

Investigation article

Service Learning in non-formal education in a penitentiary center

Aprendizaje servicio en la educación no formal en un centro penitenciario

Anabel Amores¹: Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Spain.

anabel.amores@ufv.es

Carmen de la Calle Maldonado: Universidad Francisco de Vitoria, Spain.

m.calle@ufv.es

Date of Reception: 29/05/2024

Acceptance Date: 18/07/2024

Publication Date: 28/08/2024

How to cite the article:

Amores, A., & De la Calle Maldonado, C. (2024). Service learning in non-formal education in a penitentiary center [Aprendizaje servicio en la educación no formal en un centro penitenciario]. *European Public & Social Innovation Review*, 9, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.31637/epsir-2024-545>

Abstract:

Introduction: Prisons should promote educational activities in formal and non-formal settings in accordance with the educational model that is carried out in educational contexts other than prisons. **Methodology:** The aim of this proposal is to promote social commitment and the development of skills, values and attitudes necessary for social reintegration. To this end, the aim is to develop this activity in the context of non-formal education within the prison environment, through the application of a service-learning methodology. **Results and Discussion:** Over the course of ten sessions, inmates will be able to work with young people at risk of social exclusion by telling their life stories. In this way, the prisoners will have to work on personal introspection and develop strategies to help prevent delinquency in these young people. **Conclusions:** All this will favour the development of a social commitment in the persons deprived of liberty and therefore, a series of skills and attitudes that will be necessary for their future reintegration.

Keywords: reinsertion; persons deprived of liberty; social commitment; service-learning; social exclusion; non-formal education; active methodologies; penitentiary establishments.

¹ **Corresponding Author:** Anabel Amores. Francisco de Vitoria University (Spain)

Resumen:

Introducción: Los establecimientos penitenciarios deben promover actividades educativas dentro del ámbito formal y no formal acordes al modelo educativo que se lleva a cabo en contextos educativos diferentes al ámbito penitenciario. **Metodología:** El objetivo de esta propuesta es promover en las personas privadas de libertad el compromiso social y el desarrollo de habilidades, valores y actitudes necesarias para la reinserción social. Para ello se pretende desarrollar esta actividad en el contexto de la educación no formal dentro del ámbito penitenciario, mediante la aplicación de una metodología de aprendizaje-servicio. **Resultados y Discusión:** A lo largo de diez sesiones, las personas privadas de libertad podrán trabajar, a través de relatos de su historia de vida, con jóvenes en riesgo de exclusión social. De este modo, las personas privadas de libertad tendrán que hacer un trabajo de introspección personal a la vez que desarrollar estrategias para poder ayudar a prevenir la delincuencia en estos jóvenes. **Conclusión:** Todo ello, favorecerá el desarrollo de un compromiso social en las personas privadas de libertad y por ende, una serie de habilidades y actitudes que les serán necesarias para su futura reinserción.

Palabras clave: reinserción; personas privadas de libertad; compromiso social; aprendizaje-servicio; exclusión social; educación no formal; metodologías activas; establecimientos penitenciarios.

1. Introduction

Education is one of the main agents not only for developing a sense of belonging to society but also for contributing to the development and transformation of individuals (Rubio & Fusco, 2018). Therefore, education is considered an essential mechanism for social control and transformation (Del Pozo, 2017; Scarfó et al., 2016). In the prison context, education is seen as a priority tool to help reintegrate and re-educate incarcerated individuals. For this reason, penitentiary establishments must be educational institutions focused on improving socialization processes and enhancing competencies, promoting the growth of these men and women as individuals and members of society (Enjuanes & Morata, 2019; Varela et al., 2020). Thus, these institutions must focus on three objectives to achieve this goal (Scarfó, 2003): first, keeping inmates usefully occupied; second, improving their quality of life during their sentence; and finally, ensuring that the results aimed at reintegration endure once they are released.

Penitentiary institutions should prioritize education as a fundamental tool for reintegration. The absence of an educational action that enables real changes can make the deprivation of liberty meaningless (Enjuanes et al., 2016; McNeil, 2015; Ponce et al., 2021). However, it must be noted that penitentiary establishments are among the most complex settings for teaching (Sumba et al., 2019; Varela et al., 2020). The dual purpose they must serve (custody and resocialization) along with the particularity of the inmates, complicates all educational efforts (Pozo et al., 2018).

