



Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program®

Perspectives on Ethical Inquiry

Produced by The Inside-Out Center's Evaluation and Research Committee

Leading the conversation about program evaluation and research concerning the people and organizations involved with transformative, higher education in correctional facilities.

November 14, 2016

Table of Contents

Open Letter from the Inside-Out Evaluation and Research Committee	3
Executive Summary	4
Introduction	5
Mission Statement of the Inside-Out Evaluation and Research Committee	5
A Call to Deepen the Conversation about Program Evaluation and Research	5
Assessments of Program Processes and Outcomes	6
Background	6
<i>Perspectives on Ethical Inquiry</i> vis-a-vis Federal Regulations on Human Subjects	7
Existing Federal Regulations Concerning the Protection of Human Subjects	7
Overview of Applicability	8
1. Respect for Persons	8
2. Beneficence	10
3. Justice	11
Tensions, Constraints, and Ethical Dilemmas to Anticipate	12
Conclusion	14
Contributors	16

Open Letter from the Inside-Out Evaluation and Research Committee

To the Evaluation and Research Community:

The following document was created by The Inside-Out Center's Evaluation and Research Committee. Members include trained Inside-Out instructors from numerous social and behavioral science disciplines with substantial evaluation and research expertise, as well as staff from The Inside-Out Center.

Perspectives on Ethical Inquiry is intended to be a resource for people who seek to engage in research about or with the Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program[®]. This document may be helpful for Inside-Out instructors who are approached by others who propose to study or evaluate aspects of their Inside-Out courses, students, or host institutions. *Perspectives* is also intended to summarize the Center's perspective for experienced instructors who wish to evaluate some aspect of the Inside-Out teaching, learning, or hosting experiences.

In the following pages, we open with the mission statement of the Inside-Out Evaluation & Research Committee, provide a brief summary of the committee history, and discuss ways in which existing Human Subjects requirements—foundational to the Belmont Report—are infused with enhanced meaning in the context of program evaluation and research on the Inside-Out Program.

Thank you for taking time to consider *Perspectives* in the context of your preparation for teaching or inquiry on Inside-Out. We believe that the philosophy underlying the Inside-Out pedagogy has much to offer proposals that assess this program, as well as the impacts on the contexts where it takes place and/or the people who participate in it. If you have questions, would like information about prior program evaluation and research, or would like to be put in touch with a member of the Evaluation and Research Committee, please contact Tricia Way, the Associate Director of The Inside-Out Center (tricia.way@insideoutcenter.org, 215-204-6704, Suite 331, MB 66-10, 1810 Liacouras Walk, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA).

Sincerely,

The Inside-Out Evaluation and Research Committee 2016-2017

Sarah Allred, Berry College
Nina Johnson, Swarthmore College
Keshia Moore, Drew University
Jim Nolan, West Virginia University
Dan O'Connell, University of Delaware
Ernest Quimby, Howard University
Michelle Ronda, Borough of Manhattan CC
Jerry Stahler, Temple University
Barb Toews, University of Washington, Tacoma
Tricia Way, Associate Director, Inside-Out Center

Executive Summary

The Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program® creates a dynamic partnership between institutions of higher learning and correctional systems in order to deepen the conversation about, and transform our approaches to understanding crime, justice, freedom, inequality, and other issues of social concern. The Program brings college students and other non-incarcerated people together with incarcerated people to study as peers in a seminar behind prison walls. The core of the Inside-Out Program is a semester-long academic course, meeting once a week, through which 15 to 18 “outside” students and the same number of “inside” students attend class together inside prison. All participants read a variety of texts and write several papers. During class sessions, students discuss issues in small and large groups. In the final month, students typically work together on a class project. Many stakeholders—from higher education faculty, to corrections professionals, to funders—are interested in gathering evidence of the impact of Inside-Out programs on participants. We offer this set of perspectives on research and evaluation of Inside-Out in the spirit of encouraging ethical inquiry into this work.

