

Effective Online Course Delivery in Correctional Settings: A Pilot

Michelle Dennis
Adler University

James D. Halbert
Adler University

This paper provides an analysis of best practices for the design and delivery of online programming within correctional facilities, ascertained from the evaluation of a pilot course. Utilizing the case study methodology, it was observed that fully online coursework may be delivered within controlled settings. Key considerations for effective design and delivery centered around scheduling regular check-ins with administration from the University and the Correctional Center, conducting technology testing on a set cadence, incorporating synchronous components and evaluating opportunities for the inclusion of course-embedded advising to ensure engagement. Future directions include continued delivery of a Baccalaureate program, the incorporation of micro-credentials to provide targeted training in key areas of relevance and degree continuity planning to support degree completion among recently released individuals.

Keywords: online education, online teaching, correctional centers, prison education, course-embedded advising, recidivism reduction, program evaluation

INTRODUCTION

The global pandemic, COVID-19, raised awareness among higher education administrators regarding the importance of incorporating components of remote learning into their courses. This was certainly the case within prison settings (Armstrong, 2020; Burke, 2020), but even pre-pandemic, access to higher education within correctional facilities was severely limited. Factors such as geographic location of facilities, educator willingness and ability to travel to and from correctional facilities, resource availability to support the delivery of educational programming within correctional facilities (Dewey et al., 2021), and challenges posed by correctional facility policies and regulations (Denney & Tynes, 2021) led to reduced access. This paper provides an analysis of the implementation and evaluation of a pilot course within a correctional facility to identify and address challenges ahead of the formal launch of a program within the facility. The need for higher education in correctional facilities is demonstrated in a great body of research (Ahmed et al. 2019; Alexander & Pickett, 2018; Allred, Boyd, Cotton, & Perry, 2020; Fairbain, 2021).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Individuals who become involved with the justice system are forced to adjust abruptly to limited resources and harsh conditions, which pose challenges to the rehabilitation process. The basic human right,

to seek education, is often withheld, despite research demonstrating the many ways in which higher education may lead to positive outcomes for this population (Parkinson, 2018; Taylor et al., 2021; Torrijo & De Maeyer, 2019). Studies show a relationship between preparation for reentry and recidivism rates (Denver, 2020; Yesberg & Polaschek, 2019). Given the limited resources available to correctional facilities, adequate services are often lacking (Adekanmbi & Ezikpe, 2021; Becker-Pestka, 2018). As a consequence, many individuals who are involved with the justice system are not provided with the tools they need to succeed post release, where they will face additional barriers (Brosens, Croux, & De Donder, 2019; Burke, 2019; Denver, 2020).

Employment discrimination is one of the most common and significant barriers faced by recently released individuals (Yesberg & Polaschek, 2019; Fahmy et al., 2021). While some may have networking opportunities through family and friends' others may face more challenges (Fahmy et al., 2021). Higher recidivism rates are observed among recently released individuals who are unable to secure employment (Duwe, & Henry-Nickie, 2021). Educational attainment can serve as a protective factor (Kuntz-Balcer, 2020; Lockard, 2018; Msoroka, 2021). In fact, studies have shown that educational programs for individuals involved with the justice system have reduced recidivism and increased employment rates post release (Collica-Cox, 2022; Sokoloff, & Schenck-Fontaine, 2017). Securing educational opportunities ahead of release may also be beneficial due to funding challenges for recently released individuals (Batiuk, Moke, & Rountree, 1997; Sokoloff, & Schenck-Fontaine, 2017).

