

# THE STATE OF LIBRARY SERVICES SUPPORTING UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS LOCATED IN INDIANA CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

*by David W. Wilhelmus*

*Martin University*

*and*

*Heather Wilhelmus*

*Marion County Juvenile Court*



With the advent of University-sponsored

degree-awarding programs offered within correctional facilities in Indiana, the prison librarian is confronted with the newly heightened responsibility of providing offender-patrons with materials to support academic course requirements. In recognition of the revitalization of an important duty, this article identifies and analyzes the obstacles confronting an Indiana prison librarian when selecting academic materials and making such materials accessible to the offender-patrons.

## PRISON LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

The academic collection found in a prison library is not for the sole use of offenders matriculating through university programs, but is used as well by offenders who are enrolled in other educational programs offered by the Indiana Department of Corrections. These programs cover a wide spectrum of interests, ranging from General Education Diploma (GED) preparation classes to technical and vocational training programs, such as auto mechanics and cosmetology.

Of necessity, the prison library must contain a broad educational collection to meet the diverse needs of offender-patrons with mixed educational levels and assorted educational goals. The resources of prison libraries are limited, as are resources with academic libraries in general. Complicating matters further, the prison librarian is faced with a division, often a conflict, of needs: (1) the problem of obtaining appropriate academic materials in support of the institution's educational programs and (2) the responsibility of collection development in two areas external to academics, namely, legal research and recreational reading.

## UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS LOCATED IN INDIANA PRISONS

From 1973 through 1992, one of the authors of this article was the director of a college program operated by Martin University on what is known as the Lady Elizabeth Campus (Martin University's appellation for the Indiana Women's Prison). Students who successfully matriculate through the four-year program earn a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in the humanities and a

minor in one of three fields of study: criminal justice, business administration, or psychology.

It should be noted that Martin University is not the only institution of higher education that offers college programs in Indiana correctional facilities. The list of higher education institutions include Ball State University, Indiana State University, Vincennes University, and Purdue University Northwest campus.

The courses are taught in the classrooms of the correctional facility's Education Building. The Indiana Women's Prison provides necessary security and arranges for offender-students to attend class. The atmosphere of close security is an element not found in conventional classrooms.

There are approximately 350 offenders incarcerated at the Indiana Women's Prison. Martin University has an average enrollment of thirty-five offender-students who are matriculating through its program. Ball State University has also an average enrollment of thirty-five students. Thus, 20 percent of the total prison population is attending college.

Courses taken by offender-students at the Indiana Women's Prison are offered only during the evening hours. During the day, offender-students are required to participate in either vocational educational programs or to perform the duties of a prison job. This round-the-clock schedule does not allow much time for recreational pursuits or studying. The offender-student must be, of necessity, focused and dedicated in her resolve to earn a college degree.

Offender-students who earn baccalaureate degrees while incarcerated are rewarded by the State of Indiana with the reduction of their sentences. The legislature of the State of Indiana in Public Law 240-1991(552)<sup>1</sup> recognized the importance of education to offenders both in the rehabilitation process itself and in education's potential for reducing future criminal activity among released offenders.

Indiana Public Law 240-1991(552) states that a person may petition the sentencing court for a reduction of sentence if that person successfully completes a sub-

stance abuse program, a vocational program, or any of several educational programs — specifically a general equivalency diploma and, of greatest importance to this present study, an associate's degree or other college degree.

Recognition of education as a principal factor in rehabilitation and in eventual reintegration of offenders as productive members of the community is a significant new mind-set for an ultra conservative legislative body such as the Indiana General Assembly. The role that the prison library plays through its efforts in providing academic materials to offender-students is given greater focus by such legislative recognition of the prison's potential academic functions and the rewards that can be forthcoming from their delivery of services to offender-students.

Indeed, the institutional library is being given new imperative in the correctional facility of today. The prison librarian now must be knowledgeable of the informational needs of the offender-patrons in terms of the academic materials required to support vocational, technical, and college programs being offered in the enhancement of the rehabilitation process.

#### HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PRISON LIBRARIES

In a sense, the new role is really the strengthening of an old educational concern. Going back to the earliest records available, Alexander Maconochie, while administrator of Norfolk Island off the coast of Australia, one of Britains worst prisons, established an educational program and encouraged the inmates to read.<sup>2</sup> Maconochie was one of the first prison administrators to recognize the importance of reading materials in supporting an educational program designed to reform the anti-social behavior of offenders. Maconochie went so far as to award prizes to inmates who read an established number of books — books available through one of the first prison libraries.<sup>3</sup>

The spirit of reform was also stirring in the United States. In 1870, a national prison organization met in Cincinnati and published its *Declaration of Principles*. The declaration consisted of twenty-two recommendations. Eight of the recommendations cited "religion and education" as being the "most important agencies of reformation."

This *Declaration of Principles* clearly documents the interest held by prison reformers in providing offenders with both religious and educational training. In truth, by the middle of the eighteenth century, there was a growing awareness of the importance of providing reading materials to offenders for their religious and educational growth.

Further changes in philosophy were yet to come. With the advent of the twentieth century, there was a

marked move away from the belief that offenders should be solely punished, to a more liberal belief that inmates should be rehabilitated. To this end, educational services have become the linchpin of modern rehabilitation programs.

#### THE LITERACY PROBLEM AND THE SPECTRUM OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

The problem confronting prison librarians engaged in the delivery of academic materials and services is the low level of literacy among offenders which is apparent when inmates, as a group, are contrasted with the general population of America. This issue becomes important to the prison librarian as more state legislatures recognize the need to enact legislation rewarding offenders for involvement in self-improvement programs and, especially, for earning college degrees.

According to *The Bureau of Justice Statistics: Comparing Federal and State Inmates, 1991*,<sup>4</sup> which contains the most recent statistics available, offenders with an eighth-grade education comprise 11 percent of the federal prison population and 14.2 percent of state prison populations. The report also indicates that offenders with some high school education made up 12.3 percent of the inmate population in federal prisons and 26.9 percent of the inmate populations in state prisons. The report further indicates that offenders with a high school education account for 48.5 percent of the inmate population of federal prisons and 46.5 percent of inmate populations in state prisons.

In terms of higher education levels, the report states that offenders with some college training comprise 18.8 percent of the inmate population in federal prisons and 10 percent of inmate populations in state prisons. The report indicates that offenders with a college education or advanced graduate study constitute 9.3 percent of the federal prison population and only 2.3 percent of state prison populations.

Table One  
1991 Federal and State Educational  
Levels of Inmates

Educational Level	Federal	State
8th grade or less	11.0%	14.2%
Some high school	12.3	26.9
High school graduate	48.5	46.5
Some college	18.8	10.0
College graduate or more	9.3	2.3
Median education	12 yrs	12 yrs

In summary, for all offender populations in the United States, federal and state, the median educational level for inmates is 12 years, the point at which college study typically begins.

The statistics just cited are significant in establishing the educational levels of the offender-student served by the prison library. Clearly, there are a substantial number of offenders who could benefit from participating in college programs. In fact, from a review of the statistics, it can be ascertained that in the federal prison system, 48.5 percent of the federal offender population is made up of high school graduates; and 18.8 percent is comprised of inmates having some college credits. This combination amounts to 67.3 percent of the total federal population that would be academically eligible to participate in college programs.

The state prison systems are statistically similar in terms of the composition of their offender populations to that of the federal system. As stated previously, 46.5 percent of inmates incarcerated in state correctional facilities are high school graduates; and 10 percent have some college credits. Taken together, the percentages total 56.5 percent of state prison populations — a number greater than one half of the total population — which is eligible to attend college in the state prison systems.

Coupled with statistics relating to previous educational achievement levels of offenders, there is another demographic consideration that should strongly influence the need for and establishment of college programs within correctional facilities. That second relevant factor is the ages of offenders incarcerated in America's prisons.

According to *The Bureau of Justice Statistics: Comparing Federal and State Prison Inmates, 1991*, 9.3 percent of the federal prison population falls into the age range of 18 to 24 years of age while 21.3 percent of state prison populations fall into the same age range. Of the federal prison population, 36 percent is included in the age range of 25 to 34 years of age while 45.7 percent of state prison populations is found to be in that same age range.