The Evaluation and Research Committee of The Inside-Out Center was asked to craft a perspective on program evaluation and research that reflects the mission, vision, and spirit of the Inside-Out education experience. The purpose of this type of learning is to study together in a manner that enables participants to encounter each other, especially across social barriers, as collaborative learners, and to facilitate meaningful reflection and deep learning. Inside-Out courses are designed to create transformative learning opportunities that emphasize dialogue and invite participants to take leadership in addressing crime, justice, and other issues of concern. From this base, the Evaluation and Research Committee offers this document as a means to help frame how program evaluation and research can echo the core features of the Inside-Out program.

The perspectives shared in this document align fully with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations designed to establish basic protections for all human research participants, and specifically those pertinent to program evaluation or research involving people who are incarcerated (45 CFR Part 46, Subpart C). In addition, these perspectives are intended to elevate the spirit of the Inside-Out mission and vision for those who propose program evaluation or research on Inside-Out. In offering these perspectives, we hope that the essential preparations for program evaluation or research—training in research with human participants, Inside-Out instructor training, along with a firm grasp of the Inside-Out mission and vision—culminate in protocol that exceed human subjects requirements in ways that honor the general issues raised here. Thus, *Perspectives* is offered less as a practical or instructional guideline for inquiry, but more so as a general call to evaluators/researchers to be mindful of how they approach the endeavor of researching and evaluating Inside-Out and other higher education programs where participants include people who are incarcerated.

Program evaluation and research pursued in the spirit of the *Perspectives* will contain a variety of specific features, but taken together, the Committee hopes such projects challenge traditional methodologies that may reflect destructive, existing oppressive power structures within academic and correctional institutions.

Introduction

Mission Statement of the Inside-Out Evaluation and Research Committee

The Evaluation and Research Committee has three interrelated goals. Taken together, these represent the mission of the Committee:

- To serve as an advisory body to The Inside-Out Center on the directions of and priorities for program evaluation and research;
- To serve as an advisory body to scholars interested in conducting program evaluation or research on Inside-Out; and
- To form working groups that will do project-oriented work that will assist in the committee's advisory role.

A Call to Deepen the Conversation about Program Evaluation and Research

The Evaluation and Research Committee was asked to craft a perspective on program evaluation and research that reflects the mission, vision, and spirit of the Inside-Out education experience. This learning experience is grounded in a pedagogy that brings people together, inside and outside of prison. The purpose of this type of learning is to study together in a manner that enables participants to encounter each other, especially across social barriers, as collaborative learners, and to facilitate meaningful reflection and deep learning. Inside-Out courses are designed to create transformative learning opportunities that emphasize dialogue and invite participants to take leadership in addressing crime, justice, and other issues of concern. From this base, the Evaluation and Research Committee offers this document to help frame how program evaluation and research can echo the core features of the Inside-Out program.

The perspectives shared in this document align fully with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations designed to establish basic protections for all human research participants, and specifically those pertinent to program evaluation or research involving people who are incarcerated (45 CFR Part 46, Subpart C). In addition, these perspectives are intended to elevate the spirit of the Inside-Out mission and vision for those who propose program evaluation or research on Inside-Out. In offering these perspectives, we hope that the essential preparations for program evaluation or research—training in research with human participants, Inside-Out instructor training, along with a firm grasp of the Inside-Out mission and vision—culminate in protocol that exceed human subjects requirements in ways that honor the general issues raised here. Thus, *Perspectives* is offered less as a practical or instructional guideline for inquiry, but more so as a general call to evaluators/researchers to be mindful of how they approach the endeavor of evaluating Inside-Out and other higher education programs where participants include people who are incarcerated.