Higher education in correctional facilities has been linked to improved self-efficacy and increased confidence (Curtis, Evans, & Pelletier, 2021), which helps to reduce the effects of stigma post release (Moore, Stuewig, & Tangney, 2013; Van Olphen, Eliason, Freudenberg, & Barnes, 2009). Perceived stigma may directly impact employment opportunities and (Van Olphen, et al., 2009). Education in correctional facilities also serves to empower those who are involved in the criminal justice system (Castro & Gould, 2018; Castro, Hunter, Hardison, & Johnson-Ojeda, 2018; Flores, 2021). Having the opportunity to learn and apply a new skill set (Reese, 2019; Szifris, Fox, & Bradbury, 2018; Wolf, 2020) may serve to empower individuals to make a difference for those around them by changing the status-quo and breaking down those barriers that would ultimately hold them back (Heider & Lehman, 2019; Higgins, 2021; Key & May, 2019; Sokoloff, & Schenck-Fontaine, 2017). Research has also shown that education in these settings improves self-esteem, motivation, and negative attitude toward oneself (Evans, D. N., Pelletier, & Szkola, 2018).

While studies have shown that delivering higher education to individuals involved with the criminal justice system reduces recidivism rates (Castro, 2018; Fullilove, Cortes, Gamarra, & Maxis, 2020; O'Brien, King, Phillips, & Kath, 2021), it has taken several decades for researchers and stakeholders to demonstrate the magnitude of this impact to governing agencies (Batiuk et al., 1997; Curtis, 2021; Evans, 2018; Nally, 2012). Even though the research is enviably clear, that higher education directly impacts recidivism, there are still several barriers that need to be addressed (Gashi, 2021; Gould, 2018; Ludlow, Armstrong, & Bartels, 2019; Te Pere & Stewart, 2021). Erzen et al., (2019) says the "lack of oversight and accountability within the prison setting, the complex needs of students, and the material scarcity that pervades the field" are common barriers that need to be addressed in higher education for incarcerated individuals. The absence of resources and the lack of involvement with universities serve to create some of these issues (Rankins-Robertson, 2019). If not geared toward the target population, the curriculum itself can also become a hurdle (Erzen et al., 2019; McCorkel & DeFina, 2019; McLauchlan & Farley, 2019; Wade, 2021). Other obstacles include accessibility of the professor and having the right resources at the learner's disposal, such as a writing lab, SPSS software, technology, and research modalities (Erzen et al., 2019; Palmer et al., 2020).

The global pandemic, COVID-19, has significantly impacted access to higher education (Toquero, 2020; Whittle, Tiwari, Yan, & Williams, 2020; Williamson, Eynon, & Potter, 2020) within, and external to (Bozkurt & Sharma, 2020; Knudson, 2020; Mohammed, Khidhir, Nazeer, & Vijayan, 2020; Petillion & McNeil, 2020) correctional facilities worldwide. The pandemic has made it difficult to send faculty to teach and set up courses (Collica-Cox, 2022; Johnson, 2021) and caused an interruption to the education system in all correction facilities. Current policies were the cause of most interruptions, as education in correctional facilities are often deprioritized (Johnson, 2021). Further, technology is not always readily available to correctional centers, due to security concerns (Collica-Cox, 2022; Tanaka, 2020). The pandemic, in many

cases, has brought higher education to a screaming halt for this population. Online education is one relevant solution to this access issue.

Delivery of the pilot described in this paper was based on five core goals. The first goal, to implement a high-capacity sustainable model for the delivery of higher education within correctional facilities, was based on a desire to ensure continuity of programming and equity of access. Given the resources needed to deliver higher education, many are not able to obtain their degrees (Evans, Pelletier, & Szkola, 2018). Offering online education within correctional facilities reduces a great deal of resource needs by taking away the need for faculty to travel to institutions. Further, with respect to equity, online education allows for simultaneous delivery at multiple centers, thereby increasing the number of slots which are available for students. The second goal of this initiative also pertains to access.

