

December 2023

Libraries on the Inside: A Study of Public Library Outreach to Correctional Institutions

Annaliese Melvin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/slisconnecting>



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), [Information Literacy Commons](#), [Scholarly Communication Commons](#), and the [Scholarly Publishing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Annaliese Melvin (2023) "Libraries on the Inside: A Study of Public Library Outreach to Correctional Institutions," *SLIS Connecting*: Vol. 12: Iss. 1, Article 9.

DOI: 10.18785/slis.1201.09

Available at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/slisconnecting/vol12/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in SLIS Connecting by an authorized editor of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact aquilastaff@usm.edu.

**Libraries on the Inside:
A Study of Public Library Outreach to Correctional Institutions**
By Annaliese Melvin

Readers: Dr. Stacy Creel, Dr. Jennifer Steele

INTRODUCTION

In 1911, the American Library Association (ALA) formed its first committee on prison libraries. While this committee opened the door to important conversations on correctional libraries, the ALA did not actively become involved in correctional systems until 1944, when the Objectives and Standards for Libraries in Adult Prisons and Reformatories were approved (Austin, 2019). The real catalyst for creating nationwide libraries for the incarcerated came in 1971, when “Congress passed the Law Enforcement Administration Act, which funded prison law libraries and provided budgets for other reading materials” (Sullivan, 2000, p. 57). This led to what was coined the “golden age of prison libraries” in the 1970s. Since then, many studies and personal anecdotes have been published on librarians’ views of their role within a corrections facility. These vital conversations continue today as the ALA rewrites its guidelines for services to incarcerated individuals throughout 2023.

While the benefits and purposes of the prison library seem numerous, their special services are often discounted or overlooked. “The purpose of a library in a correctional institution is multifold: to support the institution’s educational mission; to address the recreational needs of the inmates; to support rehabilitation; and possibly to serve as a legal reference center” (Conrad, 2012, p. 409). Many prison librarians feel as though their voices are lost when it comes to representation, resources, and professional development. As Ohio prison librarian Andrew Hart describes, “...there is hardly any mention about us, our needs, or our goals in general library discussions or publications” (2015, p. 8). Similar thoughts can be found in numerous accounts from librarians on the inside, with a common refrain of feeling “siloeed.”

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the websites of a sample of libraries across the U.S. to determine their relationships with local correctional facilities. This study will continue the work of a study published by the American Library Association in 1980

regarding services offered to correctional institutions across the country.

Research Questions

R1. Which of the selected public libraries in the U.S. have connections to local correctional facilities as determined by reviewing their publicly available information?

R2. What are the types of correctional facilities that are currently targeted by public library outreach across the U.S. as determined by reviewing their publicly available information?

R3. What are the types of programs offered to correctional institutions by libraries as determined by reviewing their publicly available information?

R4. What is the difference in the percentage of libraries that were highlighted as offering services to correctional facilities in the 1980s versus those that advertise their outreach via their websites currently?

Definitions

Corrections Facility: “a prison, detention home, etc.: also *correctional facility*” (Webster, 2014, p. 334).

Cybermetrics: “Description and evaluation of the impact of the internet as a scholarly communication tool, primarily by means of quantitative analysis of Web-based scholarly and scientific communications. Sometimes used synonymously with *webometrics*” (Reitz, 2013, para. 1).

Detention Center: “(1948) A place where people are temporarily kept and prevented from escaping” (Garner, 2019, p. 564).

Jail: “(31c) A prison; esp. a local government’s detention center where persons awaiting a trial or those convicted of misdemeanors are confined” (Garner, 2019, p. 998).

Prison: “(bef. 12c) A building or complex where people are kept in long-term confinement as

punishment for a crime, or in short-term detention while waiting to go to court as criminal defendants; specif., a state or federal facility of confinement for convicted criminals” (Garner, 2019, p. 1446).

Webometrics: “**See:** cybermetrics,” (Reitz, 2013). “Description and evaluation of the impact of the internet as a scholarly communication tool, primarily by means of quantitative analysis of Web-based scholarly and scientific communications. Sometimes used synonymously with *webometrics*” (Reitz, 2013, para. 1).

