should form it, a variety of knowledgeable people were asked the following questions:¹

(1) If you were to draft parts of the University's policy towards the admission and continued enrollment of student offenders,

¹These questions are taken from the Student Offenders Interview. Appendix A, questions 21 and 22; Appendix B, questions 17 and 18; Appendix C, questions 22 and 23; and Appendix D, questions 15 and 16 cite these questions.
what one or two things would you include?

(2) Who ought to be responsible for establishing a policy for student offenders?

Student Offenders Questionnaire: Major Results

Introduction. Sixty-five colleges and universities received the Student Offenders Questionnaire. Forty-eight of these, or 78%, returned usable questionnaires. These schools were divided into four groups. Group "A" consists of 28 schools having no written policy and no programs for student offenders. Group "B" consists of 7 schools having a written policy, but no programs for student offenders. Group "C" consists of 7 schools having no written policy, but at least one program for student offenders. Group "D" consists of 6 schools that have a written policy and at least one program.

Major findings. Although it is difficult to draw categorized conclusions based on the results of the Student Offenders Questionnaire, several points can be raised. From these findings, it appears that schools with no policy or program commitments to student offenders tend to have the lowest definitive response to offenders, even in the form of administrative actions. More than half the schools surveyed described their policies towards student offenders as ad hoc and based on individual cases. This was specially true for schools with no written policies, groups "A" and "C". These schools report operating within a set of unwritten administrative practices regarding student offenders. Although it is difficult to know what these ad hoc policies entailed, without codified guidelines individual bias by administrators may be more frequent in
decisions regarding student offenders. In many cases this bias reflects an effort to protect an institution's reputation rather than actions that may be helpful to student offenders. In addition, only a few schools surveyed had programs for this population, reflecting perhaps either a lack of knowledge or a lack of concern.

Institutions with policies and no programs in group "B" however did not encourage student offenders to remain in school. This factor may indicate that schools with only policies design them to move student offenders away from their campuses beyond levels of direct responsibility. Schools in group "D" (with programs and policies) generally encourage student offenders to remain as students despite their judicial status.

For those colleges and universities having either a written policy or a set of administrative actions related to this population, schools in group "C" (programs but no policy) and group "D" (policy and programs) tend to have policies addressing students in the most direct relationship with the criminal justice system, those incarcerated, on probation, or on parole. The influence of students and institutional need were primary motivations for the establishment of policies; however, this was least true for schools in group "A" (no written policy or programs). Most respondents in this group indicated the question did not apply since they had no written policies. College and university administrators appear to be the most influential in carrying out policies, although other factors, such as the influence of faculty, the attitudes of a college president and concern for ensuring due process were almost as influential. Conversely, boards of
trustees and the justice system tended to be least influential in carrying out a policy. Schools in group "D" (policies and programs) had the highest positive relationship between their policy and decisions favoring student offenders.

Most schools without a policy on student offenders do not anticipate the development of one within two years. Most schools with a policy do not anticipate any significant revisions within two years.

From the data presented, it appears that schools with either programs, group "C," or policies and programs, group "D," tend to be most clear regarding the institution's relationship with student offenders. This relationship seems to be a positive one that encourages the possibility of a student offender's matriculation towards degree completion. Those schools also tend to serve a number of minority student offenders, a group that has been seen as lacking educational opportunities.

Admission to programs varies, but most schools require a recommendation from the justice system and some kind of recommendation and/or review by staff at a college or university. Most programs have only been in existence for two to four years but have developed mechanisms to provide a range of administrative support, especially financial aid, counseling services, and the same administrative support other students receive. A member of the college or university administration or program director is primarily responsible for the administration of programs, however various people including corrections officers, parole officers, community personnel and correctional education staff serve as liaisons between justice system agencies and college and university
student offender programs. Schools having policies were requested to enclose copies with their response. Policies received show structures ranging from a brief paragraph in a code of student conduct indicating the expectation that students adhere to college and federal and state statutes, to procedures for applying for admission or re-admission from a prison or other justice system institution.

These results seem consistent with information previously presented, in which it was discovered that schools with programs or programs and policies encouraged rather than discouraged the admission and continued enrollment of student offenders. These schools also tended to have the higher number of minority students.

Policy Information. The data reported here represents findings based on the "Policy Information" section of the questionnaire, questions six through sixteen. Table 3 and subsequent tables show percentages calculated from frequency of responses to each question by the four groups: A, B, C, and D.

Table 3 summarizes background information on policies, questions six through nine. For the purpose of this questionnaire, policy was defined as either a written document or a widely known set of administrative actions. As seen in question six of the table, most school's actions are based on individual cases. Fifty-seven percent of groups "A" and "C", schools having no written policy and no programs, and schools having no written policy, but at least one program, use ad hoc policy arrangements. Only group "B" schools, having written policies and no program, had significant percentages of respondents encouraging
### TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A (N = 28)</th>
<th>Group B (N = 7)</th>
<th>Group C (N = 7)</th>
<th>Group D (N = 6)</th>
<th>Total (N = 48)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6-** Describe your institution's policy towards student offenders.*
(Circle more than one if appropriate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Encourage retention of student offenders</td>
<td>7 25</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>4 66</td>
<td>14 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Encourage student offenders to withdraw from school</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Student offenders suspended</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Justice system primarily responsible for student offenders</td>
<td>10 36</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>17 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Ad hoc policy based on individual cases</td>
<td>16 57</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>19 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>4 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7-** What group(s) of students does your policy address?
(Circle more than one if appropriate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Students facing criminal court action</td>
<td>14 50</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>22 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Incarcerated students</td>
<td>9 32</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>6 100</td>
<td>19 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Students on probation</td>
<td>12 43</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>20 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Paroled students</td>
<td>13 46</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>4 67</td>
<td>21 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Students guilty of an offense but not incarcerated</td>
<td>10 36</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>14 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>8 29</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>11 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on the next page.)

**"Policy"** refers to either a written document or a set of administrative actions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8- Do you have a written policy responding to any of the groups circled in question 7?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9- Have you included a copy of the policy with this questionnaire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
student offenders to either withdraw from school (14%) or suspend student offenders (29%). No other respondent in any group indicated either of these as part of their policy. No group "B" schools encourage the retention of student offenders. Group "D" schools, those with both a written policy and programs, had the greatest percentage of schools, 66%, encouraging the retention of student offenders. Some schools indicated "other" as one of their choice. The schools either stated in more depth the nature of their ad hoc policy or, in one case (a group "A" school), gave a lengthy explanation of its relationship to drug offenders.

Table 3 (question seven) requested a breakdown of groups towards which policies are addressed, and indicates that schools in all four groups tend to have some policy on the student offender facing criminal court action. Group "C" (with programs) and group "D" schools (with programs and policies) had at least 50% of the schools responding in each group to the incarcerated student, student on probation, and the paroled student. All six schools in group "D" have policies addressing the incarcerated student. Nine of the eleven schools indicating "other" as their response explained that their college or university had no policy.

Administrative concern for students (21%) and institutional need (17%) were primary motivations in the development of policy as indicated in Table 4. In this question, though, the highest total frequency of response and response in group "A" (no written policy and no program), and group "C" (no written policy, but programs) was in the "does not
### TABLE 4

**SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONCERNS IN RELATION TO POLICY**

|                      | Group A  
|----------------------|-----------
|                      | . N = 28  |
| n %                  | n %       |
|----------------------|-----------
| Group B              | Group C  
| . N = 7              | N = 7    |
| n %                  | n %       |
|----------------------|-----------
| Group D              | Total     
| . N = 6              | N = 48   |
| n %                  | n %       |

### 10- What primarily motivated the development of your policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Institutional need</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Concern of the</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>justice system</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Concern of students</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Concern of another group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Does not apply</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No reply: 3

### 12- What factors have been most influential in carrying out your policy? (Circle more than one if appropriate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. College administra-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Justice system</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Kinds of programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resulting from the</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Board of trustees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on the next page.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A N = 28</th>
<th>Group B N = 7</th>
<th>Group C N = 7</th>
<th>Group D N = 6</th>
<th>Total N = 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n %</strong></td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13- What factors have been least influential in carrying out your policy? (Circle more than one if appropriate.)

A. College administration | 2 7 | 0 0 | 1 14 | 0 0 | 3 6
B. Justice system         | 6 21| 3 43| 2 29 | 0 0 | 11 23
C. Students               | 5 18| 1 14| 1 14 | 1 17| 8 17
D. Programs resulting from policy | 5 18| 1 14| 2 29 | 1 17| 9 19
E. Board of trustees      | 5 18| 1 14| 2 29 | 4 67| 12 25
F. Community              | 3 11| 3 43| 0 0  | 3 50| 9 19
G. Other                  | 4 14| 0 0 | 1 14 | 0 0 | 5 10

14- In your opinion to what degree does your policy influence decisions in the favor of student offenders?

A. Very significantly      | 0 0 | 1 14| 2 29 | 3 50| 6 13
B. Significantly           | 5 18| 0 0 | 1 14 | 3 50| 9 19
C. Do not know             | 5 18| 1 14| 0 0  | 0 0 | 6 13
D. Not very much           | 1 4 | 1 14| 2 29 | 0 0 | 4 8
E. Not at all              | 1 4 | 0 0 | 0 0  | 0 0 | 1 2
F. Does not apply          | 14 50| 3 43| 1 14 | 0 0 | 18 37

No reply: | 4 8
apply" category. Most schools indicated that a lack of written policy was the basis of their response to this question.

As seen in question eleven, college administrators are influential in carrying out an institution's policy, being most influential in group "B" (policy and no programs). The "other" category of responses to this question revealed a number of additional influential factors, including faculty, concern over ensuring due process for the student, and interest on the part of the college president. Boards of trustees (25%) and the justice system (23%) are seen as least influential in carrying out policies, according to question thirteen. Within groups "B" (policies and no programs) and "D" (policies and programs), the justice system (43%) and the board of trustees (67%) are particular obstacles to institutions having written policies. A high correlation exists between proactive policy and administrative decisions in the favor of student offenders in some schools. One hundred percent of the respondents in group "D" (policies and programs) see their policy as having a significant positive influence on such decisions, according to question fourteen.

At least 50% of these schools, as seen in Table 5, do not anticipate the development of a written policy regarding student offenders. Only three schools (11%) in group "A" and two schools (29%) in group "C" anticipate the development of a policy. Question sixteen, which solicited anticipation of significant revisions in policy, reveals only one school (2% of the total 48 schools) anticipating any significant revisions in current policies.
TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF FUTURE POLICY ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A N = 28</th>
<th>Group B N = 7</th>
<th>Group C N = 7</th>
<th>Group D N = 6</th>
<th>Total N = 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15- Anticipation of policy development within next two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- Anticipation of significant revisions in policy within next two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program information findings. This section refers only to those schools having at least one program for student offenders, groups "C" (programs, but no policy) and "D" (programs and policies). These are programs for students on probation, parole, or release from a correctional facility, not a prison education program or other program based primarily at a justice system agency. Results of questions seventeen through twenty-seven are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

Most schools in groups "C" and "D" (57%) have only one program. One school in group "C", however, has four programs. Half the schools in group "D" have one program and the other half have two programs, according to Table 6, question seventeen. As seen in question twenty-four, nearly half the programs (46%) have been in existence for over seven years.

