Expanding Access to Postsecondary Education in Iowa's Prisons:

Strategic Planning Final Report

July 10, 2019

Allan Wachendorfer, Program Associate

Ruth Delaney, Program Manager

About the Project

The Vera Institute of Justice (Vera) is a justice reform change agent whose mission is to build and improve justice systems that ensure fairness, promote safety, and strengthen communities. Through the Expanding Access to Postsecondary Education Project, Vera provides technical assistance, training, and information resources to state departments of corrections, education providers working in prisons, and state and local policymakers to support the delivery of high-quality postsecondary education programs in prisons and to develop policies, procedures, and practices to increase access to such programs.

With the support of the Ascendium Education Group, Vera set out in January of 2019 to develop strategic priorities for enhancing programs offered in prison in collaboration with colleges, corrections, and reentry agencies in five target states: AR, IA, MN, OH, and WI. During this project, Vera worked with Iowa stakeholders over a six-month period to complete a strategic planning process and identify a set of priorities for the ensuing two years that will improve outputs and outcomes for postsecondary education in Iowa's prison system.

This report represents a summary of the six-month process and includes:

    I.   Final recommendations based on priorities identified by the stakeholders;
    II.   Next steps for implementation of the priorities;
   III. A review of education offerings in Iowa prisons; and
   IV. An overview of the strategic planning process.

I.   Final Recommendations

The recommendations that follow were developed based on the input of college, corrections, and workforce representatives (*see Appendix A*) who met as part of a working group over the course of the strategic planning process outlined in the report below. Although Vera and its Iowa partners initially set out to identify 2-3 priorities, through the process, four emerged. These are highlighted here for the leadership and/or an implementation group to review and determine priorities and next steps:

1) **Formalize partnerships:** This topic was a focus of discussion throughout the planning process and ultimately garnered the most overall votes. The group expressed interest in formalizing partnerships by completing MOUs and scheduling regular meetings between stakeholders. This, participants suggested, would increase the chance of success for any current or future endeavors. Several participants proposed that one agency should take ownership of this effort by coordinating meetings and tracking the progress towards any goals set forth by the parties involved.

2) **Student support (including reentry):** Many participants talked about how important it is to do a better job recruiting students and guiding them through the education and reentry process. Counseling in all forms—including career, academic, and reentry—was a common theme during discussions and in the voting session. Participants thought this element of postsecondary education needed to be nurtured and improved system-wide. This recommendation is based on an amalgamation of elements from projects 2, 3, and 7 (*see Appendix B*).

3) **Technology:** One of the most popular priorities outside of any one project was the need to improve technology. This includes the need to have better access to internet, updated computers, and alternative learning devices. Technology could safely be used for access to library research, online learning platforms, and career services.
4) **Funding:** The group expressed interest in diversifying funding streams by exploring alternative funding sources, such as GI Bill funding for veterans and fixing the state allocation for budgetary full time equivalents.

II.   Next Steps

Members of the working group agreed that, with the assistance of Vera, this report would be created and presented for approval to the leadership group that met in the Kickoff meeting described in section IV below. Vera can provide assistance to the leadership group, as it plans for implementation. Vera recommends that the leadership group take the following steps to move the projects forward:

1) The leadership group approves the plan and the working group's agreed on priorities.
2) The leadership group identifies and convenes an implementation workgroup to develop, with assistance from Vera if requested, a timeline and a more detailed set of strategies for implementation of the agreed on priorities, including resource considerations.
3) The implementation group presents a strategy plan to leadership for approval and implementation and then proceeds with implementing the project.

III.   Review of Educational Offerings in Iowa Prisons

Following the launch of this effort in IA, the Iowa Department of Corrections (IA DOC) participated in a landscape mapping exercise (*see Appendix C pending final version*) to identify the programs and initiatives already underway in IA. These include Adult Basic, Secondary, Work Skills, and Postsecondary Education. The landscape is summarized here.