Delimitations

This study includes information gathered from publicly available library websites. For this reason, to be included, the libraries must have a functioning website or webpage that contains information about library programming and services. It is not necessary that libraries have information about correctional outreach programs on their website, only that they have information about programs and outreach. If a website does not outline outreach efforts to correctional facilities, this will inform the answers to the research questions stated in previous sections.

This study focuses solely on selected libraries that were determined to offer services to correctional institutions by the 1980 study completed by the American Library Association’s Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies group. This study does not examine stand-alone libraries within correctional institutions.

Assumptions

It is assumed that all libraries that are evaluated have up-to-date websites that reflect their programming and outreach efforts. It is also assumed that the data reported by the American Library Association is as complete and accurate as reflected by the surveys returned and that the libraries self-reporting was accurate in the survey.

Importance of Study

As stated in the third edition of the Guidelines for Library Services to Prisoners, “Prison librarians often feel isolated in their jobs and deprived of regular contact with their professional colleagues on the ‘outside’” (Lehman & Locke, 2005, p. 15-16). This study aims to provide the beginnings of an updated guide to correctional libraries that correctional

librarians can use when seeking out resources, ideas, and general companionship in their profession to combat the expressed feelings of being “siloed.”

LITERATURE REVIEW

Challenges Facing Correctional Libraries

While studies conducted regarding library services to incarcerated individuals are few and far between, this topic has been investigated since the early 1900s, when religious reformatory libraries were popular globally. One of the most common themes for researchers to investigate when discussing correctional libraries is the challenges that the librarians, or libraries themselves, face behind the walls of institutions. One common challenge that these special libraries face is access to technology. In 2006, Clark and MacCreigh stated that “A computer with basic accouterments (mouse and printer) is absolutely essential” for prison libraries, or any library, to operate (p. 118). The authors of the book go on to state that each day is a constant battle for access to technology that is vital to the operation of their libraries. While this publication came out in 2006, when internet access was not as common as it is in 2022, the same challenges face correctional librarians today. As highlighted in 2020 by Gibbons and Schander, as many businesses shift to an “online-only” platform, the technology-based challenges that correctional libraries face only continue to grow (p. 67). This shift from paper to technology greatly decreases the likelihood that a librarian would be able to offer the information to a currently incarcerated person.

While the previous examples of technology challenges within institutions refer explicitly to adult facilities, this issue impacts the larger system as well. In 2020, researchers Formby and Paynter discussed the large benefits that access to technology has for young, incarcerated people. They argue that libraries positively impact the technology skills of individuals by supporting school curricula with research-based tools and methods to help adolescents become digitally adept (Formby and Paynter, 2020, p. 17). However, when correctional institutions continue to face scrutiny for their use of and access to technology, the individuals who are incarcerated suffer and lose vital opportunities to learn 21st-century skills.

Another challenge that many correctional libraries face is that of censorship. In 2012, a study was

published that evaluated the collections policies of correctional libraries in the U.S. This study highlights the scrutiny that libraries faced after the court ruling in the 2007 case, *Connecticut vs. Hayes* (Conrad, 2012). The researcher focused on the conflicts of interest between the prison system and the values that libraries hold. They aimed to answer the question, “What ethical implications does the exclusion of these policies [ALA’s *Policy of Confidentiality of Library Records*, ALA’s *Prisoner’s Right to Read*] have for the field of LIS and prison librarianship?” (Conrad, 2012, p. 416). To gauge the answer to this question, Conrad proposed a web-based study for librarians who work in correctional institutions that outlined how they handle patron confidentiality and to see how librarians adhere to “current” policies. The results of this survey outlined that 76% of libraries surveyed have collections development policies in place (Conrad, 2012, p. 418). Having these policies in place allows for a stronger argument for materials for incarcerated individuals when they are challenged by courts, administration, or the general public. A similar argument is made by Gibbons and Schander in their 2020 article. They highlight that even though librarians aim to be “champions of intellectual freedom,” they must adhere to the Department of Corrections policies within the walls of their libraries (Gibbons and Schander, 2020, p. 68). Censorship and information access are a constant battle between freedom and safety within a correctional institution.