Assessments of Program Processes and Outcomes

The Inside-Out Center invites and engages in program evaluations for a variety of reasons. To begin, Inside-Out seeks to stay apprised of the quality of interactions and relationships with various stakeholders of the program, maintain academic standards, and engage in strategic program development that can be incorporated in instructor training. Based on findings from existing inquiries, feedback from students, instructors, and institutional administrations, the Inside-Out program continues to create a transformative post-secondary learning experience that emphasizes collaboration, dialogue, and academic skill and capacity development. In addition, program assessments and student evaluations reveal that the program creates structured opportunities to formally reflect upon, engage in sustained dialogue about, and take leadership in confronting crime, justice, and other related issues of social concern.

Anecdotal and program evaluation reports of outcomes in these settings consistently suggest educational benefits and often transformative effects on participants. As more instructors are trained, and as the number of courses offered across the country increases, there is a growing need to obtain more evidence about how the program is operating, how it is affecting student and host participants, and where there are areas of possible improvement.

Background

The Inside-Out Evaluation and Research Committee was organized in response to the need to understand characteristics of program participants, where the program is implemented, how the program is implemented across settings, and the effects of the program on Inside and Outside students, instructors, and host (i.e., academic and correctional) institutions. The Committee was also convened to fulfil three related purposes, as noted in the Mission Statement above: 1) to serve Inside-Out as an advisory body concerning the directions of and priorities for program evaluation and research; 2) to function as an advisory body to scholars interested in conducting program evaluation on Inside-Out; and 3) to form working groups that do project-oriented work that will assist in the Committee's advisory role to the Center (e.g., create logic models of classes, think tanks, etc.).

The Committee was formed in 2007. Now, as then, the committee is comprised of faculty trained as Inside-Out instructors and with extensive combined expertise in program evaluation and research, as well as staff from The Inside-Out Center.

The Committee convenes via conference call as needed and annually for in-person, lengthier meetings to work on ongoing projects and revisit priorities. Members seek to foster effective communications between the Center and interested evaluators/researchers in a variety of ways. *Perspectives* is one such mechanism, as well as member rotations in the capacity of community liaison. When Committee members serve as liaison, they operate as point person for inquiries to the Center from the community regarding existing scholarship, reports, instruments, etc. that may be accessible but relatively difficult to find.

Perspectives on Ethical Inquiry vis-a-vis Federal Regulations on Human Subjects

Committee members developed *Perspectives* for multiple purposes summarized above. In what follows, *Perspectives* selectively addresses existing Federal guidelines on research with human subjects and how the mission and vision of Inside-Out can be reflected in program evaluation and research practices. What follows is not intended to be exhaustive, but as illustrative of the meaningful applications of the Inside-Out philosophy in the design and implementation phases of program evaluation and research.

Existing Federal Regulations Concerning the Protection of Human Subjects

The following section provides a discussion of the Inside-Out perspective on ethical inquiry and frames the focus around the tenets of the Federal guidelines for research involving humans set forth by the Department of Health and Human Services that concern research involving human subjects in general and people who are incarcerated in particular. These Federal guidelines were signed into law under the National Research Act (Pub. L. 93-348) on July 12, 1974. For reference, readers are directed to the following link for the full text of these guidelines:

<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/documents/OHRPRegulations.pdf>

The discussion of *Perspectives* is intentionally crafted around three overarching, ethical principles identified in the Belmont Report of 1979. The Belmont Report provides a summary of the basic principles that underlie required conduct as specified in the National Research Act (Pub. L. 93-348). The three main principles include respect of persons, beneficence, and justice.¹

The Inside-Out mission, vision, and pedagogy inform the Center's interest and concern with the nature and form of program evaluation and research in a variety of ways. First, as a reminder, the program's elements privilege the significance and role of dialogue and balance among the contributions of students. Next, the program offers training activities that highlight the effect of a composite of disparities and power positions for learners. Also, the program pedagogy is sensitive to the history of egregious ethics violations committed in the context of research on or about people who are incarcerated (e.g., Hornblum, 1999). Taken together, the Center encourages inquiries that ultimately maintain the integrity of the learning experience as well as the established trust among students and instructors that result, in part, from fidelity in program implementation. *Perspectives* is a key mechanism in this effort.