Lastly, 32.9 percent of the federal prison population is to be found in the age range of 35 to 44 years of age while 22.7 percent of state prison populations is found to be in the same age range.

**Table Two**  
**1991 Federal and State Inmate Age**

Age	Federal	State
17 or younger	0%	.6%
18-24	9.3	21.3
25-34	36.0	45.7
35-44	32.9	22.7
45-54	15.0	6.5
55-64	5.7	2.4
65 or older	1.1	.7
Median age	36 yrs	30 yrs

Collectively, 78.2 percent of the federal prison population falls within the age range of 18 to 44 years of age; and 89.7 percent of state prison populations falls within the same age range. In summary, there is a large number of potential students of college age incarcerated in America's correctional facilities who are eligible to attend college-based instructional programs, based on the demographic characteristics of educational achievement and chronological age.

#### **THE NATURE OF THE PRISON LIBRARY PATRONS AND THE ROLE OF THE PRISON LIBRARY**

The prison librarian is faced with a dichotomy of offender-patrons that must be served. On the one hand, the library is required to provide materials in support of the prisons efforts to offer offenders remedial instruction in order to raise low educational levels of a large number of illiterate inmates. On the other hand, the prison library is faced with the responsibility of providing materials to support college-level programs.

Not all correctional facilities allow higher educational institutions to operate college programs within their prison walls. In the State of Indiana there are approximately thirty correctional facilities;<sup>5</sup> only five of them have agreements with institutions of higher education to operate college or university programs within their facilities.

#### **THE OTHER ROLES OF THE PRISON LIBRARY**

Educational uses, the first obligation of the prison library, must share a place with two other functions of the prison library's tripartite role. As libraries became established in correctional facilities, their duties expanded to the second obligation of the prison library. That is to include providing recreational reading materials to assist offenders in finding some diversion from the harsh, bleak, and saturnine conditions experienced while incarcerated. Hence, this was added to the role of serving educational ends.

Perhaps the most extended statement of the diversionary role of the prison library has been set forth by Charles Perrine in his promotion of the concept of the prison library as a center for the dissemination of culture, supervised by a library professional rather than by an "undermanned educational staff." In his article "A Correctional Institution's Library Service,"<sup>6</sup> Perrine states that he believes the "library in a correctional institution must be conceived of as a cultural center for the community of man within prison walls."

Perrine outlines how he would organize and implement the prison library and its programs. He would first establish a society to develop prison libraries as cultural centers within correctional facilities. Perrine further proposes that the following actions be taken in developing cultural centers and prison libraries:

- (1) Perrine advocates the acquisition of materials that would broaden the offender's intellectual horizons;
- (2) he believes that it is necessary to strengthen the technical, vocational, and reference book collections;
- (3) he feels there should be more displays of arts' and crafts' books;
- (4) he asks that the library provide picture and pamphlet collections;
- (5) he urges that the library develop CD collections and music programs;
- (6) he suggests that the library offer informal lectures on a wide variety of topics;
- (7) he proposes that the prison librarian organize book and creative writing clubs; and
- (8) his last proposal and the one of greatest importance in terms of the role of the prison library which is the focus of this article, Perrine affirms that there should be an integration of the library and the academic and educational programs.

The third obligation of the prison library within its tripartite role is that of providing offender-patrons with legal reference materials to enable them to access the judicial system in fulfillment of their court-established right to such access.

The prison library has also had the obligation of providing offender-patrons with "writ-writers," who are persons trained in legal research and the preparation of pleadings for the purpose of assisting illiterate offenders in court-related matters.

These mandates contrast sharply with the professional training of most librarians. Only a few are trained as law librarians; yet prison librarians have been man-

dated by the courts to provide offenders with legal materials and to offer training to offender law clerks in the preparation of legal pleadings in order that they may assist illiterate inmates.