Preparing these individuals for reintegration requires understanding the society and the educational context at each moment. Today's society is subjected to numerous social, technological, labor, etc. changes, highlighting the need to offer learning opportunities beyond the traditional and to contemplate the coexistence of three different learning contexts: formal, non-formal, and informal.

Non-formal education should not be seen merely as a support for formal education but as a means to expand and deepen informal learning (Llebrés, 2021). This perspective has allowed non-formal education to complement formal education more significantly and to interrelate

both types of education through current methodologies that favor the integral development of individuals (Basurto-Mendoza et al., 2021).

However, although this is well integrated into formal educational contexts and regular teaching centers (primary or secondary schools and universities), it is not the same in penitentiary establishments. Although formal and non-formal education is also present in prisons, they are not implemented in the same way as outside the prison.

There is an urgent need to reflect on the educational model being implemented in penitentiary establishments and to promote a more innovative and realistic educational action (Güerri, 2019). It is about conducting educational interventions that, in addition to developing updated teaching-learning processes, create contexts that favor engagement with reality and the development of a series of social skills related to cognitive and psychosocial development, social interaction, and understanding and comprehending reality (Álvarez, 2014). Thus, education is seen as a means of social action to ensure that inmates can also develop a social commitment that helps them understand and transform reality from both personal and community perspectives.

This proposal is directed at inmates and aims to promote social commitment and the development of necessary skills, values, and attitudes for social reintegration. To achieve this, it seeks to apply the service-learning methodology within a non-formal educational context, bringing them closer to a social reality relevant to their experience. Specifically, the goal is to involve inmates in a project aimed at preventing delinquency among at-risk youth.

1.1 Fundamentals of this Educational Proposal

In recent years, the importance of developing active methodologies that go beyond involving students in the teaching-learning process and allow for their integral development has been highlighted (Rubio, & Fusco, 2018). Determining which educational methodology is most appropriate is challenging, but it can be said that active methodologies help improve student commitment to studies (Stover & Ziswiler, 2017).

The significant challenge education faces today is transforming individuals into persons; in this sense, we understand that educating is accompanying the other on the journey from being an individual to becoming a person. From an individual who lives for themselves, even if they live with others, to a person who opens up to others and lives for them. In this exodus – because it is a journey out of confinement within oneself – every human being needs to be accompanied while being called to accompany others: this is education. An educational community that lives open to its surrounding environment, thanks to the virtues of difference such as hospitality and dialogue, feels called to positively impact it. That is why communities, flourishing within their environment, can be creative minorities that open up to the different, to the outsider, with a perspective that sees the other as an enriching addition, not as a threat. We believe an educational center is and is called to be a community that shares a mission and a certain unity in diversity. A shared educational project creates a bond among its members that gives them a sense of unity and belonging and makes them solidary with one another. When an educational community lives the dynamic of mutual giving, in a context of dialogue and gratuity, of encounter and self-giving, it opens outward, looks beyond its classrooms, and commits to its environment. This is evident in many educational centers that undertake projects or establish collaborative relationships with other centers, institutions, the neighborhood, and society in general through the service-learning methodology. Why not also apply this approach in a non-formal training course within a penitentiary institution, with

individuals serving sentences for committed crimes, without this nullifying their right to education and a second chance?

The educational proposal we present is based on recognizing inmates as human beings with ontological dignity, something that no crime can take away from them. Below, we outline these anthropological principles that are universal, i.e., valid for any type of student, including inmates in a penitentiary center who, despite the crimes and circumstances that have led them to be in confinement, are human beings and share these characteristics intrinsic to human nature with the rest of humanity.

1.1.1. Being for Others

The desire for unity and fullness that every person carries within is a sign of the 'unfinished' or fragile nature of the human being, which is an open possibility and therefore insecure in its existence. We believe that this fullness of the person, a subject called to relationality, cannot be achieved individualistically, and even less so in isolation. Our personal history, our biography, is written within the framework of relationships with other people we interact with, voluntarily or involuntarily. These relationships must be intentional: they must seek to bring out the best in us. We are made to love and be loved, this is the meaning of human existence, and when limit, suffering, and vulnerability are present, we experience the need to be welcomed and accompanied by others even more.