Previous Studies of Correctional Institutions and their Services

While many studies published about correctional institutions and libraries outline the challenges that librarians face within the walls of institutions, another popular topic is that of services offered to incarcerated people. In 2006, a study was conducted of the services offered to inmates at Taft Correctional Institution (TCI) (Asher). This study highlighted a partnership that was developed between the institution and California State University (CSU) to create an interlibrary loan program for incarcerated individuals. While the libraries at TCI are comprised of over 7,000 books, there are still many materials that the library does not have represented in their collection. The number of works that TCI holds also looks rather minuscule compared to the 300,000+ materials that are contained in the CSU collection (Asher, 2006). In 1999, a partnership was developed between the two institutions to allow incarcerated people to gain

greater access to research and leisure materials. This partnership is especially beneficial for inmates who are enrolled in GED courses (or similar learning courses) at TCI. This partnership has allowed for over 2,000 materials to be loaned to individuals housed at TCI from the beginning of the partnership through 2006 (Asher, 2006). While this study focused on the interlibrary loan system at one institution in California, other studies published since have focused on other services available to inmates across the country.

A separate study was conducted that investigated services available to inmates in rural jails in western North Carolina (Ellern & Mason, 2013). To gather information, the researchers conducted in-person interviews with the sheriffs of each jail. These interviews gauged what jail administrators found the importance of their libraries to be, as well as what books and services were offered within the institution (Ellern & Mason, 2013). While this study and the 2006 California study completed in-depth investigations of a select group of libraries, one of the largest surveys of correctional libraries in the U.S. was conducted several years prior.

In 1980, a study was published by the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies, a branch of the American Library Association. This study reflected a survey that was sent out to libraries across the 50 states as well as the District of Columbia to create a “benchmark” of libraries and their services to correctional institutions (Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library, 1980, p. vii). In each state, the state-wide library director was contacted for information on the libraries and library systems under their direction. Surveys were then sent out to identified institutions to gauge what services were provided to correctional institutions in their vicinity, how they were staffed, what problems they viewed their library as having, and more. Some states did not return their surveys, so the information from those was gauged by the state librarian in a descriptive conversation or phone call (Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library, 1980). However, because this librarian is not always in the facilities discussed performing direct service, this information is not as reliable as the completed surveys. Of the libraries that returned their surveys, several themes emerged among them concerning the “problems” of the correctional libraries. The most

common problems highlighted were access to prisoners, loss and mutilation of books, and a lack of understanding from institution staff about the value of correctional libraries (Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies, 1980). The libraries also outlined the services that they provided to correctional institutions. These services ranged from having in-house libraries to having bookmobiles and book drops at correctional locations. While several institutions did not respond to the mailed surveys, this compilation of information is the most comprehensive guide to library services for the incarcerated that has been published to date.

Webometric Studies

In addition to evaluating published literature on the topic of correctional libraries, it is also necessary to evaluate literature as it relates to webometrics. In 2018, two researchers, Dr. Chellappandi and Vijayakumar, described webometrics as, “the study of quantitative aspects of the construction and use of information resources, structures and technologies on the web drawing on bibliometrics and [i]nformetrics approaches...” (p. 6). This form of research has become a trusted method in the field of library science to evaluate websites and web pages for a variety of purposes. The pair go on to state that webometrics is designed to help researchers gain information regarding the structure of the internet and the usage patterns of its patrons (Chekkappandi & Vijayakumar, 2018). Studying the reliability, accessibility, and popularity of websites are just some of the ways that webometrics can be implemented by researchers.

The most common goal of a webometric study is to measure the Web Impact Factor or WIF of a site. This measurement helps researchers to determine the relative impact of a site given a specific field of study (i.e. library science), or other criteria (ex: country, state, etc.). In 2002, a team of researchers set out to investigate the WIF of Library and Information Science school websites in the United States and Canada (Chu, He, & Thelwall). To accomplish this task, during a time when webometrics was emerging as a legitimate form of research, the team used free online platforms including Fast, AltaVista, and CheckWeb to collect their data on the 53 LIS schools investigated. These sites helped the team to conduct in-link and co-link searches, as well as out-link searches. However, during their research, it was found that CheckWeb was not a beneficial tool for the scope

of their project and was discarded in favor of a program created by the researchers to check out-links (Chu, He, & Thelwall, 2002). Roughly 15 years later, more webometric studies emerged using modern web-based tools to conduct their investigations into WIFs.