These programs range from informal liaison with a correctional facility or parole office, to comprehensive degree-granting programs based on contractual relationships between a state level department of corrections and a college or university. At least half of these programs are linked to monetary or staff support such as that provided through Educational Opportunity Programs, or state tuition monies for which any student can apply. Most require incarcerated student offenders to be within a specific period of time of parole eligibility, or to have completed course work within a prison education program, or obtained college credits prior to incarceration in order to be eligible for program consideration. All programs cited in the survey have a program director located at the college or university whose primary responsibility is to serve as liaison between a justice system agency
### TABLE 6

**SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON STUDENT OFFENDER PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group C N = 7</th>
<th>Group D N = 6</th>
<th>Total N = 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17- Does your institution provide specific programs for this population?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 100</td>
<td>6 100</td>
<td>13 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>7 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>3 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20- What population does your program attempt to serve? (Circle more than one if appropriate.)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Students facing criminal court action</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>2 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Incarcerated students</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>6 100</td>
<td>10 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Students on probation</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>6 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Paroled students</td>
<td>6 86</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>9 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>2 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21- Approximately how many students does your program service?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 20</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>4 67</td>
<td>7 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21- 50</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>3 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 150</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on the next page.)
### TABLE 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22- What approximate percentage of students currently enrolled in your program represents minority students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-70%</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>3 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 70%</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>4 67</td>
<td>7 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No reply: 1 8

23- How do students get into your program? (Circle more than one if appropriate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Special application</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>4 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Recommendation from your college or university</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>6 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Recommendation from the justice system</td>
<td>3 43</td>
<td>4 83</td>
<td>7 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Recommendation from a student who is or has been in the program</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Minimal grade point average</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>2 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>5 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24- How long has your program been in operation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 2 years</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 years</td>
<td>4 57</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>6 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 7 years</td>
<td>2 29</td>
<td>3 50</td>
<td>5 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 7 years</td>
<td>1 14</td>
<td>1 17</td>
<td>2 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In question twenty, all but one institution in group "C" (programs but no policy) and all schools in group "D" (policy and programs) serve incarcerated students. Half the schools in group "D" and all but one in group "C", or 86% of the schools, serve the paroled student. Only 15% of responding schools serve the student facing criminal court action.

Over half the responding schools serve fewer than twenty students in their programs; however, two schools in group "C" serve over 100 students, as seen in question twenty-one. At least half the schools reporting in each group had over 70% of their students as members of minority groups, according to question twenty-two.

Most schools in groups "D" and "C" require a recommendation from a representative of a justice system agency for admission to programs, and almost half (46%) require some kind of recommendation from the sponsoring college or university, as seen in question twenty-three. In addition, over one-third of the schools have other requirements prior to admission, including an individual review of application so that factors such as academic potential, maturity, and motivation can be assessed. They may also require review of the application by a screening committee and an interview with the applicant.

Table 7 summarizes administrative support for student offenders. As seen in question twenty-five, all schools in group "D" (policies and programs) and over half (57%) of the schools in group "C" (programs and

\[2\text{This narrative was based on question nineteen, an open-ended question. The following section, "Promising Programs, Policies, and Trends," elaborates on program descriptions.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group C N = 7</th>
<th>Group D N = 6</th>
<th>Total N = 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25- Which of the following areas of administrative support apply to your program?</strong> (Circle more than one if appropriate.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Financial aid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Personal counseling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Academic counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Individualized programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Special admissions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Tutorials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. The same administrative support other students receive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26- Who is most responsible for the administration of the program?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Member of your college or university administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Program director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Justice system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27- Who in the justice system serves as primary liason between your institution and the justice system?</strong> (Circle more than one if appropriate.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Judge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Corrections officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Parole officer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Probation officer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Does not apply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no policy) offer their students financial aid. Over half the schools also offer their students personal and academic counseling, special admissions to their college or university, and the same administrative support other students receive. With the exception of special admissions, more schools in group "D" (policy and programs) offer these services to student offenders in their program than group "C" schools (programs and no policy).

Most schools in group "C" (57%) have a representative of their college or university administration responsible for their program as seen in question twenty-six. Most group "D" schools (67%), however, have a program director as the person most responsible for the program's administration.

Question twenty-seven indicates a wide range of personnel acting as liaison between the justice system and the colleges and universities in both groups "C" and "D". Of the choices given on the Questionnaire, corrections officers and parole officers were given as primary liaisons. A number of schools in each group, though, cited "other" as their choice, giving work-release staff, program officers, and corrections educational staff as persons also responsible for this liaison.

Promising Programs, Policies and Trends

In exploring the potential for a better future for student offenders, a careful look must be taken at promising attempts of the past and present in meeting the needs of this population. Future prospects should be considered from both a policy and a programmatic viewpoint.
Perhaps one standard to be used in judging success is the level of competence enjoyed by program participants. The Adult Performance Level Project outlines the following five areas of competence for adults:

a) Functional competence in consumer economics
b) Functional competence in health
c) Functional competence in government and law
d) Functional competence in occupational knowledge
e) Functional competence in community resources

For the offender population, participation in programs which are the result of collaboration between colleges or universities and justice system agencies offer perhaps the most hope for achieving these levels of competence. Such collaboration in the future may be able to build on the strengths of past efforts, and move beyond problems of the past.

Project Newgate is one of the most comprehensive and rigorous efforts at moving offenders away from a cycle of failure and into positions where success in the community is positively reinforced. Part of the reasoning behind the Newgate thrust was the realization that prison experience tends to handicap a person. Incarceration tends to routinize people into a dull, predictable life style that is a considerable hindrance to a civilian in the outside world. Newgate planners addressed not only the cycle of prison, but also the pattern

---

3 Norvell Northcutt, Adult Functional Competency: A Summary (University of Texas at Austin: Division of Extension, [March 1975]), p. 2.
of incarceration among some population groups.

It begins before prison, in the background of the person who is eventually incarcerated. The criminal justice system, i.e., the police, courts and prisons, in a complex, but systematically biased fashion, select from the very large pool of law breakers, the least advantaged persons and deliver society's harshest punishment. The result is that the imprisoned individual tends to be far less educated, and less skilled vocationally than other members of the lower or working classes (the classes from which he almost exclusively is drawn). 4

In 1962, Dr. Thomas Gaddis began what is known as the Newgate model in the Oregon State Penitentiary. Later, several other Newgate programs were initiated in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Minnesota, and New Mexico. In this model, the Upward Bound Concept was combined with prison reform efforts. 5 Newgate planners saw inmates as persons who have lacked access to the reward and fulfillment structures of society. A comprehensive accelerated enrichment program of pre-college courses, counseling, and other support was offered to inmates, with the added motivation of access to college.

The in-prison college component of the program was as much like a regular college as possible. All efforts were made to provide a library, study area, and counseling by regular university or college staff. Once a student offender qualified for the release component or was ready for parole, efforts were made to provide him or her with

---


5 Upward Bound is a federally funded program targeted to reach high school minority and poor youth who would probably not attend colleges due to economics and/or motivation. Tutors, individualized programs and trained counselors supplement secondary school curriculum and teachers in providing a comprehensive educational program.
financial aid, academic and personal counseling, housing, clothes, and general support needed to stay in school. "The fundamental principle is to bring community people and resources into correctional programming and to develop solid community-based support into which inmates can move upon release."\(^6\)

Newgate evaluators found participants in the programs more likely to achieve success and participate in useful post-prison careers than non-participant inmates. Newgate students were more likely to have better job stability, and were more likely to be involved in post-prison education either through finishing up two- or four-year college degrees or, in some cases, graduate school.\(^7\)

Shawnee College, a two-year school in Illinois, developed a comprehensive program for offenders and the community. Based partially on the commitment of the college to serve the community, the college's involvement in the Manpower Development Training Act and state Vocational Training Program of 1971, and surveys predicting manpower needs for the future, Shawnee began offering courses for college credit at the Vienna Correctional Facility. The courses ranged from office machine repair to water/waste technology. Like the Newgate model, Shawnee College offered college preparatory classes as well, especially in the areas of developmental reading and math. An educational release

---


component developed later, but in both the in-prison and college-based components of the program all efforts were made to allow student offenders to pursue their studies like any other student. As part of the program, members of the community were allowed to take courses within the correctional facility and at the college.

Job counseling, a key part of this program, was facilitated by a full-time counselor from the Illinois Employment Service who worked to place parolees in jobs within their fields of training. The college and the correctional center program had a 92% success rate after two years of full programming.

As in Newgate-type programs, a strong effort was made in the Shawnee College program to develop community support, and a unique level of state support. Community involvement entailed not only class attendance, but also included a Citizen's Advisory Council, which was endorsed by the college's Board of Trustees. In addition a good working relationship developed between the college president and the warden of the Vienna Correctional facility. State support was developed through use of the job counselor and state manpower forecasts.⁶

Although most colleges that are involved in work with the incarcerated student offender have educational release components that developed after their in-prison components, study release programs are growing in number and continue to represent a useful method of bridging the gap between incarceration and parole or release. One study of

correctional education programs for adults noted that 56 of 172 programs used similar criteria for admitting individuals to campus-based programs, including good in-prison conduct, some consideration of the inmate's past records, recommendation from a justice system staff person and college staff person, and an overall assessment that the student offender could be successful in a college program. Most of the institutions surveyed had some restrictions on participation based on violations of drug and alcohol laws, or convictions for capital crimes.9

In 1975, the Federal Bureau of Prisons had approximately ninety post-secondary schools working with federal prisons. Of those ninety, twenty-one were four-year colleges with educational release components. One such pilot program was the Resident Release Project in Santa Barbara, California, which allowed carefully-screened student offenders to live on campus and participate as full time students in order to complete college prior to prison release. This co-ed program of eighteen men and four women encouraged its students to work in order to cover the cost of books.

Some colleges and universities have programs ranging from informal contact between pre-adjudicated students and college or university administrators to comprehensive degree-granting programs for probationed, paroled, or incarcerated student offenders in which full financial aid and other support are major components. At the University

of Washington, men and women on early release from state and federal prisons, many of whom are eligible for Educational Opportunity Program support, live in a specific part of campus and participate as full time students. In another program at Haggerston Junior College, Maryland, inmates completing at least 30 credit hours and within ten months of their first parole hearing can participate in the college release program. Students are brought to campus by vans provided by the prison and return to prison at night. The Massachusetts Department of Corrections has contracted for services from the University of Massachusetts at Boston. Offenders, within eighteen months of parole eligibility, can be recommended for educational release through a pre-release center. Student offenders in the program attend on-campus courses and may also have part-time employment to help with school expenses.\(^1\)

One extensive program sponsored by the California State University at Los Angeles consists of four programs based primarily at their campus. Known collectively as Student Parole Program, the programs offer services aimed at alleviating the stress between the incarcerated and the community in order to enable students to succeed at the university and be self-sufficient in society.\(^1\) The programs collaborate with community agencies and area human services councils. In addition, the staff of

\(^1\)The Student Offender Questionnaire, reviewed earlier in this chapter, revealed thirteen colleges and universities with student offender programs based at their institutions. The University of Washington; Haggerston Junior College, Maryland; the University of Massachusetts at Boston; and California State University at Los Angeles were part of the survey.