The human being is marked by need, both physical and emotional or affective, from the beginning of its existence. No being needs as much care and protection to survive as the human baby. The newborn enters the world in a state of vulnerability, neediness, and dependence like no other living being, appearing in existence as helpless and unadapted. Anthropologist Gehlen (1987) showed that the human being is biologically mediocre in its capacity to adapt to the environment, as its instinctual apparatus is deficient, and its behaviors are poorly specialized for surviving in adverse or unprotected conditions. Additionally, at the emotional level, no one needs to satisfy their need to feel recognized to grow on a psychological and affective foundation of trust and security as much as the human being. The baby presents itself completely unprotected and needy, depending on another for all care when it leaves the maternal womb that has protected it during gestation. It is designed to be cared for, fed, protected, that is, to be loved and welcomed. It needs another to think for it, love for it, and act for it in a loving manner (De la Calle, 2020). This is what is called "affective weaving," reflecting the human baby's indigence, as, although it is at the top of the zoological pyramid, it is the neediest and most vulnerable of all living beings. Spaemann (2004) sees in this dependence an expression of our radical relational condition, open and destined for communion, pointing out how dependence is an opportunity for deep humanization and encounter with the other.

The suffering of the other challenges us; Lévinas (1993) says, "every face challenges me and breaks my encapsulation, and among all, the face of the weak, the neediest, is the one that most profoundly captures my consciousness and overflows it." That is why particularly dependent people express this enormous value more clearly and awaken in others the development of the noblest capacities of the human being: the capacity to give and receive each other gratuitously. This is why contempt for this condition is a source of dehumanization in society; in fact, attention to the most dependent defines the degree of civilization of a culture. However, social commitment is based on our relational nature, which can recognize the ontological dignity of every human being, of each human being, and accept the evidence that we all need others. By nature, we are social beings, relational beings, and being socially responsible is living in that key: I need others, and others need me too. Social action is a concrete expression

of this commitment to the most vulnerable and needy but living in a key of service and encounter with the other, putting our vulnerability into play, goes beyond a specific social project; it speaks of our vital need for personal encounter, that we are made for giving and receiving, always accepting our radical interdependence as human beings.

The encounter with the other in their limit and vulnerability leads the human being to recognize their own vulnerability. They realize that the other needs them and that they also need the other, and this mutual need opens a universe of creative possibilities that make both grow in this bidirectional encounter. Who needs whom? Who helps whom? In a context where relationships are reversible, one gives to the other in what they are and do, and at the same time, receives and welcomes the other in what they are and do, involving fruitful reciprocity for both. Although it seems paradoxical, human beings feel a strong inclination towards autonomy, but this autonomy is always heteronomous, that is, it occurs in a dependent relationship. Therefore, this parental identity reflects their incomplete condition and shows that alone, they are incomplete, and hence, they are called to a fullness they lack (Lorda, 2013).

Dependence, therefore, refers to our essential relational condition, reflects our open nature, and our intrinsic call to live in community. In response to our own suffering, Díaz (2002), with his idea of "I am loved, therefore I exist," emphasizes that accepting pain is fundamental for personal fulfillment, as learning to suffer is learning to live. Until one suffers, one does not reach a deep knowledge of oneself:

He who is not educated by pain will always remain a child. Suffering humanizes, simplifies, purifies, and opens us to the pain of others and forgiveness: "any love that is not nourished by a bit of pain dies from unrealism. (2002, p. 38)

The key lies in understanding how change can be triggered by crossing the threshold of pain, to decide to what extent and in what way we want it to transform us. Some, after suffering, close in on themselves, protect themselves to avoid suffering again, seek blame, reproach and recriminate, avoid taking responsibility for fear of failure, victimize and pity themselves, complain and criticize, fill with resentment and bitterness, sadness and distrust, refuse to forgive, and become entangled in seeking a why (why me?). Thus, we could lengthen the list of possible reactions that bring out the worst in the human being when they have not known or been able to accept, integrate, and give meaning to their pain. On the other hand, there are those who, in adversity, bring out the best in themselves: they open up to others, ask for help and let themselves be helped with humility, take responsibility for their decisions, become sensitive to others' suffering, commit, make space for forgiveness and reconciliation, value what they have, and feel grateful for it, seek a meaning, a purpose (what is the purpose of this?). Again, the list of possibilities is endless, with as many variations and nuances as there are human beings. This reflects the mysterious greatness of the human heart, capable of the best and worst in the same situation. In other words, each person faces suffering according to their possibilities, knowledge, and desires, in a unique way. Some grow and others shrink, as Gómez Sancho says: "There are no sufferings that destroy and sufferings that elevate, some that degrade and others that give life. Any suffering can yield disparate results. It is humans who destroy or build themselves through suffering" (1998, p. 150). Therefore, it does not depend on the suffering but on the human being to rise or fall. The human being does not choose pain; it comes inevitably. However, it depends on each person to choose the attitude with which to face that pain. That inner freedom to position oneself before what happens and causes suffering is the last of the freedoms that nothing and no one can take away, no matter how conditioned it is by that seed of pain. Only the individual decides how to live that mystery, but they are not alone. Only them, but not them alone: we are beings of encounter, we need others to navigate our vulnerability. We are not self-sufficient, even if we sometimes