Goal two was to provide alternatives to face-to-face course delivery to address the impacts of unforeseen events which restrict external access to correctional facilities, such as the global pandemic. All are likely familiar with the challenges to higher education that were posed by the pandemic of 2020. Correctional facilities face a multitude of unforeseen events which, although they pale in comparison to the global pandemic, still pose a problem for face-to-face course delivery (For instance, a threat may lead to an extended lock-down of the entire facility. Were this to occur, any external faculty would be prohibited from entering the facility, thereby interfering with the continuation of the term and leading to significant challenges for the students, the faculty, and the higher education institution delivering the program. The next goals align with research supporting the need to provide relevant educational opportunities for individuals involved in the justice system and to effectively engage and empower this group of students with the aim of improving their quality-of-life post-release (Fairbairn, 2020).

Goal three, to deliver programming to individuals who are involved with the justice system in subject areas that align with job opportunities, led to the selection of applied psychology as the focus of the pilot course. Applied psychology is a diverse field and prepares graduates to serve in a wide variety of roles in settings such as sport and health, forensics, human services, and data analysis, to name a few. Further, baccalaureate level programming was selected due to the limited availability of programs at this level offered within correctional facilities. The majority of programs offered within correctional facilities culminate with either a technical diploma or an Associates level credential. Baccalaureate level programming is needed due to changes in the job market which reward those who have earned higher level credentials. Individuals who are involved with the justice system will face multiple hurdles as they attempt to find employment post-release. Equipped with a baccalaureate degree, they will be better able to demonstrate their preparation. This relates to the next two goal, in that completion of a degree may also serve to impact self-perception in important ways.

Goal four, to provide engagement to underserved individuals, thereby reducing the psychological effects of social stigma associated with incarceration, refers to the need to provide meaningful engagement opportunities to individuals who are involved with the justice system. These activities will help this group to maintain a sense of purpose during their periods of incarceration (Baranger, Rousseau, Mastroilli, & Matesanz, 2018) and also to engage in goal-setting to prepare for their ultimate release. The final goal, to train individuals based on Adlerian principles of inclusion and social justice, thereby empowering individuals who are involved with the justice system to develop and attain personal and professional goals upon release, articulates the core purpose behind this pilot (Lemberger-Truelove, 2018). The content and delivery of the pilot was deeply entrenched in principles of inclusion and social justice and, as such, it provided the students with encouragement to fully engage with the community, thereby empowering them to make a difference, post release.

METHOD

Following the establishment of a planning committee, a needs assessment was conducted based on published literature and conversations with key stakeholders. The first requirement, on which the success of all additional tasks depended, was the development of an effective partnership with aligned goals. Shared priorities for the pilot course centered around the effective and financially sustainable higher education to

individuals who are involved in the justice system, preserving the security of the correctional facility and providing engagement and job preparation for the students to reduce recidivism rates. In addition to identifying shared priorities, an effective partnership was outlined and nurtured. Key considerations for the initial establishment of the partnership included the identification, discussion and approval of a memorandum of understanding to guide decision making, the provision of pilot resources, and approval processes. Due to regulations that govern correctional facilities, parameters needed to be identified.

The identification of parameters was a necessary prerequisite to facilitate productive contact between University administrators, faculty and advisors and prospective and current students who would participate in the pilot course. These parameters included the identification of regular meeting times for discussion of key updates within the correctional center and within the University. Additionally, specifications regarding systems for information sharing and the facilitation of access to the learning management system and videoconferencing required multiple conversations to ensure that all potential risks were removed. Technology evaluation was key in the aforementioned assurances.

The first aspect of technology that required determination was the physical devices that would be utilized for the delivery of course content. Laptops were deemed superior to tablets due to functionality, the need for key software and the ability to restrict access to non-course sites. Following the assessment of the laptops, programs were added by technology staff serving the correctional center. Ahead of the pilot course, content was shared with center administration for evaluation and approval. After approval was provided, links to all course pages were provided for whitelisting. Identifying all links and sub-links allowed for the accurate provision of access to needed resources for the students.