\(^1\)Office of Economic Opportunity, Student Parole Program (California State University at Los Angeles, [1973]).
the Student Parole Program is recruited largely from program participants. These staff positions include Admissions Advisors and Extension Course Coordinators.

Another means of serving student offenders was tested through selected member schools of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. For eighteen months three colleges (Central Community College, North Carolina; Florida Junior College, Florida; and Community College of Denver, Colorado) ran pilot programs. These three institutions wanted to show that community colleges could meet the needs of offenders, and could be a more comprehensive resource for the community. As in programs previously cited both educational and human services assistance was provided to offender participants.

A unique feature of this program was the target population, first-time convicted felons. The offenders involved received no special financial assistance beyond that available to any student, including Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, vocational rehabilitation and low-interest loans. The courts were encouraged to view the colleges as resources and as a useful alternative to traditional forms of incarceration by placing non-dangerous offenders on probation so that they could participate in college programs. Only 6.1% of participants of the three programs, taken together, were re-arrested for new charges. Although program

evaluators could not draw conclusions due to a lack of complete information, this is still a far lower rate than for offenders nationally.

Another hopeful trend is the increased use of "University Without Walls" programs in which life experience, independent study, and flexible scheduling allows special students such as student offenders to matriculate through degree programs that combine work and study. Devised through the Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities, this academic arrangement sought to avoid the traditional hierarchical planning of higher education.

Other promising trends for the future are revealed by policies regarding offenders on college campuses. Most policies regarding student offenders center on codes of student conduct in which it is stressed that a student must abide by both the regulations of the college or university as well as civil laws under which all citizens must abide. Most institutions reserve the right to request a student to withdraw from school or to suspend the student in cases of serious on- or off-campus behavior which might affect the student's safety and well-being or that of the college or university. Most policies also make reference directly to drug offenses and proceedings. In most policies there are clauses indicating that in some cases awaiting trial can substantially interfere with a student's life, and in some cases the normal operation of an academic routine. As such most institutions reserve the right to enter into appropriate disciplinary actions. The

13 The policies noted were received with the Student Offenders Questionnaire.
University of Oregon has the following in their student code regarding conduct:

In general, the off-campus activities of students are viewed as their personal business. However, when a student violates local, state, or federal laws and, at the same time violates the Code of Student Conduct, either on or off campus, the university reserves the option of initiating disciplinary action on its own.¹⁴

Some policies regarding student offenders go beyond these somewhat standard clauses found in most regulations of post-secondary institutions. They include criteria for admission or readmission from incarcerated, probationed, or parolee status. Characteristic of these policies are sections of state codes regarding educational programs for offenders specifically noting any kind of limitation or restriction based on kinds of offenses, past criminal record, in-prison conduct, etc. Kinds of screening or documentation needed for college programs, as well as eligibility for financial aid or support services are also parts of these policies. They may also include statements of educational philosophy, lists of goals and objectives, policy and/or program development, and detailed descriptions of programs as part of overall policy.

Trends within the criminal justice system may also make the idea of developing policies and programs for student offenders more desirable in the future. In spite of a trend towards longer prison terms and determinate rather than indeterminate sentences, some research suggests that a return to punishment as the primary role of the criminal justice system is not functional. A study by the National Council on

Crime and Delinquency looked at the criminal records of more than one hundred thousand offenders who had been paroled from prison. One finding of this research was that "in the majority of cases those who had served the longer terms did worse when paroled than those who had served shorter terms. This finding lends additional credence to the conclusion of other researchers who have found that imprisonment is more apt to be criminogenic rather than rehabilitative."  

In a later study in 1973 researchers at the School of Criminal Justice of the State University of New York "found that mandatory prison sentencing 'does not offer the protection it was intended to provide.'"  

In 1964, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (N.C.C.D.) developed the Model Sentencing Act. Under this act criminals are divided into two groups. One group consists of those who commit serious crime against other persons, particularly those that show patterns of "persistent assaultiveness rooted in mental illness," and those who are historically involved with organized crime. This group constitutes only about 10% of the current incarcerated population. For all other criminals N.C.C.D. suggests probation, disposition, or a fine "whenever it appears that such disposition does not pose a danger or serious harm to the public."  

---


16 Ibid.

17 Ibid., p. 1299.

18 Ibid.
group are incarcerated, sentences should not exceed five years.

As one might suspect, this proposal has met with opposition. One study suggests that no form of rehabilitation is particularly effective for the majority of offenders. One lawyer therefore states, "if widely differing correctional programs have about the same results in terms of recidivism, ... it is incumbent on the state to use the punishment which is least disabling, and, since the law in essence favors the liberty of the individual, to use those means that interfere least with individual liberty."19

Consistent with this trend is the increasing use of diversion programs such as pre-trial intervention programs. In such programs the accused offender at the time of court arraignment is given the option of serving his/her sentence in a community-based program where both supervision and supportive services are provided. Many such programs became offshoots of manpower development programs for the unemployed and the underemployed. Successful completion of such programs have in some cases resulted in dismissal of charges.

In New York State accused offenders under supervision of probation personnel and judges can receive alternative sentencing, another diversion strategy. Under such arrangements, Adjournment with Contemplation of Dismissal (A.C.D.) can be used by a judge to do such things as sentence a student offender to college or other programming that may have more positive benefits than incarceration. In such cases a judge gives an accused student or other offender the choice

---

19 Ibid., p. 1300.
of going to college or going to trial and then to prison.

More data on cost effectiveness of educational programs versus incarceration suggests that providing a college education to a student offender is in the long run cheaper than the various costs of arrest, trial, and incarceration. The cost of incarceration to some degree reflects on or includes the cost of arrest, damage to property, police costs, legal costs, cost to the victim, and court fees. Incarceration cost also reflects what it costs in many cases to arrest and re-arrest an individual, and the cost to support the offender's family while he/she is imprisoned. Although perhaps not a true comparison, when one looks at these costs versus the cost of an alternative like higher education the cost is still considerably less.\(^{20}\)

In general, education has proved to be a beneficial thing for society in that "the return to society, that is the increased taxes paid by persons whose incomes have increased, is a direct return and is a form of paying back the costs in kind."\(^{21}\) The potential earning power of a college graduate continues to be better than a high school graduate. In 1976 the average income of the American male high school graduate was $9,567 compared to $13,871 for the college graduate.\(^{22}\)

Another hopeful trend is an increasing dispute over the use of

\(^{20}\)Kaplan, Gans, Kahn, An Evaluation of Newgate and Other Prisoner Education Programs, p. 86-93.

\(^{21}\)Ibid., p. 87.

reduced recidivism as a measure of policy and programmatic success with offenders. Part of the problem with correctional education is that success is measured by reduction in recidivism. Yet whether or not someone returns to prison is due to a multitude of factors, including the person's overall prison experience, life history, socio-economic background, quality of life at the time of incarceration, and the environmental conditions to which an ex-offender or parolee is returning. Regarding these conditions, Sylvia McCollum from the Federal Bureau of Prisons suggests that to link recidivism with education or training is setting up the wrong kind of relationship and asking the wrong kinds of questions. "If we want to know what 'works' with prisoners we must say . . . Quality education works, if by works we mean enrollment in relevant courses in which quality instruction is provided, persistence in courses until passing grades are received and established standards of excellence are met."23

In addition, evaluators of the Newgate Prison Education programs note that "re-arrest and/or return to prison are only indirect and not necessarily accurate indicators of criminal activity."24 As an example, some persons are re-arrested for parole violations like alcoholic abuse. Also, there appears to be little uniformity from state to state


24 Kaplan, Gans, Kahn, An Evaluation of Newgate and Other Prisoner Education Programs, p. 52.
or in some cases within states on what constitutes a parole violation or grounds to re-arrest or re-incarcerate someone. Some states are harsher than others. As in other aspects of the criminal justice system re-arrest seems to be tied to race and economic class.\textsuperscript{25} In general, more recent evaluations of correctional education programs have found the use of recidivism as a primary measure of program success to be conceptually poor if for no other reason than it takes into account other behaviors and unknown factors.

On a broader level, system's approaches to solutions to social problems have gained momentum. Consolidation of resources and services directed toward a particular target population is an idea endorsed by the federal and various state governments. In designing an idealized future Russel Ackoff, an authority in systems analysis, stresses a holistic concept which involves looking at what is, deciding what ought to be, and considering the pieces which most influence the transition between the present and the future. A key point Ackoff emphasizes is the involvement in planning of as many of those people that have a stake in the system as possible.\textsuperscript{26} In redesigning the future for student offenders, criminal justice components, human service agencies, and institutions of higher education must see this population as whole individuals and treat them accordingly. Decision-making under Ackoff's paradigm must include criminal justice personnel, persons in human

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.

service agencies, student offenders, and faculty, students and staff in higher education.

A systems approach also suggests less definition in roles and responsibilities of the particular agencies related to student offenders. The emphasis is away from strict arguments of punishment and restitution versus rehabilitation and education. Rather, collaboration for the "common good" between diverse areas such as college or university and the justice system must be philosophically based on real communication and a shared connected sense of how and why things happen in the world for offenders.

Proactive Policy Thrusts:

Some Views of Members of The University of Massachusetts Community

In order to move the issue of student offenders to a place where positive action can begin, the University community must have input on the elements of a policy. Several knowledgeable persons were asked to focus on one or two items that a policy should include, and who should be responsible for its development.²⁷

Most persons interviewed agreed that the policy needs to include some statement regarding missions and goals of the University as a land grant institution, responsible for serving the community in a variety of ways. Also within the statement should be recognition of the University as an institution whose first mission is education and

²⁷See Student Offenders Interview, Appendix A, questions 21 and 22; Appendix B, questions 17 and 18; Appendix C, questions 22 and 23; and Appendix D, questions 15 and 16.
research, and a conceptual statement on the institution's stance on serving offenders. Such a statement would emphasize the fact that the University tries to make a reasonable effort to meet a variety of needs for a variety of constituencies.

A statement of the academic and social expectations of the offender in relationship with the University, and the University in relationship with the offender, was also suggested by many of those interviewed. Some persons suggested that such statements should be made from both pre- and post-trial perspectives. Within this statement of expectations should be some notation of what the University can provide for student offenders, including the kinds of academic, financial aid, counseling, and other support. Most persons interviewed felt this was necessary for the University to consider before developing a policy. Particular emphasis should be placed on defining who is responsible for providing what services.