Adult Basic and Secondary Education

The IA DOC offers a number of core education services. These include, basic literacy, English as a Second Language (ESL), life skills training, and preparing students for high school equivalency testing (IA DOC utilizes HiSET testing). These services are rendered in partnership with the K-12 school system and community colleges.

Work Skills Education

IA DOC offers a multitude of apprenticeship programs in partnership with the Department of Labor in various facilities, including electrician, painter, plumber, welder, computer operator, and janitor. IA DOC also offers a number of work skills trainings in various facilities that lead to industry standard certificates, including:

- National Career Readiness Certificate (9 facilities)
- Forklift Operation Training (8 facilities)
- OSHA 10 (9 facilities)
- Serv-Safe Certification (9 facilities)
- Pesticide Applicator Certification (CCF)
- Construction (4 facilities)

- Transportation Distribution and Logistics (6 facilities)
- CISCO Networking Academy Training (NCF/ICIW)
- Basic Industrial Maintenance Technology Certificate (ISP/MPCF)
- Certification Logistic/Transportation/Distribution (ISP/MPCF)
- Basic Industrial Maintenance Technology Certificate
- Lean Practitioner Certificate Level 1

Postsecondary Education

Iowa Central Community College (ICCC), as part of the Second Chance Pell Experimental Sites Initiative, offers credit-bearing college courses leading to certificates in welding, supply chain management, industrial machining, carpentry, and culinary baking. These courses are offered at Fort Dodge Correctional Facility (medium security) and North Central Correctional Facility (minimum security). Additionally, students can earn an Associate of Arts degree. General studies courses are taken through an online correspondence program offered by ICCC and combined with credits earned under one of the various certificate programs (as electives) to earn the AA.

Grinnell College offers, as part of the Bard Prison Initiative, up to 60 credits worth of various liberal arts-focused courses in Newton Correction Facility at no cost to students.

University of Iowa offers credit-bearing courses to students at Iowa Medical and Classification Center at no cost to students.

Students also have access to traditional mail-in correspondence courses paid for by donations, friends, families, or the students themselves.

(A complete overview of educational offerings can be found in Appendix C – pending final approval)

IV. **Overview of the Process**

The Kickoff

In March of 2019, Vera convened a leadership group of stakeholders, which included executive representatives from IA DOC, ICC, Workforce and Development (IWD), and the Governor's policy staff. This first meeting was considered a "kick-off" meeting and provided Vera an opportunity to explain the importance of postsecondary education in prison, why now is a good opportunity to have strategic conversations, and explain the scope of the project and what Vera was offering to provide. With support from the Ascendium Education Group and approval from leadership in Iowa, Vera offered to engage stakeholders in a 4-6-month planning process to:

- Convene a partnership of department of corrections, higher education institutions, workforce development, and social service representatives;
- Identify the top three areas of focus for enhancing, expanding and improving the college-prison partnership over the next two years including at least one reentry-related goal; and
- Create an action plan with the partnership to begin working on the top three focus areas.

The goal of the planning process was to explore and attempt to answer these questions:

- What would you want higher education to look like at scale in Iowa?
- What resources (people, technology or policies) would be needed to bring higher education to scale?
- What changes and innovations already exist that need to be nurtured and grown?
- What new programs, policies, practices or services should be implemented or piloted?
- What new partners could be engaged in this effort to enhance postsecondary programs and services in prison?

During the first meeting, attendees discussed what a planning process could achieve including various ways data could be used to build support; how program data could be better tracked; how postsecondary education in prison could be integrated with the higher education system in the community; how to connect with the business sector; and the need to work more closely with reentry. Several strengths were identified, including that IA DOC is a small system with nine prisons incarcerating around 8500 people, and that postsecondary education already exists in three of prisons.