As a result of a series of federal court cases (*Johnson v. Avery* in 1969, *Wolff v. McDonnell* in 1974, *Bounds v. Smith* in 1977, and *Hadix v. Johnson* in 1988), correctional facilities were required to expand their libraries to comply with a progressively revised legal mandate. As early as 1974, at the time of the *Wolff v. McDonnell* decision, the Massachusetts Department of Corrections was forced to respond to the then-current mandates by placing a legal collection in each of its correctional facilities with an offender population of 250 or more.<sup>7</sup> The same department of corrections also developed a sixteen week course which was offered in its medium-security prisons, as training for offenders in the skills of legal research and writing.

As a result of cumulative court decisions, the prison librarian had been mandated by no less authority than the United States Supreme Court to provide an offender-patron with both an adequately stocked legal collection, and training in the techniques of legal research and writing. The term "adequately stocked law library" has been most clearly defined by the American Association of Law Libraries in its publication *Recommended Collections for Prison and Other Institution Law Libraries*.<sup>8</sup>

In summary, the prison librarian must become familiar with the support programs offered by the correctional facility which employs him/her and the duties it is required to carry out so that the librarian can make appropriate collection development decisions and best utilize the limited resources which are typically his/her lot.

## WHO ARE PRISON LIBRARIANS?

Gordon states in "Correctional Libraries: Provide Services by the Book"<sup>9</sup>, that because of the isolated and bleak nature of correctional facilities the prison librarian has a dual role to play. First, he/she must provide library materials to offender-patrons with censorship always present. Second, the librarian must be ready to act as counselor, social worker, and ombudsman to help offender-patrons through serious life issues.

Gordon's findings support the proposition that prison life is at best a dismal existence, fostering isolation and a deprivation of the information most needed by offenders to meet the academic requirements of educational programs.

Prison life is equally as hard on the librarian, forcing him/her to work against obstacles to develop professionally. Yet most in the library profession would hold that a library remains as strong as the skills and

professionalism of the librarian who holds the administration.

Personal character has a strong role to play in a librarian's success. Gordon states that prison librarians need to be "fair, firm, and consistent in dealing with offenders, although materials that threaten the institution's security may have to be censored."

A basic conflict confronts administrators of Indiana correctional facilities who in fact, hire prison librarians. These administrators are faced with the problem of hiring qualified professional librarians and also of hiring individuals who will follow without question the policies of the Indiana Department of Corrections, which may be in conflict with the codes of ethics espoused by professional library associations.

The issue of potential censorship raised by Gordon's report indicates that there is a clear and present need to study the adequacy of academic collections located within correctional facilities to ensure that offender-students' educational programs are receiving appropriate support and not being obstructed in their development.

A. R. Roberts conducted research in 1980 to answer the need just indicated above by Gordon's study. Roberts has reviewed his findings in the article "Library Services and Censorship in Corrections."<sup>10</sup>

Roberts interviewed twenty-eight offenders in prisons located in the states of Maryland, New Jersey, and New York concerning the library services that the offenders were receiving. The offenders interviewed reported that their prison libraries were important to them for "entertainment, information, and personal growth" and, in last place, for supporting educational programs. Offenders indicated that the strong point of the prison library system within the surveyed facilities was the librarians' efforts to secure books required by the inmates.

Roberts indicates in his survey that a two-page questionnaire that was sent to a selected sample of fifty of the most populated correctional facilities listed in the American Correctional Association Directory. Roberts received responses from twenty-four of the fifty prison libraries surveyed. The responses were from libraries in all regions of the United States.

The findings indicated that the most frequently censored materials were books that posed a perceived "threat to security" and hard-core pornography. Definitions of publications or collections that threatened security varied widely, but the list of books to be watched or handled with care included the legal collections of the prison libraries. The findings also indicated that educational materials were reviewed with the institution's security being an issue.

Clearly the prison librarian faces the professional dilemma of compliance with the policies of the correctional facility, and on the other hand, failing to follow the guidelines of the *Library Bill of Rights* that opposes censorship of library materials.<sup>11</sup> In fact, section three of the *Library Bill of Rights* states that "Librarians should challenge censorship in the fulfillment of their responsibility to provide information and enlightenment." Although the *Library Bill of Rights* is an important philosophical document that all librarians must be aware of, perhaps the issue of prison security warrants a modification of this document in order to meet the informational needs of an increasing large library population that will need to be served in the future.