Along with this should be a statement of restrictions placed on those eligible and ineligible for admission. Although most administrators and program directors feared becoming locked into making definitive statements regarding pending criminal court action, past criminal records or the most recent offense of a student offender, those who supported restrictions felt it should be clearly stated whether or not someone accused or convicted of murder, rape, arson, or other violent crimes had a chance of admission or continued enrollment.

Most justice system persons, student offenders, and some program directors objected to any statement regarding past criminal activity causing restrictions or categorically ruling out some offenders,
feeling that this kind of action could prove discriminatory. As an example, the armed robber of ten years ago is probably different from the armed robber of today. In addition, restrictions based on crime at times do not establish a difference between anti-social and anti-human behavior. Rather than developing categories of offenses, one program director feels the policy should emphasize the possible non-admission of a person with pending legal action in another state, or additional warrants which could in fact substantially interfere with completion of college. Several others suggested that distinctions might be made based upon place of incarceration rather than actual crimes. Inmates of county houses of correction tend to have sentences of less than three years, whereas most state prisons have offenders with longer sentences.

All program directors, most justice system personnel and some administrators felt the policy should in some written way promote the need for frequent and on-going communication between a justice system agency or correctional institution and the University, and define the need for trust between all parties involved. This was felt to be true especially in the selection of incarcerated or probationed offenders for admission or readmission.

Regarding the admission of student offenders, most persons interviewed agreed that a screening process and non-traditional admission criteria should apply to student offenders, especially the incarcerated or newly-released offender. Less emphasis should be placed on traditional college board scores or other standard academic criteria, and more emphasis should be placed on recent educational endeavors, future
plans, autobiographies, or other substitute data.

Student offenders should receive at least one strong recommendation from the justice system and one from someone connected with the University. Most people also agreed that an interview is probably also necessary, with at least one faculty member and one decision-maker in student affairs.

Some University administrators and justice system program directors emphasized the need to use the same criteria for offenders as other students in admission, noting that simply filling admission slots is not something the University should promote. Most persons interviewed believe, however, that all efforts should be made to apply the same evaluative measures in course completion and grading for student offenders as for other students. Emphasized particularly was the importance of the university's seeing student offenders as other students who may in some cases be in need of support and services.

A few persons supported uninterrupted education of current students facing criminal court action, even though the individual may eventually be incarcerated. Many also stated a need for the University to try to serve as a buffer for its own red tape regarding student offenders.

Agreement existed on a need for a support network, made up of University students, faculty, staff, offenders, and some justice system personnel, who ought to serve as an advisory board for problems or issues regarding student offenders. In particular, three persons interviewed suggested that this network should either be a part of a needed "office of offender affairs" or part of an office of "non-traditional student
affairs" which would exist within the division of student affairs. Some of those interviewed, especially student offenders, did not support an identifiable place or agency which would be labeled a place for offenders, but did support a policy that might identify contact people in a number of existing agencies, programs, and support services on campus. These contact people must be sensitive to the pre-adjudicated through the ex-offender, and women as well as men offenders.

Most persons interviewed agreed that policy needs to balance the responsibilities of the offender and the University. Doing everything for the offender is not helpful, but neither is doing nothing. Putting financial aid papers in someone's hand without some explanation of how they might be completed is not helpful. On the other hand, the University cannot serve everyone, nor should it become a rehabilitative welfare-based institution. The University's first responsibility is to identify students who can, in the opinions of those involved in admissions or counseling, experience reasonable success with available academic, personal, and career counseling.

Many of those interviewed agreed that the policy should not promote monitoring of a student offender's campus activities through an agency such as the University police. On the other hand, most interviewees agreed that student offenders should have an advocate of some sort with whom they are expected to consult informally on a regular basis.

Justice system personnel especially endorsed the idea that a policy must discourage "do-gooders," or involvement by persons inexperienced with offenders. Persons screening student offenders for admission or
serving on an advisory or support board must realize the difference between a student offender motivated for college and one simply motivated to be out of prison.

All agreed that the policy should be widely known and understood as to content and intent. Most also saw the need for commitment to the policy and its implications from top administrators in the University structure.

Officials within the justice system noted that the policy should create a framework out of which special relationships with county houses of corrections and pre-release centers can be encouraged. In addition, the policy should be a foundation for serious programmatic efforts. Because the state has statutes regarding qualification for release programs and educational programming, the policy should reflect state statute and perhaps even fill gaps in statutory provisions.

A range of opinions was presented regarding who should be responsible for establishing a policy for student offenders. Most of those interviewed agreed that it should be a collaborative effort involving administration, staff, and students, along with criminal justice system personnel such as correction officers, parole and probation officers, and student offenders. Several persons felt faculty with a particular interest in offenders should be included. A professor in legal studies or a psychology professor whose speciality is the psychology of crime may be more appropriate than a professor of fisheries biology. Regardless, University administrators and faculty interviewed agreed that faculty input into and acceptance of the policy is crucial.
Program directors, especially, noted that those ultimately responsible for implementing the policy should be involved in its formation. Ideally, such administrators should have a thorough understanding of current University policies and regulations, and have some understanding of the justice system, especially the functions of the courts and correctional facilities. Administrators, faculty, and staff should also be familiar with the current trends and style of the University. About one third of those interviewed specifically mentioned the Dean of Students office because of its function on campus as an advocate for students, and one which has a broad understanding of and involvement in administrative and student service programs. Also, about one third of those interviewed felt student affairs administrators should be primarily responsible for writing the policy. Most persons agreed that the Department of Public Safety should probably not be directly involved in drafting the policy, except perhaps where clarification on technical issues may be required.

Within the staff category several persons felt the University's Community Development Center, involved in a wide range of residence hall and off-campus student programming, ought to be involved in the drafting. Others felt that a financial aid officer and veteran's affairs staff member should be included, since most offenders will be seeking financial help. Beyond these suggestions regarding faculty, staff, and administration, some concern was raised that those drafting the policy be University personnel who plan to be at the University for several years.

Regular students and student offenders should also serve on the
drafting committee for this policy. Student offenders and program directors, especially, felt their representation was absolutely essential.

Some persons suggested individuals outside the groups named thus far as those who should draft the policy. Two persons suggested that someone from a national prison organization, or a national organization on the rights of offenders should be involved. Citizens involved with the University but in the community may also be included such as clergy, mental health persons or a representative citizen. Since the legislature was responsible for current statutes related to offenders, perhaps some persons in the legislature should have some degree of input. Prison education program directors from in and out of state were also suggested.

Several persons issued warnings regarding the selection of those drafting the policy. One such warning was that regardless of who drafts the policy, there should be some clear understanding of the unique roles of higher education and the justice system process. Also, one faculty member interviewed felt it would be detrimental to the policy if the committee includes persons who are opposed to having a policy. Rather, all those involved should at least agree that a policy is a useful and needed step in meeting the needs of the student offender population.

Summary

Movement towards "What would be better for student offenders" is tied to the willingness and ability of institutions of higher education
and the justice system to collaborate on policies and programs for student offenders. Some colleges and universities have attempted such collaboration. Under these arrangements student offenders, especially those incarcerated, have received the benefits of educational release programs including financial aid and academic and career counseling.

Notable efforts, such as Project Newgate, have attempted to serve offenders in comprehensive ways within prison, during study release periods, parole, and post-prison life. "Newgate" and other higher education offender program efforts have also brought together the services of the justice system, public services, and higher education in order to maximize the possibility of offender post-prison success.

Some trends within the justice system have increased the possibilities for positive movements regarding student offenders. Program directors and evaluators recognize that lack of recidivism is not necessarily the best indicator in judging program success. A look at justice system costs, including dollars spent on each offender from arrest through incarceration, versus higher education costs reveals that attempts to educate can be economically attractive.

Locally, persons within the University of Massachusetts community see the need for a codified policy on student offenders. Specifically, the policy must be based on a restatement of goals of the University as a land grant institution. Attention must be paid to administrative details that tie the needs of offenders, the justice system, and the University to policy elements designed to meet those needs.

Systems approaches that clarify the steps needed to facilitate change provide a helpful framework under which to develop a policy for
student offenders. With a systems approach in mind, input from all groups concerned with student offenders, and consideration of a variety of resources which might be utilized, can help bring about a comprehensive policy. Rather than continuing to promote efforts that work against student offenders, collaboration between the justice system and higher education can help this population cope with society in acceptable ways.
CHAPTER V

WHAT CAN WE DO TO MAKE THINGS BETTER?

Immediate Recommendations

A chain of change: the call to administrators. An examination of involvement with offenders reveals that intervention is complex, and that there are few institutional rewards for providing services. Yet, during the closing years of this century, institutions of higher education will find themselves in a kind of recycling process, in which much of their mission will be to pick up the pieces of the past, and continue reaching out to those potential students existing on the fringe of society. Institutions of higher education, in general, and specifically the University of Massachusetts, can be a link within a chain of change regarding the offender.

In order to be a link within this change process, the University of Massachusetts should develop a policy for student offenders. Essential to the policy is the assumption that an educational institution is the best agency to prepare individuals for productive careers. As such the University cannot exclude in policy or practice individuals who have been identified as offenders in the eyes of the law. A second basic assumption must be that the University has had limited involvement with offenders in the past but possesses the resources for more comprehensive involvement. Such a policy must encompass an understanding of offender's needs and institutional concerns. In addition, the
policy should reflect a broad understanding of proactive change mechanisms for offenders and steps that will enable changes to take place.

To arrive at a point where a policy can be developed, several steps are necessary. First, those involved in policy decision-making should understand what has been done regarding student offenders at the University and elsewhere. Within this context, specific attention should be paid to the past and current status of offenders as reflected in the University's relationship to justice system agencies. Outside of the University community, local county houses of corrections, probation and parole offices and county courts deserve this historical consideration. Within the University, selected student affairs administrators from the Admissions and Dean of Students Office, the Department of Public Safety and residential areas can make a valuable contribution to the offender's relationship with the University. The Office of Special Programs should also be included in an historical overview. Identification of successful policies and programs based at the University and at other colleges and universities of comparable size can add a broader perspective from which to develop a policy. This process may substantiate the assumption that there are some offenders who want a college education.

Of equal importance to the establishment of an historical context on the treatment of student offenders is the solicitation of policy input from four groups--student offenders, justice system personnel, student affairs administrators, and faculty. The policy needs to be based on an understanding of the unique functions of both the criminal
justice system and the University of Massachusetts as an institution of higher education. Without substantial input from persons affiliated with these two systems the possibility of a successful policy is diminished.

Although all four groups previously mentioned need to provide input to the policy, student affairs administrators, as probable policy implementers, have an expanded role. Since the literature overwhelmingly supports many offenders' need for student affairs services such as counseling and financial aid, a policy may be tied directly to providing these services. In addition, as the providers of services, student affairs personnel should be especially sensitive to the unique needs of offenders. This sensitivity can better ensure the ease of student affairs individuals in working with offenders, and an offender's ease when interacting with student affairs staff.