The group identified other stakeholders that would comprise a working group to be included in the process moving forward:

- Community colleges and universities that already work in prisons
- Probation and Parole
- Reentry nonprofits
- Business associations
- Higher education institutions where students may go after prison
- Formerly incarcerated students
- Currently incarcerated students (this was not achieved in the planning process)
- Workforce development (community colleges teaching workforce development programs and the state agency)

The Assessment

In April 2019, the working group convened. It included the Iowa Department of Education, Iowa College Aid, Central Iowa Works, University of Iowa, Kirkwood Community College, South Central Community College, Des Moines Area Community College, Iowa Western Community College, Grinnell College, reentry coordinators from IWD, various IA DOC education programmatic staff, the warden from Fort Dodge Correctional Facility, and one formerly incarcerated student.

After providing an overview of the project and a reminder of the process and timeline, Vera staff presented a brief overview of the current educational offerings. The information presented was based on consultation with the IA DOC education director. Additionally, a spreadsheet – developed by Vera and completed by IA DOC staff – was shared to provide everyone a more in-depth assessment of all education and support services offered by IA DOC. Vera then led a discussion of the following questions:

- What questions does it raise?

- What opportunities do you see?
- What would you like to know more about?

Vera staff divided the working group into small groups based on areas of expertise and interest according to five categories: partnerships, educational pathways, funding, quality instruction and academic support, and reentry supports.

Each group was tasked with assessing the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities of the current system within each of their respective categories (threats were purposely excluded to help think outside the box and not be limited by external threats and barriers). Group members were provided a checklist tool (*see Appendix B*) that led members through a series of outcome statements. Each group was tasked with answering yes or no to each outcome statement and providing more detail to explain their answer. Prompting questions included:

- What are you already doing that you can check off?
- What's missing from this tool that exists in IA?
- What's working well?
- What could be better?
- Where do you see opportunity for strengthening, expanding, or innovating?
- What's not here that you would like to exist?

After 30 minutes the small groups reconvened as a large group to walk through the entire checklist tool together and report out their findings and come to consensus about the current state of postsecondary program offerings in IA's prisons in each of these areas (*responses to each of the outcome statements can be found in Appendix B*).

Prioritization

In May 2019, Vera convened the working group again. For this meeting, Vera staff had prepared a list of nine proposed "projects" which were based on a combination of the previously used checklist tool and feedback received in meeting two (*see Appendix B*). Presenting the material in this manner was an effort to facilitate the group in processing a large amount of information in a short time.

First, Vera led the working group through a review of the previous meeting and offered an opportunity to provide any new feedback. Next, Vera staff presented the nine projects with an explanation about how and why they were developed. While Vera had done a first rough cut of grouping elements into projects, staff explicitly stated that these proposed projects were completely open to changes from the group. The group was then divided into random pairs that were each assigned one of the nine projects to review. With the number of participants available, each of the nine projects had at least one pair examining it, with projects one through three having two pairs examining them. Pairs were given 15 minutes to examine the proposed project and answer the following questions:

- Can this realistically be done?
- What resources (people, technology or policies) are needed to accomplish this?
- How long will it take?
- Are there elements from other projects that should be added? Taken out?

- On a scale of 1-10 (1 being highest priority), rate the priority level of the elements within the project.

After 15 minutes, each pair was given the option to either continue examining the project they were assigned or move on to another project of their choice. Most chose to remain working on the assigned project but a few chose another project to examine. During this time, Vera staff placed nine large "sticky notes" around the room which had been previously prepared with large print versions of each of the nine projects.

After 15 more minutes, pairs were asked to reconvene to report out their findings. One Vera staff member facilitated while the other took notes on the large pages which had been placed around the room. One project at a time, each group was asked to report out by answering the following questions:

- What are your answers from the small group exercise (see above)?
- Which project did you choose after completing the assigned project? Why?
- Was the project too much? Would you add to it? Would you break it up?
- What resource problems do you think you would run into?
- What would it take to get this done?

Feedback from the larger group was then considered for each project. About 5-10 minutes was spent contemplating each of the nine projects. This process repeated until all nine projects had been considered. This process resulted in one moderate modification to one project and several minor modifications to a few other projects (i.e. elements of project 7 were combined with project 2).