In this manner, *Perspectives* carries the Center's interests and concerns forward and offers a translation of program tenets through the lens of program evaluations and research ethics. The examples provided here include, but are not limited to, how to talk about, relate to, speak of, create genuine opportunities for voluntary participation, and structure inquiries concerning Inside-Out students, processes, and institutions. Overall, *Perspectives* may complement instructor training, and offer investigators the general elements of the Inside-Out nomenclature, value orientation, and

¹ In July of 1974, the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research was created with the enactment of the National Research Act (Pub. L. 93-348). The Belmont Report (1979) summarizes the basic ethical principles identified by the Commission in the course of its deliberations.

norms of Inside-Out as they relate to evaluation and research. Inside-Out anticipates that evaluators/researchers will respect the spirit and nature of the Center's values, norms, practices, and beliefs that underpin the Inside-Out program and pedagogy. At their core is a deep and unyielding recognition of the inalienable right of all humans to be treated consistently and equally with respect, to be heard, and to be recognized as someone capable of sharing valid, positive contributions to the social milieu.

For clarity, the committee uses the following working definitions of research and evaluation. *Research* means a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, *designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge*. Activities which meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this document, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities. *Evaluation* refers to a systematic strategy for collecting, analyzing, and using information *to answer basic questions about a program*. Evaluation is a strategy that helps to identify effective and ineffective services, processes, practices, and approaches.

Overview of Applicability

As noted above, the Inside-Out *Perspectives on Ethical Inquiry* builds upon the three "basic ethical principles" identified in the Belmont Report as cornerstone values of good research: respect of persons, beneficence, and justice. Inside-Out affirms these principles, and *Perspectives* offers examples of how such principles may be applied in the context of Inside-Out program evaluation or research. These principles refer "to those general judgments that serve as a basic justification for the many particular ethical prescriptions and evaluations of human actions," are "generally accepted in our cultural tradition," and "are particularly relevant to the ethics of research involving human subjects" (United States, 1978).

The following discussion of the applicability of these principles to research and evaluation with and about Inside-Out includes excerpts from the Belmont Report.

1. Respect for Persons

Both Inside-Out and Federal regulations emphasize respect for the individual as a paramount concern. According to the Belmont Report of 1979, respect involves acknowledging that all humans have the right to act on their own behalf as autonomous agents. People who have a diminished cognitive or developmental ability to act on their own behalf in this manner are to be protected.

Inside-Out strives to treat all individuals and institutions involved with the highest degree of consideration and respect. To demonstrate this value, investigators are encouraged to adopt practical applications that have a meaningful analytical role. For example, consider whether there are analytical purposes for comparing participants (e.g., Inside versus Outside students) or institutions (colleges versus prisons) and whether such comparisons are grounded in a substantive or a theoretical rationale related to anticipated differences. To do otherwise, suggests that the analytical categories used for comparison are warranted due to some underlying, overarching –albeit poorly measured— difference. For example, a study that compares Inside students with Outside students on attitudes

toward law enforcement officers conveys, albeit inadvertently, that there is a *prima facie* case for casting Inside and Outside students as inherently different, divided, or separate.

Inside-Out recognizes that differences between human beings are an interesting and natural part of social life and are a common object of inquiry in the pursuit of knowledge about human social behavior. Also, such differences may be identified and utilized effectively for purposes of sifting through additional variables which result from or have an impact on participation in Inside-Out. However, the program is concerned that the atheoretical use of labels may prevent evaluators/researchers from recognizing potential similarities, complexities of identity, and nuances of meaning in study information.