Essential within the policy is a closer look at the University's land grant mission. As an institution approaching the 1980's the University cannot avoid a wider role of human development and service to the community. A report completed by the "Commission on Missions and Goals of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst" describes part of the land grant mission as a response to the needs of people of the state and the region. Service to the public goes beyond the agricultural and mechanical concentrations originally envisioned.¹ This response

¹Public Service Through Academic Excellence--A Report of the Commission on Missions and Goals of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, by Sarah Lawall, Chairperson (University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Ma., 1975), p. 2.
deserves careful examination to specifically ensure that the University continues as a resource to diverse people, and does not retrench into educational elitism. Of necessity when interpreting this land grant mission must be a clear sense that the institution is not just for those who have escaped difficulty with the law. Any review of mission and goals must imply that the University can accommodate specific populations such as minorities, the handicapped, or ex-offenders.

A policy should develop out of a framework which considers the major factors that can lead to a successful policy. A higher education professor outlined five criteria necessary for any policy in education.

First, it should state its purpose, and illustrate its educational purpose. Regarding student offenders, the policy purpose must be tied to University mission and goals especially as those goals relate to reaching fringe populations who have had limited opportunity to acquire educational services. The educational purpose minimally should show that offenders can obtain a meaningful education at the University through traditional and non-traditional academic offerings.

Second, the policy should offer direction and guidance, yet be flexible in its application. As an example reference to admission or readmission avenues for the student facing criminal court action, on probation, parole, incarcerated, or an ex-offender are appropriate and necessary, but should reflect an understanding of each student offender as an individual.

Third, it should be readily carried out by staff without continued revisions. Too often policies are enacted without foresight to implementation of administrative problem areas. The policy is then sent
back to a study committee or shelved until time permits further review. Persons developing a policy for student offenders must carefully think through the content and logistics of the policy so that staff know what is required and understand how to comply.

Fourth, it should have as its purpose improvement on the goals of the University. Because the policy's target group is student offenders, the University can begin to genuinely see itself as accommodating a population that has only received limited attention in the past. Such an endeavor encompasses a part of the outreach aspect of the land grant mission.

Fifth, it should be developed from suggestions solicited from those for whom it is designed to serve. In an effort to consider the administrative needs and concerns of the University and the justice system in policy development, it is possible to circumvent key input from student offenders. Suggestions must be solicited from all major categories of student offenders, including the pre-adjudicated through the post-incarcerated.  

Due to the nature of the population, the policy must in some ways be written tougher than it actually is meant to be in an effort to close as many loopholes as possible. Because of administrative concerns of the University and the justice system, it may be necessary to outline in great detail such things as the process of delivering a student

---

2 These five major points were paraphrased from Charles W. Stokes, "Human Aspects of Social Systems--Social and Technical" (State University of New York at New Paltz, 1975), p. 40.
offender to the University for educational release, including transportation times, pick-up and drop-off points, persons the offender must immediately check in with upon arriving on campus and so forth. In this instance policy drafters may be more concerned that educational release students arrive at the University on time and proceed to class than any administrator's specific need to check his/her watch to see if the offender's transportation arrives exactly on time.

On the other hand, "trouble shooting" potential problem areas merits attention. Careful thought and policy writing are needed to address the risks in having convicted offenders on campus. Such issues as the clarification of the University's responsibility in providing a "safe" environment for the campus community and what kind of precautions and actions the University would take if an offender on a release program committed a crime need to be specifically addressed.

Some basic questions deserve attention prior to the writing of the policy. The following list represents a few of those questions which should be considered:

1. What kind of educational services are best for what people, and in what degree?
2. What can the University offer offenders?
3. Is it reasonable for the University to supply the items mentioned in question number one?
4. Is the University in any danger when supplying these needs?
5. What segments of the prison population can the University best serve?
6. Should we make available to offenders services similar to those
offered to minority students?

7. Are there special efforts that need to be developed in order to reach women offenders?

8. Within a context of fixed or diminishing resources what is both needed and possible in order to do the best job with offenders?

The issue of fixed resources remains at the heart of every question of change, specifically as it relates to the University. Too often special programs compete with each other for limited funds. Rather than linking special programs to integral academic or support programs, they prosper or fail based on their ability to gather resources. The policy that is possible from the framework suggested in following sections of this chapter can result either from a reallocation of resources or through what one educator calls a "barter economy." That is "What do you have that I need?" and "What do I have that you need?"³

Policy needs of student offenders. In order to be useful to student offenders, the policy must be clear enough so that this population knows what is in the policy and how best to utilize it. Both academic and social expectations of (student) offenders need to be addressed, so that the student knows what to expect of the University, and the University knows what to expect of the offender. Essential to their understanding of the policy is a tone that indicates the University wants to do what it can to promote an offender's degree completion.

Of importance also is an offender's assumption that policy implementation is based on sound working relationships between University administrators and justice system personnel.

Within a policy context are several basic factors related to the needs of offenders. The policy must respond to various categories of student offenders ranging from the male or female pre-adjudicated student offender facing on- or off-campus assault charges, through the incarcerated or ex-offender student reentering society after years of imprisonment. Desirable in the policy is the recognition that within categories of offenders there exist individual differences. For instance, although both incarcerated, a person convicted of armed robbery last week may be quite different from the person who has been in prison under the same charge for several years. Also related to the recognition of individual differences should be an understanding that of all categories of offenders, those incarcerated probably have the least to say about their educational desires under the present correctional system structures. Perhaps most important is the policy's promotion of guidelines that are not so rigid that they lose all possibility of interpretation or flexibility to meet individual needs.

Admission criteria deserve careful attention by policymakers. Policymakers should explore and decide upon a variety of acceptable admissions avenues. Traditional freshman and transfer admissions standards should only be one admission option. Recommendation letters from justice system and University staff, autobiographical sketches, the G.E.D., interviews, personal goal statements, and other non-traditional criteria might be packaged in ways to supplement traditional admissions
guidelines. In addition, the policy must clearly delineate what, if any, part of an offender's criminal record is relevant to admission or readmission. If such information is desirable the policy should present clear reasoning behind the need for such information, and specific assurances as to how that information may be used during a student's tenure at the University. Also related to admissions should be a recognition within the policy that there will be student offenders whom the University is not equipped to serve. This should include offenders with profound emotional or psychological problems, or those needing a high level of supervision while on campus.

Admissions decisions should be a result of collaborative efforts in which at least an admissions officer, faculty member, and justice system person have significant input. Desirable also is a student offender's participation on the admissions committee.

The policy should support the idea that, to the degree to which it is possible, student offenders will be treated as all other students. However, certain kinds of support are necessary to ensure the success of some student offenders. Without going into extensive programmatic concerns, the policy should identify a contact person or office to coordinate efforts regarding the affairs of student offenders. In addition, help should be available within specific services such as financial aid, veteran's affairs, and academic, personal, and career counseling that can be specifically tapped by student offenders. This is especially important in relation to financial aid since some financial aid not available to incarcerated offenders may be available to those on parole. Since the policy should remove obstacles for offenders
rather than create them, it is important also to realize that support through work/study and scholarships (as opposed to loans) is more likely to keep an offender in school. This group of persons within specific programs, along with program directors and interested faculty, could become a support network for student offenders within the policy.

The policy needs to recognize the special position from which some student offenders operate, especially those incarcerated on release programs. These students have fairly detailed schedules and access to only certain hours on campus which may interfere with the ability to do everything him/herself. The contact person may use this network to help cut through red tape and move paper work along. Also, due to the restricted position from which some offenders operate, a high priority within the policy should be the availability of part-time student status with availability of the support services cited above.

The role of the Department of Public Safety regarding student offenders also deserves clarification. Although the Department operates as a police force, policy should address additional roles or responsibilities public safety may pursue because of the nature of this particular student population.

Essential to the policy are mechanisms that encourage equal treatment of students accused of on-or off-campus crimes by campus administrators. Under the policy, academic standing or notoriety should not influence student status decisions. Policy issues should address the rights of students, kinds of support available, and who the student or student's parents should contact with questions. Parallel to these immediate concerns of pre-adjudicated offenders must be policy exploration
regarding any intervention by the University at the trial level. This becomes particularly relevant if a campus administrator's input can influence the correctional facility placement of a convicted student. Placement at a facility where educational release to the University is possible may enhance the desires of the student, the University, and the justice system.

A statement of support in the policy for, and an exploration of avenues to permanently fund, such efforts as Project Reentry as a support organization for offenders should be included. The policy should also encourage possibilities for increased interaction with state prisons, pre-trial diversion programs, and pre-release centers.

Prior to implementation of the policy should be efforts to receive wide recognition and approval of the draft by members of various constituencies. Some effort should be made to inform key persons within the community, such as town officials and the Chief of Police that such a policy will be in effect. An opportunity should be provided for these people to have their concerns addressed. Also, justice system agencies located in various parts of Massachusetts should receive notification about the policy. Since such a policy would need approval by the Board of Trustees, time should also be given for their review, comment, and questions.

Although the points mentioned above touch on a variety of issues concerning all student offenders, the University may want to initially address only a particular student offender population. Such a policy might indicate the beginning of a modest but manageable effort regarding student offenders. Regardless, efforts can be made to establish
a policy which includes a wide range of involvement, yet does not present overwhelming problems to the University.

**Future Thrusts**

There is no simple method of creating changes in University structure which will enhance the kind of collaboration necessary for policy development on behalf of student offenders. Some immediate steps have been suggested within the context of a policy framework. The initial policy may need to remain in operation for at least five years in order for University administrators to gain experience with the policy, and to achieve attitudinal changes which can facilitate serving offenders as a normal part of University life.

Key decision-makers at a large institution like the University of Massachusetts have difficulty envisioning the way in which it can be a force for change in the community and the society. A university, however, can provide a setting in which the members of the community feel a sense of hope in their own futures. For the student, this can be the result of experiencing the right professors, right courses, right extracurricular activities, or the right friends. It can, however, be something far less tangible. The University can trigger or reinforce a sense within the self that "I can make it in the world." That person knows that he/she will be able to succeed professionally and, perhaps more importantly, as a human being. Faculty, staff, administrators, and students of post-secondary institutions ought to realize both elements: the ability of the institution to have impact in profound and positive ways on society; and have impact on the lives of individuals.
Goals suggested for the University, student offenders, and local justice agencies in the initial policy ought to be expanded to include goals for both the University community and community beyond the University. In the long run the impact of the University's thrusts directed towards offenders should include general goals (like a safer community and a more efficiently functioning court system) which will be a result not only of the interface of the University and justice system, but also a recognition that what the University does can impact on the broader society.

The possibilities of future long-range improvements and expansion of policies and programs are great. Specific attention to administrative detail, moving forward with deliberate but not excessive speed, and adoption of the goal of offering the best kind of service through a policy are crucial. Much of what is possible must be based on deliberate efforts to influence the kind of student the University attracts, and establishing whether or not the services offered will be supportive of diverse populations, including both traditional and an increasing proportion of non-traditional students.