believe we are. We are made for communion, for encountering others in the community, we are social beings. Only each person can take the reins of their life and decide how to face pain in its multiple manifestations: it is something that depends exclusively on each human being, nothing and no one can decide for them. However, only them, but not them alone, can move to action after making that personal decision. It is there that the other reveals themselves as someone necessary to sustain that decision in action and over time, thus extracting the most benefit possible; ultimately, transforming suffering into something fruitful.

In summary, our deep openness to the other tells us (sometimes shouting and other times whispering) that we are responsible for the other's need, and from the experience of that reciprocity, we also discover ourselves in need of the other in our vulnerability. This anthropological principle inherent to human nature is also applicable to inmates, who live this dependence and need to be recognized in their personal value in a special way.

1.2. Discover the Value of Freedom and Service

The word "responsibility" is intrinsically linked to the terms "correspond" and "co-responsible." Being responsible implies responding to the call of values that seek to be realized. This means having sensitivity towards values, i.e., the ability to discover and recognize the fertility they bring to our lives, offering us possibilities for authentic personal development. The connection to values constitutes a form of obligation that, while it may limit or even annul freedom of action, makes true human freedom possible: creative or inner freedom.

This definition of authentic freedom as a binding obligation to values serves as a reference framework for explaining what we understand by obligation in the sense posed by López (2002): obligation as a connection to something valuable, feeling tied to something that fulfills us as people (p. 115). Our goal is to approach the area of irradiation of the value of social commitment and solidarity, so that students perceive the value of what is suggested to them and adopt it as their own, internalizing it. In this way, they will understand internally and from its genesis the profound reason for the need to consider social responsibility, not from coercion but from an inner and personal conviction.

López (2002) clarifies that it is not about teaching the value of social commitment but helping the student discover it for themselves. That is:

Helping them to discover the encounter on their own and, through it, the values and virtues. This persuasive task will be carried out by themselves, becoming internally convinced that adopting values is a requirement of their condition as a person and constitutes, therefore, the primary task of their life. (p. XVII)

The value of commitment to others, especially to the neediest, is not imposed coercively from the outside as something strange and foreign. Its way of asserting itself is precisely by showing that we cannot remain indifferent to what happens to our fellow human beings and in our environment. If we want to develop fully as individuals and aspire to happiness, we are called to committed encounter with others and the pursuit of the common good.

1.3. Decide to Act and Serve

By experiencing giving, the human being finds greater fulfillment by connecting with the reality of the other and with their own, leading them to the conviction that the human being is a being of encounter. This personal discovery leads to a deeper commitment in their actions.

From the dignity, unity, and equality of all people, the principle of the common good derives, to which every aspect of social life must refer to find fullness of meaning. According to a broad definition, the common good is understood as the set of social life conditions that make it possible for associations and each of their members to achieve their own perfection more fully and easily. The common good does not consist of the mere sum of the particular goods of each member of the social body. Being for everyone and each one, it is and remains common because it is indivisible and because it can only be achieved, increased, and safeguarded together, also with a view to the future. Just as the moral action of the individual is realized in the fulfillment of good, social action reaches its fullness in the realization of the common good. The common good can be considered the social and community dimension of moral good. A society that, at all levels, seeks to serve the human being is one that proposes the common good as a priority goal, as the good of all men and women. The person cannot find fulfillment only in themselves, that is, disregarding their being "with" and "for" others. This truth imposes not only simple coexistence at the various levels of social and relational life but also the incessant search, in a practical and not just ideal way, for the good, that is, for the meaning and truth found in existing social life forms. No expressive form of sociability – from the family, through the intermediate social group, association, economic enterprise, city, region, State, to the community of peoples and nations – can avoid the question of its own common good, which is constitutive of its meaning and the authentic reason for its very existence.