One study from 2017 used the site “open site explorer” to collect data for their investigation of universities’ websites in northeast India (Verma & Brahma, p. 187). This site allowed the team to collect data regarding the number of pages on a site and the number of pages that link to the site. A similar study published in 2020 elected to use “various small SEO tools” to collect the data for their investigation (Chaparwal & Rajput, p. 4). The tools selected included smallseotools.com and dulichecker.com. The website *Alexa* was also used to gather data on the traffic rank in terms of India and a global platform (Chaparwal & Rajput, 2002). While these studies were investigating similar questions, such as WIFs or link validity, the tools that the teams of researchers made use of varied depending on when the studies were conducted. This reflects the changes in methods and tools as webometrics continues to grow in the LIS field.

In 2015, one study evaluated the WIF of “world class” university websites. The platform *Alexa* was used as a tool to measure website usage, including information regarding page count, out-links, and frequency of updates (Baka & Leyni, 2015, p. 107). However, while this study had a large focus on the WIF of the highlighted sites, it also focused largely on the accessibility of the sites. In this study, the investigation into a website’s accessibility used the tool *EvalAccess 2.0*. This software evaluates the webpages as well as their HTML markup, sorting all errors in the sites into three categories: Priority 1, Priority 2, and Priority 3. These “errors” are based on a site’s compliance with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) (Baka & Leyni, 2015).

Applications for this study

While many webometric studies focus on collecting data regarding website usage, page count, out-links, and updates, the goals of this study will take a different approach to evaluate websites. Incorporating various methods from webometrics studies, this research aims to fill the gap that exists in documenting

library outreach services to correctional institutions on a large scale.

METHODOLOGY

This study followed the general methods of a webometric study. Library websites were evaluated for representation of their outreach programs to local correctional institutions, including prisons, jails, and juvenile detention centers.

Information Sources and Procedures

In 1980, the American Library Association published the Survey of Library Service in Local Correctional Facilities. This document serves as the basis of the data collected in this study. Using this survey, public libraries and public library systems that offer outreach and services to local correctional facilities were identified based on the provided state reports within the survey. In an Excel document, the library name, location, type of facility served, and programs offered were documented. All libraries that returned the survey with their library branch or system name included and indicated that they did offer outreach services or programs were included on this initial list.

Research was then conducted to identify which of these identified libraries and library systems had functioning publicly accessible websites that outlined their current programs and services. For libraries and library systems to be included in this study they must have functioning and up-to-date websites so that research into their programs could be conducted. The search was done via search engine (Google). The information collected from the ALA survey including name and location was used to conduct this web-based search. If a library or library system's website is located using this information, the website URL was documented on the existing Excel spreadsheet. If a website was not found, a note of "no website" was made on the same spreadsheet. A note of "permanently closed" was documented in the spreadsheet if it was found that a library has closed or was turned into a museum.

Each library website was searched for any details of programming or services offered to local correctional facilities by using the "search" feature of a website and common terms associated with correctional institutions (i.e. jail, prison, detention, etc.). A search of the key webpages on each website was also conducted to see if there is any record of services or

outreach to correctional institutions that did not appear in the search of the site. The pages and files searched included those outlining events, outreach efforts, services, job postings, strategic plans, and mission and values pages if available. On each of these pages the shortcut of "control+f" was used to again search the page or document for key terms related to the study (jail, prison, detention, etc.). This research was then documented alongside the previous information within the Excel spreadsheet including the information found, where it was found, and the route to obtain the information. This data was then used to inform the answers to the research questions of this study.

To answer the research questions, a quantitative approach to evaluation was taken. Totals of libraries, services, and types of institutions served were counted across all of the documented institutions. A comparison was also made to the original list of libraries that identified services offered in 1980 versus those that advertised correctional outreach services in 2022.

Limitations

While the 1980 study from ALA is the most comprehensive list of libraries and library systems offering outreach services to correctional institutions, it is not complete. There is also a possibility that libraries that previously indicated that they did not partner with any local correctional institutions in the 1980s have since developed programs or outreach efforts, which would leave them excluded from this survey. The study is also limited by the accuracy of the information found on the libraries' websites and the functionality/availability of the websites.