Next, each person was provided one green "sticky dot" and three yellow "sticky dots." Everyone was instructed to use the green sticky dot to vote for their favorite project and use the three yellow dots to vote for their three favorite elements within any of the nine projects. They were allowed to either spread the three dots evenly over three choices, put two on one and one on another, or place all three on one choice – therefore "stacking" their vote. What resulted was a visual and numerical representation of the large group's preferences. After the voting closed, Vera tallied the results and led a discussion of the priorities until the working group reached consensus that the voting outcomes accurately represented the views of the participants.

(*See Appendix B for voting results and notes from the assessment and prioritization meetings.*)

Appendix A - Contributors

Abby Underberg, Program Director, Iowa Central Community College
Alex Harris, Iowa Department of Education
Andrew Beckett, University of Iowa
Beth Townsend, Director, Iowa Workforce Development
Brenda Hampton, Iowa Medical and Classification Center (DOC)
Carla Andorf, Kirkwood Community College
Chad Shearon, Student, Grinnell College
Christie Linsey, Iowa Central Community College
Dan Craig, Acting Director, Iowa Department of Corrections
Dawn Hansen, Iowa Department of Corrections
Deborah Yuskis-Mulch, South Central Community College
Emily Guenther, Grinnell College
Heather Erwin, University of Iowa
Katrina Carter, Iowa Department of Corrections
Kevin Robbins, Iowa Department of Corrections
Jennie Doke-Kerns, Des Moines Area Community College
Jim Kersten, VP of Governmental Affairs, Iowa Central Community College
Julie Spicer, Iowa College Aid
Katrina Carter, Iowa Department of Corrections
Kevin Robins, Iowa Department of Corrections
Kris Weitzell, Iowa Department of Corrections
Libby Woods, Iowa Western Community College
Linsey Christie, Iowa Central Community College
Logan Shine, Education Policy Staff, Iowa Governor's Office
Mark Wiederspan, Iowa College Aid
Marsha Kidd, Des Moines Area Community College
Michael Witt, Division Manager, Iowa Workforce Development
Nate Ristow, Criminal Justice Policy Staff, Iowa Governor's Office
Neale Adams, Dean of CTE, Iowa Central Community College
Pat Steele, Central Iowa Works
Richelle Seitz, Reentry Coordinator, Iowa Workforce Development
Rob Denson, Des Moines Area Community College
Robert Johnson, Warden, Fort Dodge Correctional Facility
Ryan West, Iowa Workforce Development
Sandra Smith, Director of Education, Iowa Department of Corrections
Sally Kreamer, Iowa Department of Corrections

Appendix B - Project Proposals, Notes, and Vote Tallies

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
PROJECT 1: FORMALIZING PARTNERSHIPS **MOUs and Contracts** The system has developed a written memorandum of understanding (MOU) that is clear, intentional, and honest about shared goals and each institution's roles and responsibilities. The MOU addresses what is needed (programmatically and logistically) to support a high-quality postsecondary education program in a correctional environment. **Policies and Procedures** The partners have developed and updated policies, procedures, and processes that promote and strengthen the partnership to support postsecondary education programs. **Quality Assurance and Reporting** College partners report at least quarterly on aggregate (non-personally identifiable) student achievement and accomplishments, operational concerns, and shared goals. **Regular Meetings** Partners have regularly scheduled meetings (e.g., at least quarterly) between college and corrections representatives to foster relationship and trust-building,	Regarding MOU's: Contracts in place for all CCs but need MOUs with other partners (Universities). *NOTE: Does this relate to CCs doing workforce or CCs doing other postsecondary programs?* Regarding Roles and Responsibilities: MOUs need to distinguish roles between DOC and college. Regarding Policies: Most policies are in place but not many for postsecondary – usually these programs are lumped in w/ broader education policy. This could be revisited. Regarding Data Entry: MOUs should designate who will complete for postsecondary programs. Regarding Quality Assurance: reports are required quarterly – postsecondary are not currently included.	Regarding priorities: MOUs and regular meetings were considered top priorities; policies and procedures were secondary Regarding formalizing partnerships: Would a central coordinator be needed to facilitate formalizing the partnerships, coordinate meetings, etc.? If so, which agency would be responsible? Regarding MOUs: Some are already in place, many are in the works Regarding policies and procedures: these would become part of or come out of MOUs Regarding regular meetings: leadership team needs to meet monthly; coordinator reports to leadership team	10 overall 8 votes for MOUs and contracts 5 votes for regular meetings 1 vote for a central coordinator