The common good is a duty of all society members: no one is exempt from collaborating, according to their abilities, in its achievement and development. The common good demands to be fully served, not according to reductive visions subordinated to the advantages each can obtain but based on a logic that assumes the corresponding responsibility in its entirety. The common good corresponds to the highest inclinations of the human being, but it is a challenging good to achieve, as it requires the ability and constant pursuit of others' good as if it were their own.

1.4. Objectives

The main objective of this innovation proposal is to promote social commitment and the development of skills, values, and attitudes in incarcerated individuals to facilitate their reintegration process.

Additionally, the following specific objectives are proposed:

Promote a process of introspection among incarcerated individuals.

Engage them with the reality of other social groups.

2. Methodology

This teaching innovation proposal aims to be carried out within non-formal educational contexts in penitentiary establishments. Thus, it is directed at any incarcerated person, regardless of the type of crime, the length of their sentence, or age. The goal is to apply the service-learning methodology within a non-formal educational context to bring them closer to a social reality relevant to their life experience. Specifically, the aim is to involve incarcerated individuals in a project aimed at preventing delinquency among at-risk youth.

This proposal is based on the personal experiences of incarcerated individuals to create a story with different narratives about real-life stories but adapted for these at-risk youth. Through

these short stories, these youth can identify situations, characteristics, contexts, etc., and reflect on the consequences if the necessary preventive measures are not taken.

Over ten sessions, each lasting two hours, incarcerated individuals will learn not only to know themselves but also to see the social work they can do by helping at-risk youth avoid delinquency.

The development of this proposal is carried out in 5 phases (Table 1):

Phase 1 - Presentation of the activity (1 session): The activity, purpose, session organization, evaluation forms, and rules will be explained. Knowing the rules is fundamental for the proper development of the sessions. Therefore, the following rules will be established:

- Anonymity of participants will be guaranteed.
- All participants must complete all proposed activities.
- All participants must submit activities on time and in the required format.
- Participation in these activities will not have penitentiary benefits, only personal growth and learning benefits.

Phase 2 - Starting point (1 session): In this phase, an initial analysis will be conducted to understand the starting point of incarcerated individuals regarding delinquency and at-risk youth. For this, a series of questions will be posed to make them reflect on the role they can play in helping these youth avoid delinquency. These questions will be related to three aspects:

- General: General questions about social exclusion and youth. Questions like: To what extent do you believe social exclusion can influence the start of delinquent activity? To what degree do you think youth is a key stage for starting delinquency?
- Personal: Questions about their personal life and beginnings in delinquency: What was the environment like where you lived when you were a child/youth? How important was education to you? What were your interests? Who did you usually rely on?
- Prevention: Questions about how they believe they can help prevent these youth from starting delinquent activity: Do you think your experience could serve as an example for at-risk youth? In what other ways could you contribute to preventing these youth from starting delinquent activity?

Phase 3 - Self-awareness (2 sessions): In this phase, incarcerated individuals will be encouraged to do an introspection exercise to identify the factors that led them to stray into delinquency. Thus, they will have to think about how their youth was, the environment they lived in, what and who they valued, what kind of help they would have liked to have. This way, they can become more involved in the activity and describe more precisely the risk factors that may influence these youth.

Phase 4 - My story (1 session): In this phase, incarcerated individuals will have to write a short story (about two pages) about their life during youth, focusing mainly on aspects they believe at-risk youth can identify with.

Phase 5 - Reading stories among peers (2 sessions): In this phase, the various stories will be read. Each incarcerated person will read their story aloud to the rest of the group to share them. This way, they can compare life stories, find common risk factors, and reflect on the work they can do with these youth.

Phase 6 - Group meeting (1 session): In this phase, there will be an encounter between

incarcerated individuals and a group of at-risk youth. During this session, incarcerated individuals will have to read their stories to the youth and then discuss their impressions, fears, expectations, etc.

Phase 7 - Conclusions (1 session): A collective discussion will be held with incarcerated individuals regarding the role they can play through collaborations with various youth groups to prevent delinquency. They will also be asked how they felt, what the experience brought them, and whether they would like to continue helping this group.