Further exploration is needed into ways in which the University handles student offenders. Creation of an "office for non-traditional student affairs" is an important step which might gather the scattered support persons and services most directly accountable to the student over the age of twenty-five, the individual exploring other career options, the person attempting to break out of a cycle of welfare, the student offender, and other special student populations. Identifying faculty and staff to affiliate with this office should be based on
increased efforts to educate the campus regarding the needs of non-traditional students, including student offenders. The office could provide a number of diverse services including classes in reading and writing skills, and workshops on financial management. The office might also offer a colloquium on "community adjustment," aimed specifically at offenders.

Additionally, ways of handling University students at the pre-trial level deserve attention. The establishment of a connection between campus disciplinary hearing results which might insist a person be suspended from living on campus, and desire on the part of the justice system to keep a student in school, is desirable. University administrators and justice system persons, such as the sentencing judge and probation officer, may collaborate on the stipulations of further school attendance.

Parallel to this, a relatively easy future program might involve developing a letter to be sent to education and human services coordinators working with offenders and ex-offenders within outreach, correctional, probation, and parole programs, informing them of what the University can do for the offender population. This letter could suggest ways in which a student offender might straighten out past academic records, complete courses that were terminated, and re-affiliate with the University.

Another priority must be the creation of mechanisms for smoother transition of the incarcerated offender to on- or off-campus living prior to parole or release. Although the student offender should pursue regular channels in dormitory selection or seeking off-campus
housing, perhaps during that time a more thorough orientation regarding the advantages of specific living areas might be offered.

To expand or create new programs means finding new resources. Grants from federal and state government or private foundations may be needed; however, there are other ways to, in a sense, create resources. The justice system and the University each have resources useful to the other. Perhaps an exchange could be arranged, in which University students studying legal services, or involved in courses on criminology, could serve as interns in probation or parole offices while student offenders from those agencies attend the University. Corrections officers might attend University classes with incarcerated offenders at reduced tuition, providing built-in supervision of student offenders at the same time.

At some point the University may need to enhance its relationship with correctional institutions by providing some services within those institutions to support existing pre-college programs. Most correctional facilities offer the General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.). Perhaps student teachers in a variety of secondary teaching disciplines could fulfill their internships by acting as aids to G.E.D. teachers within correctional facilities. Also, since there is a need for one-to-one tutoring of inmates, especially those who lack adequate reading and math skills, both secondary and elementary school level trained teaching interns could provide the needed tutoring. Student offenders and correctional officers could offer guest teaching services on campus by becoming part of the training component for student teachers. Students in political science or other disciplines might undertake problem-solving,
involving offenders not only on campus but in their adjustment to community life. Student offenders themselves might be involved in such classes.

As the policy strengthens and the programs expand, levels of trust and collaboration between the University and justice system agencies should improve. On a public relations level the University may want to put together a "road show," or mini-orientation, about the University that can be taken to justice system agencies, and be presented to administration, support personnel, and student offenders. The orientation would concentrate on academic programs and support services, especially services such as financial aid and academic and career counseling. More day-to-day contact between the justice system and the University should take place. Persons from the justice system, like staff people in the district attorney's office, should speak in classes on criminal justice, court reform or public policy. Also, perhaps the student newspaper should reinstate a practice of the past in which student-related cases in district court were featured in order to help students see directly what happens in court. Desirable also is an increase in non-adversary contact between justice system agencies and students, specifically student government.

The University might assume a role as the focal point of offender programs in Western Massachusetts by offering a kind of Upward Bound summer experience for student offenders. This may be tied to successful completion of other kinds of educational programs while on probation or parole. One future concept which deserves serious consideration is the formation of a college consortium to serve student offenders. This
consortium could involve the Five Colleges (the University of Massachusetts, Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Hampshire College, and Smith College) and the community colleges of Greenfield and Holyoke. Some combination of two-year and four-year colleges providing educational services to student offenders could provide both the two-year vocationally-oriented degree justice system people desire for their clients, and also the four-year degree desired by some student offenders.

As in the "Five College" programs currently offered, in which students of one institution can take courses at the others in the consortium, perhaps student offenders on release programs could be offered the same kind of opportunity to take courses at various institutions. One asset for the participating institutions, beyond the mix of student offenders with regular students at the various campuses, might be the possibility of having those offenders teach courses on the prison experience, or work with particular professors involved with issues related to human services and correctional systems. Another approach might be to require that such students, within their senior year, offer relevant colloquia on offender issues or serve as peer advisors to other offenders.

Publicity for these efforts should be an integral part of policy and programmatic efforts. The college communities and constituencies throughout Massachusetts ought to be informed through the media, town meetings, and meetings of public service groups about efforts to work with the justice system. In this way key persons are aware of these efforts, and criticism can be met before it gets out of hand.

Regardless of future policy or programmatic thrusts, once in effect
the policy and resulting programs ought to be evaluated through student surveys in order to determine both the number of students served and the areas in which policies and programs ought to be altered or expanded. The survey could be conducted through an "office for non-traditional student affairs," or by the regular channels of student affairs research and evaluation.

Institutions of higher education, and especially the University of Massachusetts, can be a link within a chain of change regarding those who have perhaps had the least opportunity in American society, the offenders. Within this context the University is not called to provide all things to all offenders, but rather to take a serious stand regarding service to offenders who can most benefit from the educational resources of the University. These services can be provided in new ways that can potentially benefit more students than just student offenders. The positive impact of education on offenders can, in the long run, affect a better quality of life for all individuals in society.

Summary

Within the context of change, persons involved in higher education are in some ways clearly able to see how the institution can impact on society through the generation of research and the preservation of knowledge. Both knowledge and research can point towards the need for change, yet achieving it can be difficult. The University trains practitioners—students, faculty, and staff—and should engage in educational activities promoting an interface between theory and practice. In confronting societal concerns, including those related
to offenders, this interface receives added importance. Through courses and internships faculty and students can build on the theory and reality behind the justice system. Through policy and programs, administration and staff can increase educational opportunities for offenders.

Beyond the simplicity of this idea are several underlying issues. Society lacks a common framework of justice. Although larceny is condemned, taking office stationery is treated differently from car theft. "Padding" a travel account is viewed as more acceptable than embezzlement by individuals and the justice system. Parallel to this concern is the varied treatment students receive at colleges and universities for on-campus versus off-campus crimes. A prank by an on-campus fraternity might be treated as a criminal offense in the community. In these and other examples guilt or innocence is determined as much by whether or not individuals are arrested as any conviction in a court of law.

Within this apparent paradox of justice are issues of race and sex. As noted earlier, blacks and men are arrested, convicted, and incarcerated more often than whites or women. Also, more poor people are incarcerated than middle or upper class individuals.

Many such practices will continue unless various legal and human services institutions come together under a common commitment to useful change and equitable justice. These collaborations must promote less delineation between systems of justice, human service systems, and education in order to improve the life conditions for all individuals, including offenders. Under a collaborative framework, reducing crime would not only include a call for better police protection, but also
the creation of more jobs, better housing, and increased educational access. With the knowledge that all people have the potential and the opportunity to be educated and find employment that is economically and personally fulfilling, crime becomes less justified than under the present marginal circumstances in which many Americans live.

The University needs to change social policy to help people live better. The creation of a policy for student offenders can encourage the goal of helping this population. Policy commitments must lead to programmatic thrusts which involve both on- and off-campus human and judicial resources. Under this commitment may be the creation of special services or programs that are awkward for the campus, but essential to the thrust of social change. The University of Massachusetts and an increasing number of higher education institutions must promote inclusion of offenders in society's mainstream. This inclusion must be viewed as a factor positively related to the goal of a better quality of life for all citizens.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW

GROUP "A"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW

FOR

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS AND PUBLIC SAFETY
INTERVIEW

GROUP "A"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW FOR UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS AND PUBLIC SAFETY

Note: Ask those taking this interview to act as if they were the most knowledgeable about the subject at the University. Avoid referrals.

1. Name__________________________Title__________________________

2. Briefly describe what some of the interactions or functions have been between your office and student offenders from 1971 to the present.

3. When did you first become aware of the University's involvement with student offenders?

4. What programs do you know of for student offenders either at the University or at other colleges or universities?

5. What offender population has the University been involved with? e.g. students facing criminal court action, incarcerated students

6. To your knowledge approximately how many student offenders has the University been involved with?

   Since 1971 - How many men (women)?
   In 1976 - How many men (women)?
6. If the person answering the questions does not know, ask if they have any suggestions as to how to find out.

7. Since 1971 would you describe the University as encouraging, discouraging, or having a neutral position on the admission of student offenders? (select one of the three underlined)

   Explain

8. How do student offenders become eligible for admission or re-admission to the University? e.g. special application, recommendation from a court officer, or agency

9. Do you know of any one who was denied admission to the University because he/she was an offender? If yes, what were the circumstances.

10. Do you have a specific role in the admission of student offenders?

    Explain

11. Since 1971, would you describe the University as encouraging, discouraging, or having a neutral position on the continued enrollment of student facing criminal court action? (select one of the three underlined)

    Explain
12. What role do you play in the continued enrollment of students facing criminal court action by the justice system?

13. How long have the present administrative practices towards student offenders been in operation?

14. Which of the following areas of administrative support from the University are readily available to student offenders?

- Financial Aid
- Personal Counseling
- Academic Counseling
- Individualized Programs
- Special Admissions
- Tutorials
- The same administrative support other students receive
- Other

15. Are student offenders monitored in any way while they are students? Explain.

Who monitors them?
In what ways are they monitored?

16. What people in the justice system have served as primary liaisons between their justice system agency and the University? e.g. parole officer, judge
17. Besides working out programs for student offenders, do you or does your office have any kind of ongoing communication with particular justice system agencies or personnel? If yes, which agencies or personnel?

18. Have the administrative practices toward student offenders been evaluated between 1971 and the present?
If yes, --- in the most recent evaluation are there things relevant to establishing a policy?

19. Do you see strengths (weaknesses) in the current administrative practices toward student offenders? Explain.

20. What advantages (disadvantages) do you see for the University in having a policy on student offenders?

21. If you were to draft parts of the University's policy towards the admission and continued enrollment of student offenders, what one or two things would you include? e.g. types of crimes a student could have committed, areas of University administrative support

22. Who ought to be responsible for establishing a policy for student offenders? e.g. University administrators, team of student administrators, justice system personnel.
23. Given this topic of student offenders, is there any one else I ought to talk to, or do you have any further questions or concerns?
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW

GROUP "B"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW

FOR

PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND JUSTICE SYSTEM PERSONNEL
INTERVIEW

GROUP "B"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW FOR PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND JUSTICE SYSTEM PERSONNEL

1. Name ______________________________ Title ______________________________
   Institution, Agency, or Program ______________________________
   City ______________________________

2. Briefly describe what the interaction has been between your institution, agency, or program and the University between 1971 and the present concerning student offenders.