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
engage in ongoing planning, and troubleshoot emerging issues and challenges. **External Communications** College and corrections partners have a plan to share program goals and successes with relevant stakeholders such as college and corrections leadership, legislators, the media and general public.	Regarding Meetings: According to correctional education standards, 4 meetings annually must take place (focused on foundational education, staff development, academic needs, standards, teaching strategies). Structure hasn't been applied to postsecondary as much. Regarding External Communication: Plans exist but not shared as much as they could be among partners. Colleges do it informally, but an opportunity exists for more coordination		
PROJECT 2: STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND REENTRY SUPPORT SERVICES **Intake** Potential students are assessed for educational needs and interests at system intake. **Student Recruitment** The system has materials available to students in classrooms and living units as well as online for corrections staff, faculty, friends, and/or family members that clearly articulate educational options, enrollment and withdraw dates, eligibility requirements, career pathways, and policies, rights, and responsibilities.	Regarding Intake: Incarcerated students may learn about postsecondary options if they are in Life Skills, or Reentry. They may not otherwise. Regarding Recruitment: Information about postsecondary options is not as "publicly" available as it needs to be. Staff need to be made more aware of what programs exist and their benefits. Potential students also need to do know about these programs.	Reentry counseling and post-incarceration education support were added to this project and were originally part of project 7 (RENAMED - FORMERLY POSTSECONDARY PREPERATION) Regarding priorities: Intake was considered a lower priority than the others Regarding intake: perhaps could be done at intake with education staff; need to think more broadly than only recruiting students at	6 votes overall 9 votes for student recruitment 5 votes for reentry counseling 4 votes for CCs making changes to get buy-in from college

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
Developmental Instruction Students have access to developmental or adult basic education courses that directly prepare them for college-level credit-bearing work. Instruction prepares students for different pathways in college-level work either while incarcerated or after release. **Reentry Counseling** • Education providers have facility-based coordinators who are available to answer students' questions about enrollment and planning outside of class time. • Educational institutions provide students with assistance around issues of enrollment, transferring credits to postsecondary institutions after release, including assistance in submitting college admissions applications, financial aid forms, federal work study program, and links to post-release student support services on campus, such as tutoring and scholarship information. **Post-Incarceration Education Support** The partners are working with the relevant community-corrections staff, addressing curfews that conflict with evening class times, work requirements that supersede educational goals, supervision meetings that occur during class times, and other rules that can negatively impact academic persistence and success.	Regarding Developmental Instruction: Not enough staff available to serve all students with need Regarding Intake: TABE is done at intake, goes into ICON. Need to check selective service, VA benefits, etc. Regarding Recruitment: Life skills course is a potential contact point for financial aid, selective service, student loan default, etc. Regarding Recruitment: Utilize VA office within each facility to deal with selective service issues. Regarding Preparation: Educational pathway checklist or program map would be beneficial. Regarding Counseling from Colleges: If asked but not formal. In the process of formalizing a system for this. Regarding College Staff who Work in Prison: Staff make attempts to provide support in transitioning to	intake; race/gender equity should be considered at intake process – gap analysis should be done; could ICON track prior college experience; schedule time to do counseling with non-education-involved students Regarding recruitment: start thinking about recruiting students higher up stream (i.e. max security students could be recruited and moved to medium); May need training/materials/collaboration with CCs/Us Regarding resources: need stackable credits Regarding project: could be done and could be started now Regarding reentry counseling: CCs need more buy-in from college faculty/administration/boards/etc.; Need better coordination/info sharing between colleges and DOC;	to support counseling 3 votes for post incarceration education supports 1 vote for intake 1 vote for developmental instruction