Initial information sharing needs pertaining to the course included the use of email to share documents requiring student signatures and login information. This information was provided to the educational administrators at the correctional facility and then shared with the students. Videoconferencing was utilized for the facilitation of synchronous sessions, which provided the students with the opportunity to engage with the faculty member, hear lectures, and engage in live discussions. Facilitator engagement was a key component of the pilot.

All online courses require engagement by the facilitator to support student learning, engagement and course completion (Bloomberg & Grantham, 2018; Eom, & Ashill, 2016). Facilitators are able to demonstrate their engagement in a multitude of ways. First, facilitators must provide an introduction, sharing relevant information regarding their background and qualifications with the students. Utilizing video to accomplish this task is preferred. Next, a weekly introduction, outlining the key resources, activities and assessments for the Module is needed to orient students. Active participation on the weekly discussion board by the facilitator is a necessary prerequisite to full student engagement. Faculty members who respond to the main post of all students, posing questions, sharing examples and expanding the scope of the analysis tend to enjoy rich discussions and improved learning outcomes. Timely grades and detailed and helpful feedback on all assignments is also a key strategy for keeping students in online courses engaged. Finally, regular synchronous sessions that provide opportunities for students to discuss content with the facilitator and with their peers and apply relevant information represents a best-practice in all online courses. Several course adjustments were made to accommodate regulations within the correctional center, none of which impacted the learning environment for the students.

The first adjustment involved scheduling the synchronous sessions. Weekly synchronous sessions were held and these are typically scheduled by the instructor. In this case, correctional center staff were asked to schedule the sessions. This allowed the center staff to collaborate with the faculty member to ensure that times reflected availability of all and aligned with the times that students were available to enter the computer lab at the facility. Additionally, this allowed the center to own the Videoconferencing meeting, to ensure security of the system. The next adjustment pertained to scheduling time for coursework.

One of the main benefits of online courses are that they may typically be attended at times that are convenient for students. This allows students in online courses to work or engage in other activities. In this case, students were required to complete their coursework at set times. This was due to the fact that laptops could not be brought into housing units. Administration from the University collaborated with Correctional Center Administrators to determine set periods of time that students would be permitted to enter the

computer lab, sign into the learning management system and complete their coursework. The final main adjustment pertained to course resources.

Many online courses have moved away from physical textbooks to embrace the use of electronic resources. This is due to student costs, to some degree, as the price of textbooks serves as a barrier to higher education for many. The higher education institution in which this pilot was conducted typically does make use of physical textbooks. In this case, textbooks were utilized, for a number of reasons, key among which was the desire to extend the amount of time that students could engage with course resources. Textbooks were brought back into housing units, allowing students to read at their leisure. This also served an important purpose within the center, as it reduced the number of hours that the students needed to spend in the computer lab, thereby reducing staffing needs for the institution. The final need was advising.

Many online programs employ an advising model, which helps to support growth and development of students (Dennis, Fornero, Snelling, Thom, & Surlis, 2020). This pilot made use of face-to-face advising, which involved an administrator traveling to the correctional center to meet with the students. This was important, because it provided interaction for the students, and allowed them time to discuss goals, pose questions and receive live mentorship. Two advising sessions were conducted, one of which focused on career goals and one of which focused on the collection of student reflections post pilot course.

The pilot course which serves as the basis of this case study was conducted during the summer term of 2021, in the midst of a global pandemic. The pilot was conducted within a rural, medium security men's correctional center. Marketing involved sharing a description of the opportunity in flyer format with the educational administrators of the facility. A short description was also played on prison TV within the institution. Paper applications were shared and prospective students were asked to complete applications, which were then scanned by administrators at the center and sent via email to the University for evaluation. Requirements for admission into the pilot course involved the completion of an Associates level credential or at least 60 credits of undergraduate coursework. Ten slots were available for the program and all ten were quickly filled.

Post admission, notices were sent from the University to the Correctional Center and students were asked to sign an enrollment form, which was then scanned and sent back to the University. The next step was onboarding, a process which involves entering student information into key systems which will be needed to access University resources. Login information was generated for each student and then shared with educational administrators within the institution. The next step was technology testing.