Table 1.
Schedule of the Sessions

	October				November				December
PHASE.	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8	Week 9
I									
II									
III									
IV									
V									
VI									
VII									

Source: Own elaboration (2024)

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Service-Learning

The Service-Learning (SL) methodology encourages students to seek global responses to complex needs, offers values education to form critical and committed citizens, and promotes competency education by increasing social responsibility (Martínez, 2008).

It is not about promoting social commitment to the apparently most needy but to the entire environment, starting with the people closest to them, such as families, prison companions, and the educational community...

Various authors discuss the teacher's role in SL, and all agree that the teacher leads the entire process, responsible for the student's acquisition of knowledge, competencies, skills, behaviors, and values. The teacher must also stimulate students to take an active role in this teaching process. SL is a complex activity that integrates community service with learning. It is an innovative proposal, but at the same time, it is also a proposal based on well-known elements: voluntary community service and, of course, the transmission of knowledge, skills, and values by schools and non-formal educational institutions.

SL allows students to perform tasks in contexts where there are real needs and combines meaningful learning, community service, and civic action. Throughout the course, these activities are fed back with the student's evolution as they progress in theoretical and practical content.

SL aims to engage individuals in activities that combine community service and academic learning. Since service-learning programs are usually based in formal courses, the service activity is typically based on the curriculum content being taught.

SL is a way of learning by doing a service to the community: faced with a problem in the environment, students mobilize and carry out an activity to improve it, thus applying their knowledge, skills, aptitudes, and attitudes.

SL is an experiential education form where students engage in activities that connect personal and community needs with intentionally designed opportunities to promote students' development and learning. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts in SL. SL is an experiential education form where learning occurs through a cycle of action and reflection, allowing students to work with other colleagues in applying what they have learned to community problems while reflecting on the experience of pursuing real community goals and increasing their own understanding and skills. That is, they develop the multiple human dimensions—intellectual, emotional, and practical—concurrently and cultivate civic and social responsibility.

SL combines educational success and social commitment, thus serving as a compass to guide talent. Competencies, skills, behaviors, and values should also stimulate students to take an active role in this teaching process.

SL offers the possibility of encounters among equals, allowing individuals to know each other in their greatness and enabling them, from this recognition of human dignity, to commit to their neighbor to embark on a path of societal transformation together.

SL is a proposal that understands learning based on experience, research, reflection, and social responsibility. This methodology educates from and for social justice, helping achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and education for sustainable development.

SL has a close relationship with social responsibility training; these proposals aim to provide academic studies with a more significant social content and thus train students in social responsibility. These are not volunteer practices but teaching proposals oriented towards community commitment (Martínez, 2008).

The novelty does not lie in each component but in closely linking service and learning into a well-articulated and coherent educational activity. Therefore, known elements are combined to form something new of greater originality. If we orient education only towards talent (asserts Roser Batlle in her lecture "A Compass to Guide Talent" 2018), we risk fostering the formation of individuals who only use their talents for their personal interest; the goal of education is to foster social commitment to transform the world. Cortina (2023) points out that a more just society is not built with incompetent people or mediocre citizens; it takes a lot of talent to change the world by focusing in the same direction. We cannot and should not differentiate between a successful educational path and a social commitment path; this is precisely what service-learning aims to resolve: we are not faced with a dilemma between being a good student and being a good person, between being competent and being supportive; it is the same endeavor, and service-learning integrates practical learning with service.

There is great consensus in understanding SL as a pedagogy based on experience, reflection, and reciprocity. That is, a pedagogy that starts from real activities carried out by students but always completed through reflection on every aspect of the experience, and finally, service-

learning activities designed so that the relationship between students providing a service and service recipients is reciprocal:

The quality of our educational action can be measured by the degree to which it impacts society as a whole, not just the small circle of our educational community. However, when the values of encounter and social commitment have truly touched people's deep fiber, the community opens outward, to the outside. Our educational action will not succeed if it does not awaken in people social responsibility, the desire to serve others and the entire human community, starting with those who are worse off and closest (neighbor/neighbor). Training in social commitment is possible, even in a penitentiary center, and today more than ever, it is necessary for the reintegration of the prison population.

4. Conclusions

Finally, it can be concluded that this proposal aims to highlight the importance of applying innovative educational methodologies in non-formal educational contexts within penitentiary establishments. The use of methodologies such as service-learning can contribute to fostering the social commitment of incarcerated individuals. As part of the reintegration process intended to be undertaken during their stay in prison, it is necessary to include the formation in values such as commitment to others. To the extent that an incarcerated person is recognized for their personal worth, seen as someone unique and unrepeatable who can contribute to others and society (despite previous mistakes), their reintegration is made possible.