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
	campus, but could do more if they had more capacity. Regarding Counseling: Education coordinators often play this role. Several sites have reentry coordinators. Regarding Post-Incarceration Education Support: Informal arrangements have been made with community corrections, but nothing is formalized or systematic. Some parole offices are better than others at addressing this. People are paroled – most often – to the communities they came from rather than communities where opportunities exist. Regarding College Information in Reentry: Education presence does not exist within reentry world – needs to be developed. Colleges have only done outreach about steering students away from careers where a background would prevent them from working. Regarding Connecting Students with Campus Supports: Starting to	Regarding resources needed: time/staff from CCs; Time from DOC Need better career connections w/ wages, hiring info, etc.	

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
	do more of this, but does not exist consistently or at scale		
PROJECT 3: PROGRAM QUALITY AND STUDENT SUPPORTS **Academic Counseling** Partners provide academic support, financial aid information, and career advising that are specifically directed to students in prison. This includes a discussion of postsecondary options available to them during and after prison as well as counseling on how to pay for additional schooling. **Postsecondary Transfer Credits** • The educational institution offers credit-bearing courses that are transferable to colleges in the community. • The educational institution offers credit-bearing courses that build progressively (i.e., "stackable credits") so that students may attain certificates and then be able to apply those credits to associate and bachelor's degrees. • The educational institution has articulation agreements ensuring credits can be transferred from in-prison courses to community-based postsecondary institutions. **Instructor Training**	Regarding Academic Counseling: Even at Fort Dodge, where college exists, there isn't enough outreach to current students about these supports. Regarding Prison Transfers: Somewhat hampered but structure is in place to hold students for programs. Regarding Postsecondary Transfer Credits: Some facilities offer credit-bearing courses and stackable certificates but not all. Vocational are stackable but not always for college credit Regarding Training: Yes, but training is focused on corrections – not correctional education Regarding Transfer Credits: How to collect and advise on credits from multiple schools • Is there a completion college in Iowa? • ACE credits	Student transfer coordination is a previous outcome statement that was removed because everything that can be done is already being done Regarding priorities: all are considered a top priority Regarding resources: can CCs do academic counseling on a quarterly basis? Regarding instructor training: CCs do some training but more resources are needed for DOC staff Regarding transfer credits: more info needed from CCs	0 votes for overall project 7 votes for academic counseling 3 votes for postsecondary transfer credits

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
Training is available for teaching staff entering correctional environments for the first time that focuses on the unique experience of teaching in prison, communicating with officers and students, and the process of dealing with issues as they arise. **Tutoring** Students are provided access to tutoring.			
PROJECT 4: Race and Gender Equity The education provider has a plan to ensure racial and gender parity in enrollment practices and access to high-wage high demand educational programming.	Regarding Policy: New policy exists to address racial disparities more broadly – and education will be included. Regarding Practice: Needs to be looked at. Jobs are looked at but not education – but will be now.	Can be done, already have pieces in place with existing policy Step 1: assess Step 2: set goals Step 3: develop a plan Regarding gender: what programs are available for women?	0 votes overall
PROJECT 6: FACILITY SUPPORT **Technology Access** • Students and instructors have access to technology in the classroom appropriate to their field of study.	Regarding Technology Access: Not equivalent. Where it does exist, it is not consistent. On Technology: More meetings between colleges, DOC, and IT at DOC are needed, especially around meeting education needs of students.	Former Project 5 (student leadership) was combined with project 6. Both elements of the original project 5 were considered a top priority Technology access was considered a top priority	4 votes overall 12 votes for technology access (5 under project 6