As in the program's instructional settings, the Center is hopeful that people who pursue research and program evaluations will pursue protocols whose elements convey an intent and volition to deconstruct presumptions about difference that have the potential to reinstitute stereotypes, social distancing, and othering.²

Next, the guideline of "respect for persons" may also take into account the use of class time, regardless if the researcher is present. More respectful research strategies would have minimal or no negative impact on the structure, content, or overall flow of Inside-Out course sessions as would normally be carried out if there were no research activity being conducted or researcher present. Course sessions are designed to build upon levels of trust and mutuality, and contain important, pre-planned templates for interaction, learning, and reflection. Evaluators/Researchers must be cognizant that their study interventions may alter or disrupt class sessions, and therefore should avoid activities which may detract from the quality experience deserved by those who are present for the purpose of learning, not to be studied. Likewise, observational methods may warrant additional consideration, to the extent that they may involve the presence of people who are involved with research but create distractions due to their presence. Evaluators/Researchers must anticipate and avoid undue inconveniences that their study may impose on prison staff or procedures.

It is hoped that program evaluations and other inquiries have the net effect of facilitating the empowerment and personal independence of participants, to the extent possible, as participants will likely receive little else in return for their time. Empowerment, at minimum, may include the genuine feeling that people as study participants have contributed meaningfully to the advancement of knowledge about an important topic, process, or issue under investigation. As opposed to participants feeling like subjects under study, an empowering experience can allow and encourage participants to speak as change agents. Inside-Out expects that Informed Consent will include a clear discussion of the ways and means by which participants may or may not benefit or be affected by the research. Autonomy, at minimum, includes the realization that people feel they have a sincere opportunity to decline or accept the opportunity to participate in a study, or to withdraw at any time with no fear of repercussion from any source.

As an opportunity for empowerment, evaluators/researchers may wish to obtain input from

² By "othering" we mean to single out an individual or group as different, often used to exclude the voice of the targeted person or group or to implicitly orient conversation or dialogue in a way that dismisses possible complexities of identity, thought, and perspective.

multiple sources (e.g., Inside Students, Outside Students, staff) concerning methodology and project design. In addition, they may engage participants (students, staff, etc.) as co-creators of knowledge as well as experts in developing aspects of the study, providing perspective on ethical issues or concerns, interpreting results, or discerning ways in which the study may be most successful without jeopardizing the prison environment. When possible, participants and co-creators of research may be offered the option to receive the results of the study.

Lastly, in addition to typical confidentiality requirements, Inside-Out encourages evaluators/researchers to anticipate other possible threats to a “respect for persons.” Requests or requirements for confidentiality in correctional institutions should be taken with all due seriousness and attention because incarcerated persons have limited control over their living environment as well as the people with whom they interact. The choice to participate in research or the information shared by an incarcerated participant or correctional staff may involve factors that the evaluator/researcher may not be aware of or privy to, such as unintended effects or repercussions upon the participant or others in the institution. In addition, research may create situations in which research participants can be singled out or identified based on recorded comments, even if first or last name is not used.

These heightened threats to confidentiality are particularly possible when the evaluator/researcher is drawing information from a small sample size. Under such circumstances, it is ideal for the evaluator/researcher to be constantly attentive and responsive to the complicated challenges of maintaining confidentiality and the well-being of participants in all stages of the research process, in response to requests by both individual participants and administration of the facility in which research is taking place or is based.

2. Beneficence

Inside-Out affirms the Federal mandate to be concerned with intentional acts of goodness and kindness to persons involved in the research process. According to the Belmont Report of 1979, beneficence involves situations wherein evaluators/researchers are expected to go "above and beyond" formal requirements to maximize benefits and minimize harms to study participants. Although opportunities for implementing beneficence may not always be clear, such actions often involve voluntarily thoughtfulness and serious forethought about the pros and cons of study participation from the perspectives of both the participants and the broader community.

In the context of Inside-Out evaluation/research, one application of the principle of beneficence relates to the program's language policy. The Inside-Out language policy is consistent with the language policies adopted by some scholarly journals (e.g., *Disability and Society*) that are sensitive to how the use of language may position or frame groups of people in particular discourses. Although Inside-Out believes that evaluators/researchers would never knowingly submit articles which contain offensive, disabling, or prejudicial language, it recognizes that in the implementation of efforts to describe a study it is not always apparent when language may be problematic.