During technology testing, adjustments were needed to ensure that all students were able to access the needed resources. This testing process provided an engagement opportunity for the students, who had the opportunity to explore the course ahead of the formal start, pose questions to a University administrator via Videoconferencing, and share career goals. Following the completion of the 8-week pilot course, a number of parameters were evaluated to determine next steps in the implementation of the formal program.

RESULTS

First, with respect to the assessment of student learning outcomes, all enrolled students completed the course and demonstrated mastery of content at or above the expected level as based on the assessment plan for the program and the aligned end of course rubric. There were some challenges pertaining to student experience, most of which related to technology and access to course content.

In terms of technology, there were opportunities to provide a better experience for students by identifying and incorporating a word processing program. The learning management system which was utilized includes functionality that supports drafting, editing and submitting documents, but formatting documents in accordance with organizational formatting procedures was problematic. This feedback may be addressed through discussions with the technology staff serving the center to support the inclusion of a formal word processing program in the laptop set-up. In terms of access to course content, students reported the need for additional time in the computer lab to facilitate the completion of their discussion responses and assignments. Administrators shared feedback pertaining to scheduling parameters, which may be addressed easily through minor adjustments. Faculty also shared feedback regarding the pilot course.

Sentiments shared by faculty were positive and centered around engagement and collaboration. First, regarding engagement, faculty felt that students were significantly engaged with the course and with one another. Group work during synchronous sessions was reported to be highly productive and seeped in rigor. In terms of collaboration, faculty felt fully supported by center administration and staff alike. Many important lessons were learned through the delivery of this pilot course, which are discussed in the context of future directions.

DISCUSSION

Limitations of the work presented here include the small size of the sample and the unstructured method of collecting data. Collecting feedback in an unstructured manner makes analysis a challenge, and although it can still be a useful way to guide alterations to programming, devising a formal survey for administration is preferable. As of the time of this writing, a formal program launch has occurred. Future directions center around the formal collection of data, degree continuity planning and the implementation micro-credentials.

First, we aim to secure approvals to support the formal collection of data. Data such as student educational back-ground, such as the number of prior institutions attended, whether the student has attended college internal or external to correctional facilities and student GPA in prior educational settings would be useful, as these parameters could be evaluated as potential predictors of success in the program. Additionally, information such as the number of years that a student has been involved with the justice system or the percent of sentence completed might be utilized to assess career goal delineation. Further, information regarding prior careers of students might be useful to use as a predictor of their future career goals and plans within the program. Finally, assessing program completion and associated predictors will be useful. This relates to the next area of focus, degree planning continuity.

Degree completion planning within correctional centers poses several challenges, as release dates are fluid and individual students may be transferred to other facilities. While the latter can be easily addressed through discussions with administrators, the former requires careful contingency planning. Developing a set of resources for students who will be released ahead of the completion of their degrees will be a helpful way to ensure that they have the tools they need to continue their work. Additionally, collaborations with departments of probation and parole in the vicinity of correctional centers where the program will be offered provides an opportunity to ensure continuity for the students. The final direction involves the implementation of shorter and more targeted programming, including micro-credentials.

Micro-credentials are 3-4 course sequences that provide a targeted deep-dive into a particular subject area (Olcott, 2022). These credentials are useful for working professionals who are aiming to move into a different field or those who are hoping for a promotion. This option might also be attractive for individuals who are involved with the justice system, particularly for those who have a short period of time remaining before their release and those who wish to change careers following their release. Potential areas of study include diversity and inclusion and advocacy.