RESULTS

Research for this project was conducted over several weeks. Information from the 1980 ALA study on services to the incarcerated was reviewed and documented throughout January 2023. From the original study, 706 libraries or library systems were identified as offering services to jails, prisons, detention centers, or other correctional institutions. Using the information collected from this study, websites were then located and documented from February 1st to February 18th of 2023. From this information, 669 libraries were identified as having functioning and up-to-date library websites. This removed 20 duplicate libraries or library systems,

eight libraries or systems that did not have websites, and nine libraries or systems that had closed since the original 1980 study was conducted. The sites were then searched for information regarding outreach efforts to correctional institutions from February 19th to February 23rd of 2023. During this time, several library websites that had previously been identified as existing and functioning did not function as expected, eliminating five additional websites. This left the final total number of websites searched at 664.

R1. What public libraries in the U.S. have connections to local correctional facilities as determined by reviewing their publicly available information?

71 libraries or library systems detailed services to correctional institutions. The libraries stem from a variety of states. Those states were: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Washington, D.C., Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. The names of each library or system that have information regarding outreach to correctional institutions are detailed in Appendix A.

R2. What are the types of correctional facilities that are currently targeted by public library outreach across the U.S. as determined by reviewing their publicly available information?

It was found that libraries serve numerous types of correctional facilities around the country. To compare the different results, the types of facilities were split into one of the following categories: jails, juvenile detention centers, correctional facilities, prisons, detention centers, county detention centers, youth correctional facilities, county correctional facilities, juvenile justice centers, federal prison camps, and state correctional facilities. It should be noted that three libraries or library systems, Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, MD, Southern Tier Library System in Corning, NY, and Free Library of Philadelphia in Philadelphia, PA, did not detail the types of facilities that they served.

Some libraries detailed that they served multiple facilities, such as jails and juvenile detention centers, and therefore one library may be represented in multiple categories. As shown in Table 1, a majority

of libraries geared their services or outreach towards jails, juvenile detention centers, or correctional facilities. It was found that 28 libraries or library systems served jails, 17 served juvenile detention centers, and 11 served general correctional facilities. Only one library was found to serve federal prison camps (Montgomery City-County Public Library in Montgomery, AL) and one was found to serve state correctional facilities (Clinton-Essex-Franklin Library System).

Table 1. Types of Facilities Libraries Serve (n=82)

Type of Facility	No. of Libraries/ Library Systems Serving the Type
Jails	28
Juvenile Detention Centers	17
Correctional Facilities	11
Prisons	8
Detention Centers	6
County Detention Facilities	3
Youth Correctional Facilities	3
County Correctional Facilities	2
Juvenile Justice Centers	2
Federal Prison Camps	1
State Correctional Facilities	1

R3. What are the types of programs offered to correctional institutions by libraries as determined by reviewing their publicly available information?

Of the 71 libraries that mentioned outreach to correctional facilities, 15 offered general library services. This would include collection development, general reference questions, and other services that a typical library would offer to its patrons. While preparing their population to leave a correctional facility, 12 of these libraries offered robust re-entry assistance or re-entry programs. Not included in this category were any libraries that offered services for “formerly incarcerated” patrons or those that only provided a guide to re-entry once individuals had left a correctional institution. Of the 71 libraries, 11 libraries or systems detailed book talks, book discussions, or book clubs held with incarcerated individuals. Some of these programs also led to

performances or speakers related to the topic of the book club.

It should be noted that libraries may offer more than one service to the incarcerated populations that they work with, and therefore one library may fall into multiple categories. There were also 12 libraries or systems that did not provide details as to what their outreach efforts entailed. Further detail about what programs and services are offered can be found in Table 2.

Table 2. Services Offered to Correctional Institutions by Libraries

Type of Service	No. of Libraries/ Library Systems Providing Service
Library Services	15
Re-entry Assistance/Programs	12
Unreported	12
Book Clubs/Book Talks	11
Donate Books/Materials	9
General Programming	7
Books/Materials	7
Family Literacy Programs	5
Literacy Programs/Services	5
Mobile Library Services	5
Book Delivery	3
Continuing Education Programs/Services	3
Legal Materials	3
Tutoring	3
Books-by-Mail	2
Court	2
ESL Services	2
Legal Research	2
Reference-by-Mail	2
Digital Library	1
Digital Literacy Programs	1
Funding	1
In-House Facility	1
Podcast Program	1
Video Visitation	1

R4. What is the difference in the percentage of libraries that were highlighted as offering services to correctional facilities in the 1980s versus those that advertise their outreach via their websites currently?