As a general guide, evaluators/researchers are encouraged to examine labels used to represent analytical categories for the possibility that they hold pejorative or inaccurate meanings. Evaluation reports or research articles that contain derogatory words or labels, even if these words are based upon professional or legal classifications, are inconsistent with the value perspective and philosophy of

Inside-Out. Words such as "inmate," "criminal," "offender," "prisoner" or "ex-con" offer some clarity in their use, but tend to create social and psychological distances between individuals and social groups and undermine the overall Inside-Out pedagogical goals of dissolving barriers. Given Inside-Out's explicit goal of reducing social distance and othering, it is advised that evaluators/researchers refrain from using terms that label or mark people using words that have the potential to create the psychological salience of a difference and ultimately stereotypes and prejudices. Inside-Out recognizes that there is no universal consensus as to what is and is not offensive, disabling, or othering, but encourages evaluators/researchers to demonstrate personal and cultural sensitivity in their use of language. However, as of May 2016, the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs has implemented agency-wide policy to avoid terms that further stigmatize the incarcerated and formerly incarcerated (see Mason, 2016). The use of person-first language is preferred (e.g., a person who is incarcerated, people who live in prison, etc.)

3. Justice

In the context of Inside-Out, the concept of justice pertains to the reasonable and balanced consideration of who benefits or is encumbered by program research and evaluation. According to the Belmont Report of 1979, justice involves situations wherein we consider the fairness involved in the distribution of benefit and harm.

In the context of Inside-Out research, one application of the principle of justice relates to the program's preferences for *transparency*. Transparency involves engaging in thorough and clear discussions with all people and groups who may be impacted by research on Inside-Out. Such discussion will, at minimum, pertain to Informed Consent. Inside-Out expects consent to exceed the issuance of a written consent statement to study participants. Rather, Inside-Out wants evaluators/researchers to plan occasions to talk with participants in a genuinely confidential context about any questions or comments that they may have about the research.

Inside-Out understands that at times, it is not feasible or desirable to talk directly with study participants about all aspects of a study (e.g., hypotheses, expected findings). In such instances, Inside-Out anticipates that evaluators/researchers will develop some general form of checks-and-balances procedure for ensuring that participants' rights to privacy and rights-to-know are not compromised. One option may involve participatory research—beginning with proposal development and continuing through report writing—that involves those with evaluation/research expertise as well as expertise on the perspectives of subjects.

Transparency is also a principle of research that relates to the staff and administration of the institutions involved, in particular correctional institutions. Evaluators/researchers must solicit consent and assure that evaluation/research does not compromise the guidelines set forth by the institution. For this reason and more, transparency with the institution is important because evaluators/researchers must be able to form and maintain open lines of communication with facility representatives and establish trust. In addition, the institution may be aware of possible risks or harms to incarcerated participants that may result from participation in evaluation/research.

Tensions, Constraints, and Ethical Dilemmas to Anticipate

Because of the complexity and structure of the Inside-Out program, there are a number of possible tensions or constraints that may be present in undertaking research or program evaluation. In the interest of taking proactive measures to acknowledge and address the unique nature of the program as relates to research, the issues of instructor as evaluator/researcher, methodological concerns, and reporting of findings are addressed below. These specific concerns may not be encountered in all inquiries, nor are these concerns exhaustive of all possibilities that evaluators/researchers much be attentive to. The Committee is willing to serve as an advisory body for evaluators/researchers who find that they have encountered ethical constraints or dilemmas in the course of their evaluation/research that are not covered below.

- A. *Instructor as Evaluator/Researcher* – On occasion, some individuals may desire to teach Inside-Out courses and engage in research or program evaluation involving their own classes. When instructors consider this dual relationship vis-à-vis students, they may reflect upon the perspective of students and their sense of the voluntary nature of the inquiry.