REFERENCES

- Adekanmbi, G., & Ezikpe, U. (2021). Prison education in Nigeria. *Research Anthology on Rehabilitation Practices and Therapy*, pp. 1723–1736.
- Ahmed, R., Johnson, M., Caudill, C., Diedrich, N., Mains, D., & Key, A. (2019). Cons and pros: Prison education through the eyes of the prison educated. *Review of Communication*, 19(1), 69–76.
- Alexander, P., & Pickett, O.W. (2018). The prison-to-college pipeline program: An ethical, education-based response to mass incarceration in Mississippi. *The Journal of African American History*, 103(4), 702–716.
- Allred, S.L., Boyd, C., Cotton, T., & Perry, P. (2020). Participatory evaluation in a prison education program: Meaning & community building within Inside-Out think tanks. *Corrections*, 5(1), 6–27.

- Armstrong, M. (2020). Moving classes online is hard—Especially in prisons: Higher education in prison programs get creative to keep classes going. *Slate*. Retrieved from <https://slate.com/technology/2020/05/remote-learning-prisons.amp>
- Batiuk, M.E., Moke, P., & Rountree, P.W. (1997). Crime and rehabilitation: Correctional education as an agent of change—A research note. *Justice Quarterly*, *14*(1), 167–180.
- Baranger, J., Rousseau, D., Mastroilli, M.E., & Matesanz, J. (2018). Doing time wisely: The social and personal benefits of higher education in prison. *The Prison Journal*, *98*(4), 490–513.
- Becker-Pestka, D. (2018). Polish prison education system. *HERJ Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, *8*(4), 41–51.
- Bloomberg, L.D., & Grantham, G. (2018). Teaching in graduate distance education: Perspectives on evaluating faculty engagement strategies. *International Journal of Online Graduate Education*, *1*(2), 1–24.
- Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R.C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to Coronavirus pandemic. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, *15*(1), 1–4.
- Brosens, D., Croux, F., & De Donder, L. (2019). Barriers to prisoner participation in educational courses: Insights from a remand prison in Belgium. *International Review of Education*, *65*(5), 735–754.
- Burke, L. (2019). Blackboard behind bars. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2019/12/10/online-education-comes-prisons>
- Burke, L. (2020). College programs in prisons go remote. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/18/college-programs-prisons-adapt-covid>
- Castro, E.L. (2018). Racism, the language of reduced recidivism, and higher education in prison: Toward an anti-racist praxis. *Critical Education*, *9*(17), 1–14.
- Castro, E.L., & Gould, M.R. (2018). What is higher education in prison? Introduction to radical departures: Ruminations on the purposes of higher education in prison. *Critical Education*, *9*(10), 1–13.
- Castro, E.L., Hunter, R.K., Hardison, T., & Johnson-Ojeda, V. (2018). The landscape of postsecondary education in prison and the influence of Second Chance Pell: An analysis of transferability, credit-bearing status, and accreditation. *The Prison Journal*, *98*(4), 405–426.
- Collica-Cox, K. (2022). Bringing inside-out online: Coming together in a virtual environment. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *61*(2), 61–87.
- Curtis, C.A., Evans, D., & Pelletier, E. (2021). Developing social capital through postsecondary correctional education. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *60*(4), 270–290.
- Denney, M.G.T., & Tynes, R. (2021). The effects of college in prison and policy implications. *Justice Quarterly*, *38*(7), 1542–1566.
- Dennis, M., Fornero, S., Snelling, J., Thom, S., & Surles, J. (2020). Evaluating student perceptions of a course-embedded faculty advising model. *Journal of Strategic Innovation and Sustainability*, *15*(6), 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jsis.v15i6.3592>
- Denver, M. (2020). Criminal records, positive credentials and recidivism: Incorporating evidence of rehabilitation into criminal background check employment decisions. *Crime & Delinquency*, *66*(2), 194–218.
- Dewey, S., Codallos, K., Barry, R., Drenkhahn, K., Glover, M., Muthig, A., . . . Roberts, B.A. (2020). Higher education in prison. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *71*(1), 57–89.
- Duwe, G., & Henry-Nickie, M. (2021). Training and Employment for Correctional Populations. *Contexts*, *20*(4), 40–45.
- Eom, S.B., & Ashill, N. (2016). The determinants of students' perceived learning outcomes and satisfaction in university online education: An update. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, *14*(3), 185–215.
- Erzen, T., Gould, M.R., & Lewen, J. (2019). *Equity and excellence in practice: A guide for higher education in prison*. St. Louis, MO: Alliance for Higher Education in Prison and San Quentin, CA: Prison University Project.