3. To your knowledge how did this University first get involved with student offenders?

4. What programs do you know of for student offenders either at the University or at other colleges or universities?

5. What population does your institution, agency, or program attempt to serve? e.g. students facing criminal court action, incarcerated students.

6. Approximately how many student offenders does your institution, agency, or program serve?
   Since 1971 - How many men (women)?
   During 1976 - How many men (women)?
7. How do student offenders become eligible for this program with the University? e.g. special application, recommendation from your institution, agency, or program, desire to do college work.

8. Do you know of any one who was denied admission to the University because he/she was an offender? If yes, what were the circumstances?

9. How long has the program been in operation?

10. Which of the following areas of University administrative support apply to student offenders in your program?

- Financial Aid
- Personal Counseling
- Academic Counseling
- Individualized Programs
- Special Admissions
- Tutorials
- The same administrative support other students receive
- Other

Or Explain:

11. Who is most responsible for the administration of the program? e.g. program director, member of the University administration.
12. Who in the justice system serves as primary liaison between your institution, agency, or program, and the University? e.g. parole officer, program director.

13. Has your program been evaluated between 1971 and the present?
   If yes ---- in the most recent evaluation are there things pertaining to your program's relationship to the University that are relevant here?

   What are these points?

   (Request a copy of the latest evaluation)

14. How do you perceive the current University administrative practices toward student offenders?

   Is it working (not working)?

   Do you see any strengths (weaknesses)?

15. Do you think student offenders should be served on a college campus?

   Why or why not?

   If yes, cite one or two ways they should be served.
16. What advantages, (disadvantages) do you see for the University in having a policy on student offenders?

17. If you were to draft parts of the University's policy towards the admission and continued enrollment of student offenders, what one or two things would you include? e.g. types of crimes students commit, areas of University administrative support

18. Who ought to be responsible for establishing a policy for student offenders? e.g. University administrators, team of students, administrators and justice system personnel

19. Given this topic of student offenders, is there any one else I ought to talk to, or do you have any further questions or concerns?
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW

GROUP "C"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW

FOR

STUDENTS WHO ARE OFFENDERS OR EX-OFFENDERS
INTERVIEW

GROUP "C"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW FOR STUDENTS WHO ARE OFFENDERS OR EX-OFFENDERS

1. Name ___________________________ Major ___________________________
   Class Year __________ Present Status with the Justice System __________
   (e.g. paroled, incarcerated)

2. Were you on probation, parole, incarcerated, or facing criminal court action when
   you sought admission, readmission, or continued enrollment at the University?
   (Select one from each underlined group)

3. What were the circumstances surrounding your case?

4. What legal charge was brought against you?

5. At any time did your academic performance at the University influence your
   treatment by the justice system?

6. While you were communicating with the University regarding your student status,
   what kind of information did the University provide?
7. Besides information, what actions did the University take regarding your student status?

8. Who at the University was involved in determining your status as a student?

9. Could the University have been more helpful?

10. Who in the justice system serves (served) as primary liaison between you and the University? e.g. parole officer, corrections officer

11. Who in the justice system was involved in determining your status as a student?

12. What programs do you know of for student offenders either at the University or at other colleges or Universities? Were you involved in any of these?

13. As an offender or ex-offender at the University were your activities monitored? If so by whom?
14. Which of the following areas of administrative support should apply to student offenders?

- Financial Aid
- Personal Counseling
- Academic Counseling
- Individualized Programs
- Special Admissions
- Tutorials
- The same administrative support other students receive
- Other

Which did you find readily available?

15. Do you know any student offenders or ex-offenders that are current University students? How many?

16. Do you know or other offenders or ex-offenders that are seeking admission to the University?

How many?

17. Do you know of any one who was denied admission to the University because he/she was an offender? What were the circumstances?

18. In your opinion do you think being a college student influences court decisions in favor of students?

19. How do you perceive the current University administrative practices towards student offenders?
19. Do you see strengths (weaknesses)?

Is it working (not working)?

20. Do you think student offenders should be served on a college campus?

Why or why not?

If yes, cite one or two ways they should be served.

21. What advantages (disadvantages) do you see for the University in having a policy on student offenders?

22. If you were to draft parts of the University's policy towards the admission and continued enrollment of student offenders, what one or two things would you include? e.g. types of crime a student could have committed, areas of University administrative support.

23. Who ought to be responsible for establishing a policy for student offenders? e.g. University administrators, or (team of students, administrators, and justice system personnel)
Given this topic of student offenders, is there any one else I ought to talk to, or do you have any further questions or concerns?
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW

GROUP "D"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW FOR OTHERS
GROUP "0"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW FOR OTHERS

1. Name __________________________ Title __________________________
   Institution, Agency, or Program __________________________
   City __________________________

2. Briefly describe what the interaction has been between your institution, agency, or program and the University between 1971 and the present.

3. To your knowledge how did this University first get involved with student offenders?

4. What offender population does your institution, agency, or program attempt to serve? e.g. students facing criminal court action, incarcerated students.

5. Approximately how many student offenders has your institution, agency, or program served?
   Since 1971 -- How many men (women)?
   In 1976 -- How many men (women)?

   In what ways -

   Cite one or two cases.
6. Have you defended U. Mass student offenders?
   How many since 1971?
   In 1976?

7. What kind of offenses had the students committed?

8. What programs do you know of for student offenders either at the University or at other colleges and Universities?

9. Have you tried to get student offenders into the University?
   If so, what was the process?
   What were the results?

10. How do you perceive the present administrative practices toward student offenders?
    Its strengths, (weaknesses)?
11. In your opinion do you think being a college student influences court decisions in favor of students?

12. Do you think offenders should be served on a college campus?
   Why or why not?
   If yes, cite one or two ways they should be served.

13. Which of the following areas of University administrative support should apply to student offenders?
   - Financial Aid
   - Personal Counseling
   - Academic Counseling
   - Individualized Programs
   - Special Admissions
   - Tutorials
   - The same administrative support other students receive
   - Other

14. What advantages (disadvantages) do you see for the University in having a policy on student offenders?

15. If you were to draft parts of the University's policy towards the admission and continued enrollment of student offenders, what one or two things would you include? e.g. types of crimes a student could have committed, areas of University administrative support.
16. Who ought to be responsible for establishing a policy for student offenders? e.g. University administrators, or a team of students, administrators, and justice system personnel.

17. Do you think the legislature may act more favorably in budgeting University monies if they could see strong collaborations in human services such as between the University and the county jails? Explain.

18. Given this topic of student offenders is there any one else I ought to talk to, or do you have further questions or concerns?
APPENDIX E

ONE INTERVIEW
INTERVIEW

GROUP "B"

STUDENT OFFENDERS INTERVIEW FOR PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND JUSTICE SYSTEM PERSONNEL

1. Name ____________________________________________ Title ____________________________________________

Institution, Agency, or Program ___________________________ Justice system agency ____________________________

CITY ____________________________________________

2. Briefly describe what the interaction has been between your institution, agency, or program and the University between 1971 and the present concerning student offenders.

We have tried to expedite matters through the University "red tape" for student offenders on probation or just released from a correctional facility. Specifically we have worked with the Dean of Students office and the Financial Aid office on late admissions like in August for September.

3. To your knowledge how did this University first get involved with student offenders?

I'm not really sure.

4. What programs do you know of for student offenders either at the University or at other colleges or universities?

Project Reentry.

5. What population does your institution, agency, or program attempt to serve? e.g. students facing criminal court action, incarcerated students.

Probationers,
Federal and military parolees.

6. Approximately how many student offenders does your institution, agency, or program serve?

Since 1971 - How many men (women)?
During 1976 - How many men (women)?

Between 1974 and the present, we have provided services to between 140 and 160 clients, 20 of those were either part-time or full-time college students, and 1/3 of these go to the University.
7. How do student offenders become eligible for this program with the University? e.g. special application, recommendation from your institution, agency, or program, desire to do college work.

First of all we would help anyone in the community with this whether or not they had been involved with the courts, on probation, or parole.

Those specifically that have been convicted of a crime or that are on parole, we review their pre-sentence report and determine if the rehabilitation program should be oriented toward work opportunities or further education.

If a person has a particularly poor academic record, we ask them to go to a community college first to see how they do, then we'll help them into a four-year college program.

8. Do you know of any one who was denied admission to the University because he/she was an offender? If yes, what were the circumstances?

No. Anyone I know of was denied because of a poor academic record, not because he/she was an offender.

9. How long has the program been in operation?

We have definitely been operating since 1974, but probably before that time as well.¹

10. Which of the following areas of University administrative support apply to student offenders in your program?

- _____ Financial Aid
- _____ Personal Counseling
- _____ Academic Counseling
- _____ Individualized Programs
- _____ Special Admissions
- _____ Tutorials
- _____ The same administrative support other students receive
- _____ Other

Or Explain:

I believe all areas of administrative support apply, although some ex-offenders may need more help in one area than another.

Individualized programs are especially important for those who cannot cut the regular school routine.

Special admissions are also important. An offender must meet

¹ He was unsure because he had been on the staff less than three years.
the necessary criteria for admissions though, and should not be given a special admission slot just because he/she is an offender.

11. Who is most responsible for the administration of the program? e.g. program director, member of the University administration.

Our office is more individualized than a University that must deal with 25,000 students.

I see parolees and probationers once a month, and if they are in school, probably more. A guy (gal) cannot drop a course much less drop out of school without speaking with us. We keep fairly tight administrative control. If a student is only making C's and D's in classes, I question him about that and try to make it clear that it may be difficult for me to go for financial aid from the University for him if he does not pull up his marks.

12. Who in the justice system serves as primary liaison between your institution, agency, or program, and the University? e.g. parole officer, program director.

I do for my clients.

13. Has your program been evaluated between 1971 and the present?

No, our office has not been evaluated separately, and there has been no mention of any university or college program.

If yes ---- In the most recent evaluation are there things pertaining to your program's relationship to the University that are relevant here?

What are these points?

(Request a copy of the latest evaluation)

14. How do you perceive the current University administrative practices toward student offenders?

Is it working (not working)?

Do you see any strengths (weaknesses)?

I have had no problem in getting any of my clients into the University. The University is a real asset. Student offenders I know of who have gotten themselves into the University have had no admission problems either, and consider the services good. The major weakness is that the University does not make
an effort to help with part-time employment most offenders need. Maybe administrators need to consider having specific work/study slots for offenders.

I am also concerned because two of my clients have complained because they have been in some ways stigmatized as offenders at the University.

15. Do you think student offenders should be served on a college campus?

Why or why not?

If yes, cite one or two ways they should be served.

Yes, as long as the student offender is abiding by the rules of the college or University and is not engaging in any criminal activity.

They should not be given any preferential treatment in grades and so forth.

16. What advantages (disadvantages) do you see for the University in having a policy on student offenders?

Advantages:

1. An offender can say they were in college for 2½ years or more, which is the average amount of time it seems to take to get through following time at a two year school.

2. The University might be able to help document that educating offenders does help with a positive change in the individual.