First, standard Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements will, in some instances, address the inherent role conflict that exists when seeking to involve one's own students in evaluation or research. What follows is a non-exhaustive list of points to consider.

1. *Conflict of Interest* – For pedagogical purposes, it may be very useful to collect information or feedback from one's students regarding teaching methods, knowledge of material, or general reactions to the class. However, utilizing students as participants in a formal evaluation/research project has the potential to cause confusion among those students about the teacher role and may result in some people feeling duped about the purpose of the overall course, coerced to participate, or something else. As stated above, IRB's will examine this and may not permit evaluation/research if it is conducted by the instructor of the course. In addition to other considerations, it may be worthwhile to explore the range of available means for ensuring the ability to opt in or opt out of the inquiry anonymously.
2. *Ethical Neutrality* – For individuals who have completed the Inside-Out training and have become instructors, there are likely very strong feelings about the benefits of this type of educational process. Further, there may be anecdotal information that reinforces one's beliefs about the positive effects of Inside-Out courses. As an investigator, it is important to set aside one's personal feelings or judgments so that these will not interfere with being objective, distort observations, or bias any conclusions drawn from the research process.
3. *Responsibility to Scientific Community* – Related to #2 above, it is important to thoroughly and accurately describe and disseminate the research process, findings, and conclusions. Inside-Out is not concerned with the outcome of results, to the extent that they are generated by studies that involve solid methodology and adhere to all Federal regulations and embrace the spirit and intent of the *Perspectives on Ethical Inquiry*.
4. *Specific Methodologies with Ethical Implications*– Less participatory methodologies may lead to special concerns as they relate to inquiry about the Inside-Out program.

- a. *Interviews* - Due to the nature of face-to-face interviews, anonymity is not a viable promise. Thus, confidentiality of participants' personally identifying information is paramount. Prior to conducting interviews (or distributing surveys), carefully consider how the content of the interview/survey may be protected from others who may see the interview taking place, overhear the content of the discussion, or peruse participant answers to survey items. Also, in the transcription process and the reporting of findings, consider applying the Inside-Out practices of first name uses. Last, interviewers would want to be sensitive to the importance of their demeanor during the interview, and be aware of body language, props, speech tone, etc. that may create the ambiance of a therapeutic or interrogative session.
- b. *Observational Research* – While one can take on many different observer “roles” (e.g., complete observer or disguised observer) a likely observer role that one may take in conducting research on the Inside-Out program is that of a “participant observer.” While this role permits for much greater understanding of the process, event, or persons being observed it may also make it more difficult to be completely objective as well as comprehensive in recording, interpreting, and reporting findings. It would thus be important to acknowledge these potential tensions or challenges at the outset of the project.
- c. *Creating Opportunities for Voluntary Participation.* Voluntary participation is complicated when study opportunities are presented to people who have limited ability to decline requests to participate regularly, and who have limited privacy. *Perspectives* invites evaluators/researchers to consider options for how potential subjects may have the ability to take part or decline and maintain their anonymity or confidentiality. For example, perhaps potential student participants can be issued study materials (e.g., surveys with no identifying information requested) in plain envelopes marked with a unique number and then asked to complete the content outside the class session. Provided teachers are unable to associate particular students with the numbered packets, have all students return their packet—whether completed or not—in a subsequent class session. If all students return their packet and someone other than the instructor handles the collection, then subject participation may be anonymous to the instructor.

Conclusion

Multiple constituents will benefit when *Perspectives* is considered prior to and during protocol development and report writing related to program evaluation/research on Inside-Out. First, *Perspectives* sensitizes investigators to the Inside-out mission, vision, and teaching pedagogy. Across these elements, the program reflects a value of co-creators among instructors, inside students, and outside students in the process of learning, a feature compatible with some research methodologies and replicable to varying degrees in the process of program evaluation and inquiry.