- Evans, D.N., Pelletier, E., & Szkola, J. (2018). Education in prison and the self-stigma: Empowerment continuum. *Crime & Delinquency*, 64(2), 255–280.
- Fairbairn, F. (2020). Trust, power, and transformation in the prison classroom. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 7(2), 160–182.
- Fahmy, C., Gricius, M., Chamberlain, A.W., & Wallace, D. (2021). Prison visitation and the likelihood of post-release employment. *Crime & Delinquency*. DOI: 00111287211022631
- Flores, J. (2021). Fromm, Foucault, Garland, and prison education. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 41(2), 231–236.
- Fullilove, R.E., Cortes, A., Gamarra, R., & Maxis, H. (2020). The bard prison initiative: Education, incarceration, and public health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 110(S1), S33–S34.
- Gashi, E. (2021). Prison education characteristics and classroom management by prison teachers. *SEEU Review*, 16(2), 104–113.
- Gould, M.R. (2018). Rethinking our metrics: Research in the field of higher education in prison. *The Prison Journal*, 98(4), 387–404.
- Heider, C., & Lehman, K. (2019). Education and transformation: An argument for college in prison. *Critical Education*, 10(9), 1–12.
- Higgins, L. (2021). Exploring the relationship between education and rehabilitation in the prison context. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 7(2), 144–159.
- Key, A., & May, M.S. (2019). When prisoners dare to become scholars: Prison education as resistance. *Review of Communication*, 19(1), 1–18.
- Knudson, D. (2020). A tale of two instructional experiences: Student engagement in active learning and emergency remote learning of biomechanics. *Sports Biomechanics*, pp. 1–11. DOI:10.1080/14763141.2020.1810306
- Kuntz Balcer, C. (2020). The framework for information literacy for higher education (in prison): Using the frames to teach incarcerated students. *College & Research Libraries News*, 81(4), 178.
- Johnson, C. (2021). Lessons Learned from Prison Education Interruption during Pandemic. Fact Sheet. *Center for Law and Social Policy, Inc. (CLASP)*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED613764.pdf>
- Lemberger-Truelove, T. (2018). Belonging, striving, and style of life among black women in the southwestern United States. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 74(1), 75–95. DOI:10.1353/jip.2018.0005
- Lockard, J. (2018). Prison writing education and US working -class consciousness. *Prison Pedagogies: Learning and Teaching with Imprisoned Writers*, pp. 11–31.
- Ludlow, A., Armstrong, R., & Bartels, L. (2019). Learning together: Localism, collaboration and reflexivity in the development of prison and university learning communities. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 6(1), 25–45.
- McCorkel, J., & DeFina, R. (2019). Beyond recidivism: The value of higher education in prison. *Critical Education*, 10(7), 1–17.
- McLauchlan, J., & Farley, H. (2019). Fast cars and fast learning: Using virtual reality to learn literacy and numeracy in prison. *Journal For Virtual Worlds Research*, 12(3), 1–11.
- Mohammed, A.O., Khidhir, B.A., Nazeer, A., & Vijayan, V.J. (2020). Emergency remote teaching during Coronavirus pandemic: The current trend and future directive at Middle East College Oman. *Innovative Infrastructure Solutions*, 5(3), 1–11.
- Moore, K., Stuewig, J., & Tangney, J. (2013). Jail inmates' perceived and anticipated stigma: Implications for post-release functioning. *Self and Identity*, 12(5), 527–547.
- Msoroka, M.S. (2021). Prison education for industrialization: Killing two birds with a single stone. *Handbook of Research on Nurturing Industrial Economy for Africa's Development*, pp. 428–441.
- Nally, J., Lockwood, S., Knutson, K., & Ho, T. (2012). An evaluation of the effect of correctional education programs on post-release recidivism and employment: An empirical study in Indiana. *Journal of Correctional Education (1974-)*, 63(1), 69–89.