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
• Instructors have access to internet and communication tools either in their classroom or in an office at the correctional institution. • The software, hardware, tools and equipment are equivalent to what is available on campus or in the workplace. • Education providers, corrections education leaders and corrections IT leaders have regular meetings to discuss current and future technology needs. **Library Access** • Students have access to academic library and other research materials. • Students have access to online (internet) resources either directly or through an offline solution. • Courses at both pre-college and college-level include instruction in the use of libraries and other research materials. **Study Lab Access** • Postsecondary students have access to a study lab. • Postsecondary students have access to a study lab that includes computer access.	Regarding Libraries: These exist but not intended for postsecondary research. Materials must be brought in. Regarding Study Labs: Inconsistent. Student computer lab came after postsecondary program came. No space to study unless it is a specific structured time that requires a call-out. Regarding Planning and Implementation: Happens on an individual informal basis but not formal. Regarding Tutoring: Yes, but not paid sufficiently. Training is informal.	Yes, there is a library but need money to improve Yes, there is study lab, but space is limited Resources needed: time; technology; facility space; books; coordinator Some labs exist or are in the process of being built Ideas for increasing student input: Develop an advisory council; Survey students Regarding tutoring: wage of 56 cents/hr is not competitive Regarding student leadership: Important to include lifers because they become champions of the program Regarding technology: leadership needs to coordinate technology issues	and 7 under project 8)

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
• If a study lab is not available, students have a dedicated place to study in living units or education areas. **STUDENT LEADERSHIP** **In Planning and Implementation** • Partners have incorporated students' voices in program planning through student advisory boards, councils, or other means. **In Tutoring** • Incarcerated tutors receive training by the educational institution in effective tutoring techniques. • If these are paid positions, incarcerated tutors are paid a rate that is competitive with other skilled jobs (i.e. prison industries) within the facility.			
PROJECT 7: EDUCATION AND REENTRY **Welcoming Campuses** The educational institution works to make the campus community more welcoming to formerly incarcerated students. • The educational institution supports peer networks for formerly incarcerated students on college campuses to promote pro-social relationships and provide a means to connect with	Regarding Recruiting New Students in Reentry: Outreach form colleges to reentry to recruit students Regarding Admission Barriers: U of I does permit and encourages formerly incarcerated students to apply. Grinnell uses common application (which checkbox for felony may have been removed).		0 votes (votes ended up moving to project 2)

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
others who have faced similar challenges in returning home and continuing their education. • The institution provides opportunities for leadership development and mentoring. • The educational institution provides training and development opportunities to student services staff and career counseling staff to increase their capacity for working with formerly incarcerated students. • The educational institution connects students to existing student support resources on campus (e.g., food assistance, transit support, book vouchers, on-campus jobs, tutoring). • The educational institution permits and encourages formerly incarcerated students to apply on campus. • Admissions criteria do not exclude formerly incarcerated applicants.	Regarding welcoming campuses: need website; need training/buy-in from other campus staff		
PROJECT 8: EXPANDING PROGRAMMING Consider how to best serve people in minimum security, maximum security, and as they move to different facilities within the correction system.	Regarding Minimum Security: NC Pathways and DMACC jail program models were discussed.	Technology was added to this project (as a means of expanding) therefore splitting technology related votes between 2 projects. Therefore, votes were counted as being part of Project 6.	0 votes

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes		May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
			Regarding transfers, most people thought students should be transferred (seamlessly) to facilities where programming is already available rather than creating programming in those places	
PROJECT 9: FUNDING The educational institution and/or the correctional system utilizes the following funding to expand opportunities for postsecondary education:	**Already Have?**	**Comments**		2 votes overall 4 yellow stickers (meant for individual elements) were placed at the top and seemed to be intended for the overall project
GI Bill funding (for incarcerated veterans)	No	Some know it is available but have not figured out how to use it		1 vote
State enrollment allocations (Full time equivalent student enrollments for publicly funded institutions)	Yes	CC funding is heavily weighted towards state funds and tuition, very little local money. Also,		

Projects and Outcomes	April assessment meeting notes	May prioritization meeting notes	Votes
	funding formula for FTEs has not changed in years which makes tuition main source of new revenue.		
State Financial Aid	Yes/No	Programs exist but not tailored to incarcerated people. Federal guidelines are usually followed – which ends up disqualifying students.	2 votes
State K-12 funding	No	Contracted	

Appendix C – Programing Landscape - Final Version Pending IA DOC Approval