In the original 1980s study published by the ALA, 706 libraries were determined to have offered services to correctional institutions. As stated previously, the actual number of those libraries that were able to be searched today dropped to 664 due to libraries closing, duplicates being removed, and libraries not having functioning websites. Of the 664 libraries or library systems, it was determined that only 71 libraries or library systems, or 10.7 percent (10.7%) detailed outreach to correctional institutions. All the institutions that outlined services are detailed in the previously mentioned Appendix A.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the websites of a sample of libraries across the U.S. to determine their relationships with correctional facilities. This work was built upon the published study from 1980 by the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies, a sub-group of the American Library Association.

The 1980 study was conducted by the ALA sending out surveys to all libraries across the U.S. inquiring about outreach efforts to correctional institutions. Any libraries or library systems that wished to participate then returned the survey detailing their partnerships and outreach efforts, including the type of facility served, programs offered, staffing, and more. Following a similar pattern, this study documented the libraries or library systems that offered services to correctional institutions, as outlined by various publicly available electronic documents and webpages, as well as the types of institutions served, and programs or services offered.

The results of this study indicated that New York had the highest number of libraries and library systems that served correctional institutions, followed closely by California, Maryland, and Ohio. It also indicated that jails, juvenile detention centers, and general correctional facilities, are most frequently served by libraries and library systems across the country, and that general library services, re-entry programs and assistance, as well as book clubs, book talks, and book discussions are the most frequently highlighted programs at correctional institutions. This study also indicated that after eliminating libraries that have closed, those without websites, and those that were duplicated in the original study, only 71 of the original 664 libraries or library systems (10.7%) currently

detail outreach services or programs to correctional facilities in their area.

As the American Library Association continues to rewrite the standards for service to correctional institutions, it is especially relevant for libraries to consider how they are targeting this underserved population in their area. During this time of revision and change, other studies and research are emerging about library services for the incarcerated, such as the Washington State Library's project to "develop strategies and tools designed to address disparities in the service standards and capacities of general services libraries located in U.S. state and territorial prisons" (Washington State Library, 2022, para. 1).

Since no other current database of libraries that offer services to the incarcerated exists, this study aims to begin to fill in this gap of information by creating the beginnings of a guide to libraries that serve incarcerated individuals. To build upon this study, it is recommended to engage libraries in an updated survey to find out if there are services that are offered to incarcerated individuals that are not publicly available online. It is also recommended that this data is then converted into a "living" database of these libraries to provide an up-to-date guide for librarians who work in correctional institutions, providing them colleagues, programming ideas, and guides for their work in the field.

REFERENCES

Asher, C. (2006). Interlibrary loan outreach to a prison: Access inside. In *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 16(3), 27-33.

Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies (1980). *Survey of library service in local correctional facilities*. American Library Association.

Austin, J. (2019). *Timeline of library services to incarcerated people*.

<https://jeanieaustin.com/2019/12/11/timeline-of-library-services-to-incarcerated-people/>

Baka, A.B.A. & Leyni, N. (2015). Webometric study of world class universities websites. In *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries (QQML) Special Issue*.

Chaparwal, N. & Rajput, P.S. (2020). NIRF ranking 2020: A webometric analysis of websites of top 10 medical institutions.

Chellappandi, P. & Vijayakumar, C.S. (2018). Bibliometrics, scientometrics, webometrics / cybermetrics, informetrics and altmetrics – An emerging field in library and information science research. In *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 7(1).

Chu, H., He, S., & Thelwall, M. (2002). Library and information science schools in Canada and US: A webometric perspective. In *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 43(2).

Clark, S. & MacCreigh, E. (2006). *Library services to the incarcerated: Applying the public library model in correctional facility libraries*. Libraries Unlimited.

Conrad, S. (2012). Collection development and circulation policies in prison libraries: An exploratory survey of librarians in US correctional institutions. In *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, 82(4).

Ellern, G.D. & Mason, K. (2013). Library services to inmates in the rural county jails of western North Carolina. In *North Carolina Libraries*, 71.