There are no disadvantages as far as I can see. It seems to me that it is the role of the University to serve everyone, offenders and non-offenders.

17. If you were to draft parts of the University's policy towards the admission and continued enrollment of student offenders, what one or two things would you include? e.g. types of crimes students commit, areas of University administrative support.

There needs to be a section on the need to assist with financial aid, part-time work, work study, and summer employment.

It should address the need for expediting admissions and financial aid.

The policy needs to facilitate cutting through University "red tape." As an example, some of my clients have gotten funds through the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission but they at times do not pay tuition bills on time. I suggest that a
letter of some sort become acceptable as a promise of payment.

The policy needs to suggest an official liaison between an offenders office and the University at large.

18. Who ought to be responsible for establishing a policy for student offenders? e.g. University administrators, team of students, administrators and justice system personnel.

An administrator from the University in conjunction with a committee of ex-offenders, student ex-offenders, and someone from the criminal justice system should draft the policy.

19. Given this topic of student offenders, is there any one else I ought to talk to, or do you have any further questions or concerns?

I have nothing else to add.
APENDIX F

SCHOOLS RESPONDING TO STUDENT OFFENDERS QUESTIONNAIRE:¹

¹The colleges listed were obtained from College Division of Barons Educational Series, eds., Baron Profiles of American Colleges, vol. 1, (Woodbury, New York: Barons Educational Series, Inc., 1976).
(1) FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A Schools</th>
<th>Group B Schools</th>
<th>Group C Schools</th>
<th>Group D Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston State College Massachusetts</td>
<td>Fort Valley State College Georgia</td>
<td>California State University at Los Angeles California</td>
<td>City University of New York John Jay College of Criminal Justice New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Washington State College Washington</td>
<td>Massachusetts Maritime Academy Massachusetts</td>
<td>San Francisco State University California</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts at Boston Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framingham State College Massachusetts</td>
<td>University of Illinois Chicago Circle Illinois</td>
<td>Southern Illinois at Carbondale Illinois</td>
<td>University of Washington Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts College of Art Massachusetts</td>
<td>University of Oregon Oregon</td>
<td>University of California at Davis California</td>
<td>State University of New York at New Paltz New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...Continued on the next page....
(1) FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC SCHOOLS--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A Schools</th>
<th>Group B Schools</th>
<th>Group C Schools</th>
<th>Group D Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York at Utica, New York</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>(None)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton State College, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield State College, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester State College, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A Schools</td>
<td>Group B Schools</td>
<td>Group C Schools</td>
<td>Group D Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Drew University</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>(None)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A Schools</td>
<td>Group B Schools</td>
<td>Group C Schools</td>
<td>Group D Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire Community College</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>Middlesex Community College</td>
<td>Hagerstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quinsigamond Community College</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Ulster County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College of Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College of Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa-Walton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) TWO-YEAR PRIVATE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A Schools</th>
<th>Group B Schools</th>
<th>Group C Schools</th>
<th>Group D Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson and</td>
<td>Dean Junior College</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>(None)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales College</td>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

STUDENT OFFENDERS QUESTIONNAIRE
Please answer all questions based on your undergraduate population.

Name_________________________________________ Title_________________________________________

Name of Institution________________________________________

City________________________________________ State________________________________________

1. What population does your institution attempt to serve?
   e.g. full time in-state residential students, part time commuter

2. What approximate percentage of your current full time undergraduate enrollment represents racial minority students?
   __________ %

3. Indicate the approximate percentage of students on your campus receiving financial aid?
   __________ %

4. Does your institution encourage or discourage the admission of student offenders? (circle one of the underlined)
   If appropriate explain.

5. Does your institution encourage or discourage the continued enrollment of students facing action by the justice system? (circle one of the underlined)
   If appropriate explain.
PLEASE NOTE: *Policy* refers to either a written document or a set of administrative actions.

6. Describe your institution's policy towards student offenders. (Circle more than one if appropriate).
   
   A. Encourage the retention of student offenders
   B. Encourage student offenders to withdraw from school
   C. Student offenders are suspended
   D. Justice system primarily responsible for student offenders
   E. Ad hoc policy based on individual cases
   F. Other, specify ____________________________

   If appropriate explain.

7. What group(s) of students does your policy address? (Circle more than one if appropriate).
   
   A. Students facing criminal court action
   B. Incarcerated students
   C. Students on probation
   D. Paroled students
   E. Students found guilty of an offense, but not incarcerated
   F. Other, specify ____________________________

8. Do you have a written policy responding to any of the groups circled in question '7'?
   
   A. Yes
   B. No
9. Have you included a copy of that policy with this questionnaire?
   A. Yes
   B. No
   C. Does not apply

10. What primarily motivated the development of your policy?
    A. Institutional need
    B. Concern of the justice system
    C. Concern of students
    D. Concern of another group, specify__________________________
    E. Does not apply

11. Provide the following information concerning the person primarily responsible for your policy's administration.
    (This information will be used only in obtaining this data and perhaps to ask follow-up questions as appropriate.)

   Name_____________________________________________________
   Title_______________________________________________________
   Telephone___________________________________________________

12. What factors have been most influential in carrying out your policy?
    (circle more than one if appropriate)
    A. College administration
    B. Justice system
    C. Students
    D. Kinds of programs resulting from the policy
    E. Board of Trustees
    F. Community
    G. Other, specify_____________________________________________
13. What factors have been least influential in carrying out your policy? (circle more than one if appropriate)

A. College administration
B. Justice system
C. Students
D. Kinds of programs resulting from the policy
E. Board of Trustees
F. Community
G. Other, specify

14. In your opinion to what degree does your policy influence decisions in the favor of the student offender?

A. Very significantly
D. Significantly
C. Do not know
D. Not very much
E. Not at all
F. Does not apply

15. If your institution has no policy do you anticipate the development of one within the next two years?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Does not apply

16. If your institution has a policy do you anticipate significant revisions within the next two years?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Does not apply
17. Does your institution provide specific programs for this population?

A. Yes  How many?

B. No

18. In the following space list the name of one program, the director, and the director's address. This program should be based at your college or university and not at a justice agency. Do cite a prison release program, a program for students on probation or parole, or other as appropriate. Do not cite a prison education program or other program administered at a justice agency or any place other than your institution.

(This information will be used only in obtaining this data and perhaps to ask specific follow-up questions as appropriate.)

Program Name

Director

Address

Telephone

----------

You have completed the questionnaire if you do not have specific programs for student offenders, or programs based at your institution as noted in question '18'. Kindly forward the completed questionnaire, and a copy of the requested policy if you have one in the enclosed stamped envelope. Thank you for your cooperation.

----------

PROGRAM INFORMATION

(The answers to the following questions are based on the program cited in question number '18'.)

20. What population does your program attempt to serve? (circle more than one if appropriate)

A. Students facing criminal court action
B. Incarcerated students
C. Students on probation
D. Paroled students
E. Other, specify ____________________________

21. Approximately how many students does your program service? ____________________________

22. What approximate percentage of students currently enrolled in your program represents minority students? _____%

23. How do students get into your program? (circle more than one if appropriate)

A. Special application
B. Recommendation from your college or university
C. Recommendation from the justice system
D. Recommendation from a student who is or has been in the program
E. Minimal grade point average
F. Other, specify ____________________________

24. How long has your program been in operation? ____________________________
25. Which of the following areas of administrative support apply to your program? (Circle more than one if appropriate)

A. Financial aid
B. Personal counseling
C. Academic counseling
D. Individualized programs
E. Special admissions
F. Tutorials
G. The same administrative support other students receive
H. Other, specify__________________________

26. Who is most responsible for the administration of the program?

A. Member of your college or university administration
B. Program director
C. Justice system
D. Community group
E. Other, specify__________________________

27. Who in the justice system serves as primary liaison between your institution and the justice system? (Circle more than one if appropriate)

A. Judge
B. Corrections officer
C. Parole officer
D. Probation officer
E. Other, specify
F. Does not apply

Thank you for completing the questionnaire. Kindly forward it, and a copy of the requested policy if you have one in the enclosed stamped envelope.
APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER TO
DEAN OF STUDENTS OR ADMISSIONS
Dear Colleague,

In recent years institutions of higher education have developed policies and programs to meet a larger needs range of students including minority, women and non-traditional students. However a group represented by those facing court action, incarcerated, on probation, or on parole have received limited similar attention by colleges and universities. The University of Massachusetts is most interested in exploring possible policy action for this population.

We are undertaking a review of policies and programs that are currently in operation. As an administrator in an institution of higher education, we are asking that you, or your designee, please take a few minutes from your busy schedules to assist us. First, kindly fill out the enclosed questionnaire regarding student offenders. Second, if you have a written policy for this population please include this with the questionnaire. Forward the information in the enclosed stamped envelope.

If you prefer, I will administer the questionnaire to you by telephone. If this is your preference, please quickly look through the questionnaire to be sure you can respond to the requested items. I will comply with this request if you fill out the form at the bottom of the page and forward it to me.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. Upon request a copy of the major results will be sent to you. If you have any questions concerning this, please feel free to call me at the Dean of Students office at 413-545-2684. I would greatly appreciate your response by April 22, 1977. Again, thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Janis Wertz
Asst. to the Dean of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Place a check in the box preceding your preferred telephone option. Fill out the necessary information within that option. (Please do not select any times between April 1 and April 12.)

Option 1 [ ] Please call me on(date)________ at(time)________.

Option 2 [ ] Please call me on(date)________ in the morning or the afternoon. (Circle one.)

Option 3 [ ] Please call me the week of(give Monday’s date)________ in the morning or the afternoon. (Circle one.)
STUDENT OFFENDERS QUESTIONNAIRE

The University of Massachusetts is undertaking a review of policies and programs regarding undergraduate student offenders. The term "student offender" is defined as any undergraduate student facing possible criminal court action, incarcerated, on probation, or on parole. Another term frequently used in the questionnaire is "justice system." This term refers to the police, judicial and correctional systems created and authorized by either the federal or various state governments. The following questionnaire has been designed to obtain information most useful to our institution. The questionnaire has been divided into three sections covering background information, policy, and programs.

Note that questions '11' and '18' request the name of a specific administrator and program director from your institution. Please be assured that these names will be used only in obtaining this data and perhaps to ask specific follow-up questions as appropriate. Beyond these purposes names will be confidential.

Note also that question '17' requests the name of a program for student offenders. This program should be based at your college or university and not at a justice system agency. More specifically do cite a program for students on probation, on parole, on release from a correctional facility, or other as appropriate. Do not cite a prison education program or other program administered at a justice system agency or any place other than your institution. The questions following require responses based on the program cited. You may not be able to complete this section of the questionnaire. If you cannot please give the questionnaire to the appropriate program director for completion.

We have attempted to keep this survey brief. Instructions for answering specific questions are noted with the question. If there are no notations select the one most appropriate response.

When you have completed this questionnaire please forward it, and a copy of your policy for student offenders, if you have one, in the enclosed stamped envelope. Thank you for your cooperation.