- O'Brien, K., King, H., Phillips, J., & Kath, D. (2021). Education as the practice of freedom? – Prison education and the pandemic. *Phoenix Educational Review*, 73(6), 1–19.
DOI:10.1080/00131911.2021.1996335
- Olcott, D. (2022) Micro-credentials: A catalyst for strategic reset and change in U.S. higher education. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 36(1), 19–35. DOI: 10.1080/08923647.2021.1997537
- Palmer, E.J., Hatcher, R.M., & Tonkin, M.J. (2020). *Evaluation of digital technology in prisons*. Ministry of Justice press.
- Parkinson, J.G. (2018). Did that really happen? The marginalising of fiction in the prison education classroom. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 23(4), 539–547.
- Petillion, R.K., & McNeil, W.S. (2020). Student experiences of emergency remote teaching: Impacts of instructor practice on student learning, engagement, and well-being. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 97(9), 2486–2493.
- Rankins-Robertson, S. (2019). Complex lives, complicated literacies: Writing programs in higher education -prison partnerships. *Writing Program Administration*, 42(2), 166–176.
- Reese, R. (2019). The prison education project. *International Review of Education*, 65(5), 687–709.
- Sokoloff, N.J., & Schenck-Fontaine, A. (2017). College programs in prison and upon reentry for men and women: A literature review. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 20(1), 95–114.
- Szifris, K., Fox, C., & Bradbury, A. (2018). A realist model of prison education, growth and resistance: A new theory. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 5(1), 41–62.
- Tanaka, K. (2030). When online isn't an option: Higher education in prisons during a pandemic. *Ithaka S+R*. Retrieved from <https://sr.ithaka.org/blog/when-online-isnt-an-option/>
- Taylor, S., Holder, J., Muhammad, B., Jones, T., & Haynes, L. (2021). Why race matters for higher education in prison. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 96(5), 588–597.
- Te Pere, M., & Stewart, G. (2021). Challenges facing a Māori prison education leader. *Leadership for Justice*, 41(2), 33–43.
- Torrijo, H.R., & De Maeyer, M. (2019). Education in prison: A basic right and an essential tool. *International Review of Education*, 65(5), 671–685.
- Toquero, C.M. (2020b). Emergency remote teaching amid COVID-19: The turning point. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 185–188.
- Van Olphen, J., Eliason, M.J., Freudenberg, N., & Barnes, M. (2009). Nowhere to go: How stigma limits the options of female drug users after release from jail. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*, 4(1), 1–10.
- Wade, M.W. (2021). What can be taught in college in prison? Reconciling institutional priorities in clashes over incarcerated students' access to instructional materials *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 7(1), 6–22.
- Whittle, C., Tiwari, S., Yan, S., & Williams, J. (2020). Emergency remote teaching environment: A conceptual framework for responsive online teaching in crises. *Information and Learning Sciences*, 121(5–6), 311–319.
- Williamson, B., Eynon, R., & Potter, J. (2020). Pandemic politics, pedagogies, and practices: Digital technologies and distance education during the coronavirus emergency. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(2), 107–114.
- Wolf, L.J. (2020). Teaching in a total Institution: Toward a pedagogy of care in prison classrooms. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 6(2), 209–216.
- Yesberg, J.A., & Polaschek, D.L. (2019). How does offender rehabilitation actually work? Exploring mechanisms of change in high-risk treated parolees. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(15–16), 2672–2692.