On the other hand, it should be noted that this is a completely viable innovation project as it can be carried out in any penitentiary establishment and with any incarcerated individual, regardless of the type of crime they have committed. However, it is necessary to highlight the potential difficulty in authorizing the encounter between incarcerated individuals and the group of at-risk youth within the penitentiary establishment.

5. References

- Álvarez, J. A. (2014). Desarrollo prosocial en el medio penitenciario: bases teóricas del "programa de compromiso social". *Postconvencionales*, 7-8, 81-100.
- Basurto-Mendoza, S. T., Moreira, J. A., Velásquez, A. N. y Rodríguez, M. (2021). Autoevaluación, coevaluación y heteroevaluación como enfoque innovador en la práctica pedagógica y su efecto en el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje. *Polo del Conocimiento*, 6(3), 828-845. <https://doi.org/10.23857/pc.v6i3.2408>.
- Battle, R. (2020, 20 de junio). *Una brújula para orientar el talento* [vídeo]. YouTube. <https://n9.cl/boc109>
- Cano, L. C. (2014). *Aprendizaje servicio y educación superior. Una rúbrica para evaluar la calidad de proyectos* [Tesis doctoral] Universidad de Barcelona. <https://www.tesisenred.net/handle/10803/277560>
- Cortina, A. (20 de enero de 2023). No construiremos un mundo justo con ciudadanos mediocres. *Noticias de Navarra*. <https://goo.su/SnA1tmz>
- De la Calle Maldonado, C. (2021). *Apuntes inéditos elaborados para los alumnos del Programa de Acompañamiento Internacional de la Universidad Francisco de Vitoria sobre "El dinamismo*

relacional de la persona”.

- De la Calle Maldonado, C., Giménez, P. y Castañera, C. (2020). La incomunicabilidad del misterio del sufrimiento. *Revista Comunicación y Hombre*. <https://goo.su/GCzAC>
- Del Pozo, F. J. (2017). La educación en las prisiones españolas: formación y acción socioeducativa con reclusas drogodependientes. *Educación XXI*, 20(2), 343-363. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educXX1.12180>
- Díaz, C. (2002). *Soy amado, luego existo. Yo y tú*. Desclée De Brouwer S.A.
- Enjuanes, J. y Morata, T. (2019). Modelos penitenciarios educativos como base del éxito en la reinserción social de las personas privadas de libertad. *Boletín Criminológico*, 25. <https://doi.org/10.24310/Boletin-criminologico.2019.v25i2019.7131>
- Enjuanes, J., Escribano, X. y Sánchez, J. (2016). La pedagogía social comunitaria como modelo de intervención socioeducativa en centros penitenciarios. En T. Morata (Ed.), *Pedagogía social comunitaria y exclusión social* (pp. 11-144). Editorial Popular.
- Gehlen, A. (1987). *El hombre. Su naturaleza y su lugar en el mundo*. Sígueme.
- Gómez Sancho, M. (1998). Dolor y sufrimiento. El problema del sentido. *Revista de la Sociedad Española del Dolor*, 5, 144-158. http://revista.sedolor.es/pdf/1998_02_07.pdf
- Güerri, C., Martí, M. y Pedrosa, A. (2021). Abriendo ventanas virtuales en los muros de la prisión: reflexiones sobre la digitalización de las comunicaciones penitenciarias a propósito de la COVID-19. *Revista de internet, derecho y política*, 32. <https://raco.cat/index.php/IDP/article/view/n32-guerri>
- Lévinas, E. (1993). *Entre nosotros. Ensayos para pensar en otro*. Pre-textos.
- Llebrés Colado, A. (2021). Educación formal y educación no formal: acortando las distancias. *Quaderns d'Animació i Educació Social*, 33, 1-34. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7721047>
- López Quintás, A. (2002). *Inteligencia creativa. El descubrimiento personal de los valores*. B.A.C.
- Lorda, J. L. (2013). *Antropología Teológica*. EUNSA.
- Martínez, M. (2008). *Aprendizaje servicio y responsabilidad social de las universidades*. Octaedro. <https://goo.su/doh6>
- McNeill, F. (2015). Cuando el castigo es rehabilitación. *Indret, Revista para el análisis del Derecho*, 3. <https://indret.com/cuando-el-castigo-es-rehabilitacion/>
- Ponce, L., López, G. y Camacho, R. (2021). Programas de formación universitaria en centros penitenciarios. *Andamios*, 18(45), 487-509. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29092/uacm.v18i45.827>
- Pozo Cuevas, F., Navarro Ardoy, L., Nakahira, M. y Cutiño Raya, S. (2018). Cara a cara con la cárcel. La visión de los presos sobre sus condiciones de custodia y resocialización en un centro penitenciario. *Encrucijadas. Revista Crítica De Ciencias Sociales*, 16, a1603.