Formby, A. & Paynter, K. (2020). The potential of a library media program on reducing recidivism rates among juvenile offenders. In *National Youth-at-Risk Journal*, 4(1), p. 14-21.

Garner, B.A. (2019) Detention center. In *Black's law dictionary* (11th ed., p. 564). Thomson Reuters.

Garner, B.A. (2019) Jail. In *Black's law dictionary* (11th ed., p. 998). Thomson Reuters.

Garner, B.A. (2019) Prison. In *Black's law dictionary* (11th ed., p. 1446). Thomson Reuters.

Gibbons, P. & Schander, D. (2020). Behind the wall: service challenges at a prison library. In *Public Services Quarterly*, 16(1).

Hart, A. (2015). Prison library awareness. In *American Libraries*, 46(½), p. 8.

Lehmann, V., Locke, J. & International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. (2005).

Guidelines for library services to prisoners, 3rd Edition. In *IFLA professional reports*, 92. International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions.

Reitz, J.M. (2013). Cybermetrics. In *Online dictionary for library and information science*. http://products.abc-clio.com/ODLIS/odlis_c#cybermetrics

Reitz, J.M. (2013). Webometrics. In *Online dictionary for library and information science*. https://odlis.abc-clio.com/odlis_c.html

Sullivan, L.E. (2000). The least of our brethren: Library service to prisoners. In *American Libraries*, 31(5).

Verma, M.K. & Brahma, K. (2017). Websites of central universities in North East India: A webometric analysis. In *Journal of Library & Information Technology* 37(3).

Washington State Library. (2022). *Institute of Museum and Library Services*. <https://www.imls.gov/grants/awarded/lg-252319-ols-22>

Webster. (2014). Corrections facility. In *Webster's new world college dictionary* (5th ed., p. 334). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

APPENDIX A

Libraries Offering Outreach Services to Correctional Institutions by State

	State	Number of Libraries
1	New York	12
2	California	8
3	Maryland	6
4	Ohio	6
5	Washington	5
6	Minnesota	4
7	Pennsylvania	3
8	Alabama	2
9	Florida	2
10	Kansas	2
11	Iowa	2
12	Missouri	2
13	Oregon	2
14	Virginia	2
15	Wisconsin	2
16	Arizona	1
17	Colorado	1
18	Georgia	1
19	Kentucky	1
20	Louisiana	1

21	Michigan	1
22	Nebraska	1
23	Nevada	1
24	North Carolina	1
25	South Dakota	1
26	Texas	1
27	Washington, D.C.	1

libguides.ala.org/PrisonLibraries

People Imported From IE MS Power 9+ ACUE Wymar FCU Classes Citi Card 0 Notifications

ALA American Library Association

Resource Guides

ALA Library American Library Association ALA Online Institutional Repository ALA Archives

American Library Association / LibGuides / Libraries and Incarceration / Home


Libraries and Incarceration: Home

Search this Guide Search

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in 2020, approximately 1.26 million persons were incarcerated in the United States. Research shows that increasing the literacy rates and strengthening the library and information access opportunities for det

Home Resources for Librarians Resources for Reentry

About this Resource Guide



LIBRARIES AND INCARCERATION

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in 2020, approximately 1.26 million persons were incarcerated in the United States. Research shows that increasing the literacy rates and strengthening the library and information access opportunities for detained and formerly detained individuals often correlates to successful rehabilitation and reentry (Hall, 2021). The American Library Association, through its members, works to provide library services to these persons, as well as their families.

This resource guide provides information on providing library services within correctional institutions, including ALA policies and standards, a select bibliography, directories of organizations that support library services and intellectual freedom for justice-involved individuals, along with resources for libraries to provide justice-involved individuals upon reentry into their communities.

Policies Relating to Prison Libraries

- Service to Detention Facilities and Jails
Policy B.8.2 states, "The American Library Association

How to get involved

Revisoning Standards for Library Services for the Incarcerated and Detained

The Office for Diversity, Literacy and Outreach Services (ODLOS) has taken over responsibility for issues related to library services for incarcerated

Organizations

- Library Services to the Justice Involved
Library Services for the Justice Involved (LSJI) is an interest

For more information visit <https://libguides.ala.org/PrisonLibraries>