Second, *Perspectives* will enhance project outcomes and reporting to the extent it encourages collaboratively pursued and implemented activities. *Perspectives* offers a reminder that, as in collaborative learning, program evaluation/research informed and pursued by multiple, relevant constituents—research experts, trained instructors, students, host representatives, etc.—offers tremendous potential for valid, efficacious insights on programmatic characteristics, processes, outcomes, and areas of needed enhancement. Thus *Perspectives* encourages inquiry that resembles participatory methods (e.g., Participatory Action Research) as much as feasible, a general methodology that is consistent with the Inside-Out pedagogy for learning. Third, *Perspectives* offers a resource for people who need additional information about existing program evaluation and research or have questions related to potential projects.

Next, the Evaluation and Research Committee believes that due diligence in the incorporation of these perspectives will benefit student participants in or institutional hosts for Inside-Out courses. For example, *Perspectives* may contribute positively to an interest in program evaluation that involves transparency and balance in focus. Just as Inside-Out courses privilege equally the insights, contributions, and experiences of all students, so too program evaluations/research on Inside-Out may be equally concerned with impacts on all students or both host facilities (i.e., college/university and correctional facility). In addition, *Perspectives* promotes clearer or more helpful communication between colleges and correctional facilities to the extent that methodologies are considerate of all stakeholders. Program evaluation and research pursued in the spirit of the *Perspectives* will contain a variety of specific features, but taken together, the Committee hopes such projects challenge traditional methodologies that may reflect destructive, existing oppressive power structures within academic and correctional institutions.

Last, *Perspectives* is a means for The Inside-Out Center to reaffirm the inherent value, rights, and agency of people and institutions affiliated with the Inside-Out Program. In the context of program evaluation or research, on behalf of the Center, the Evaluation and Research Committee members extend their appreciation to those who reflect upon and incorporate into their projects the perspectives and issues raised herein.

References

Hornblum, A. M. (1998). *Acres of Skin: Human Experiments at Holmesburg Prison*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jackman, T. (2016, May 4). Guest Post: Justice Dept. agency to alter its terminology for released convicts, to ease reentry. Washington Post. Retrieved from:
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/true-crime/wp/2016/05/04/guest-post-justice-dept-to-alter-its-terminology-for-released-convicts-to-ease-reentry/>

United States. (1978). *The Belmont report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research*. Bethesda, Md.: The Commission. Retrieved from:
<http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/>

Contributors

Inside-Out Center staff:

Lori Pompa, Founder and Executive Director
Tricia Way, Associate Director

Members of the Evaluation and Research Committee (2016-2017):

Sarah Allred, Berry College
Nina Johnson, Swarthmore College
Kesha Moore, Drew University
Jim Nolan, West Virginia University
Dan O'Connell, University of Delaware
Ernest Quimby, Howard University
Michelle Ronda, Borough of Manhattan Community College/CUNY
Jerry Stahler, Temple University
Barb Towes, University of Washington, Tacoma
Tricia Way, Associate Director, Inside-Out Center

Special thanks to the Former Members of the Research Committee who also contributed this document:

Norm Conti, Duquesne University, PA Sociology
Holli Drummond, Western Kentucky University Sociology
Kerry Dunn, University of Pennsylvania Anthropology/Social Work
Michelle Inderbitzen, Oregon State University Sociology
Roger Jarjoura, IUPUI, IN Criminology
Stephanie Knight, Seattle Central Comm. College, WA Sociology
Jamie Martin, Indiana University of PA Criminology
Kathy Mason, Widener University, PA Sociology
Dani McKinney, SUNY, Fredonia Psychology
Kesha Moore, Drew University Sociology
Bahiyah Muhammad, Rutgers University, NJ Criminal Justice
Jim Nolan, West Virginia University Sociology/Anthropology
Janice Ross, Stanford University, CA Drama
Natalie Sokoloff, John Jay College of Criminal Justice/CUNY, NY Sociology/Criminal Justice