<https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/encrucijadas/article/view/79162>

- Rubio, M. y Fusco, L. (2018). La educación como compromiso social para el desarrollo y transformación del ser humano. *Revista Arjé*, 12(23), 275-284. <http://www.arje.bc.uc.edu.ve/arje23e/art30.pdf>
- Scarfó, F. J., Cuellar, M. E. y Mendoza, D. S. (2016). Debates: sobre el rol de la escuela y de los educadores de adultos en las cárceles. *Cuadernos CEDES*, 36(98), 99-107. <https://www.scielo.br/j/ccedes/a/dZFDfCQFJEjjP8X63H6ftRD/>
- Scarfó, F.J. (2003). El derecho a la educación en las cárceles como garantía de la educación en derechos humanos. *Revista IIDH*, 36, 291-327. <https://www.corteidh.or.cr/tablas/r06835-11.pdf>
- Spaemann, R. (2004). El sentido del sufrimiento: distintas actitudes ante el dolor humano. *Atlántida*, 15.
- Stover, S. y Ziswiler, K. (2017). Impact of active learning environments on community of inquiry. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 29(3), 458-470. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1111856>
- Sumba, N., Cueva, J. y López, R. (2019). Experiencias en el ejercicio de la educación superior en la prisión, desde la perspectiva del docente. Estudio de caso: Guayaquil, Ecuador. *Revista Páginas de Educación*, 2(12), 72-88. <https://orcid.org/10.22235/pe.v12i2.1838>

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS, FINANCING AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors' contributions:

Conceptualisation: Amores, Anabel; De la Calle Maldonado, Carmen. **Writing-Preparation of the original draft:** Amores, Anabel; De la Calle Maldonado, Carmen. **Writing-Re-vision and Editing:** Amores, Anabel; De la Calle Maldonado, Carmen. **All authors have read and accepted the published version of the manuscript:** Amores, Anabel; De la Calle Maldonado, Carmen. **Funding:** This research did not receive external funding.

Acknowledgements: This text is part of a research project Reinsértate-Reinsértales of the Universidad Francisco de Vitoria.

Conflict of interest: There is no conflict of interest.

AUTHOR/ES:**Anabel Amores**

Universidad Francisco de Vitoria.

PhD in Physical and Forensic Anthropology. Master's Degree in Higher Education. Professor Accredited Doctor by ANECA at the University Francisco de Vitoria in the degree of Criminology teaching, among others, the subject of Social Responsibility. Director of the project 'Reinsert yourself-Reinsert them' carried out in the Madrid-VI penitentiary establishment. She has published several publications related to the educational field, as well as several research stays related to the penitentiary field.

anabel.amores@ufv.es

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6152-400>

Carmen de la Calle Maldonado

Universidad Francisco de Vitoria.

PhD in Education from the Complutense University. Master in Philosophy. She has worked at the Universidad Francisco de Vitoria since its foundation in 1993 as a lecturer in undergraduate and postgraduate courses in Humanities (Anthropology and Social Responsibility). Professor of Social Responsibility. Director of the Santander Chair of Social Responsibility. Trainer of the IDDI-Agile Human Organizations Institute. Coordinator of various social action and humanitarian work projects with university students in Madrid and outside Spain (Bosnia, Cuba, Mexico, Equatorial Guinea, Argentina, Chile...). She also teaches at the Universidad Rey Juan Carlos and at the Jerome Lejeune Foundation.

He has published extensively, including research on the social responsibility of academics, on accompaniment (in suffering, forgiveness, vulnerability) and on service learning.

m.calle@ufv.es

H Index: 12

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0387-5959>

Scopus ID: <https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=56664431400>

Google Scholar: <https://scholar.google.com.mx/citations?hl=es&user=FhiRkHcAAAAJ>