Roberts found that only one-third of the respondents to the survey had final responsibility for acquiring library materials. The study further indicated that twenty-five of the thirty-four respondents did not have any training from graduate library science programs.

Roberts summarizes the article by stating: "considering the importance of libraries to inmates, efforts should be made to hire professional librarians." Roberts' survey indicated that there is a need to review the current standards for prison librarianship and to continue to study the adequacy of the educational collections of prison libraries to ascertain if censorship is in operation within these libraries. The presence of censorship is undeniably, a major collection development issue which will affect the building of academic collections, as well as all other types of collections, recreational, legal or general-educational.

## THE TECHNOLOGY PROBLEM

Technology is another area of concern for the librarian who has the responsibility of providing materials to support academic programs within the Indiana prison system. Correctional facilities are reluctant to permit the use of prison library computers to access outside databases or to access the Internet, out of fear that the institution's security would be compromised.

Indeed, all contact with the world outside the prison is suspect as the censorship of mail — an old practice — makes evident. Notwithstanding the prison administrator's need to maintain a high level of security in terms of offender's contact with outside entities, the prison librarian often does have access to computer systems operated by the institution.

Added to the administrative-imposed restrictions just mentioned, the prison library characteristically has a limited academic collection because of a lack of shelf space and the competing court-imposed mandate of providing offenders with legal materials and services.

In a series of three articles published in *Corrections Today*, Brenda Vogel has brought the issues surround-

ing the prison library use of computers under extended examination. In her first article, "Ready or Not, Computers are Here,"<sup>12</sup> Vogel states that computers have a role to play in correctional facilities. Such a statement is often met with disbelief and suspicion by prison personnel.

Some correctional officials fear they will lose control of prisons if offenders are allowed access to modern technology. Vogel, however, points out how "the future of corrections depends on whether we embrace new technologies and make them a part of our regular work routine."

Vogel states that computers can be used in the prison workplace without jeopardizing public safety. She offers the example of being able to load software onto the computer with a password." She points out to correctional employees that it is possible for prisons to utilize tamper-proof modems. Vogel also includes among her ideas the suggestion that prisons should use "external modems that can be removed from the computer when the employee leaves." Another method of maintaining security involving the use of modems is to "secure the phone line at the main console when the employee is not present."

Although the suggestions offered by Vogel may seem simplistic to academic librarians and other information specialists, it should be kept in mind that the readership of her article is composed of individuals with little, if any, experience in the use of information technology, and for whom the maintenance of prison security is of paramount interest.

Vogel further states that "technology will be a boom to the administrative sector of correctional agencies in much the same way that computerized security equipment has been to facilities." In this statement, Vogel points out to correctional personnel that information technology has the same potential importance to the secure operation of a prison that the adoption of computer-operated security systems has had.

It is a compelling argument for acceptance of the whole of a technology's applications on the basis of the part which has already been tested and has won acceptance. Continuing her argument, Vogel states that correctional administrators should foster the development of electronic information systems to enhance the effectiveness of their organizations. Importantly, present-day and archival uses being considered together, in-house documents could be better managed through computerization. As examples of such applications, computers could be used to post rules and regulations, bulletins in making available program descriptions, administrative orders, and personnel regulations. They could be used to maintain offender manuals and lastly, to further human resources development through various programs, some clearly instructional.

In Vogel's second article of her series, "Meeting Court Mandates: the CD-ROM Solution,"<sup>13</sup> the author reviews the problems confronting correctional administrators of accommodating increasingly larger prison populations and, at the same time, meeting the court mandates that prisons provide offenders with necessary legal information. As Vogel states, "[usually, the more inmates you have, the more materials you need — which...means you spend more money use more space and need more staff]"

As stated previously, one of the three principal roles of the prison librarian is to comply with the courts' mandate to provide offenders with an adequately stocked law library and persons trained in legal research to assist illiterate inmates with the preparation of legal documents. The domain of law itself, of course, occupies a professional and technical niche of the world of academia. Indeed, a related field, criminal justice, is one of the possible minors in the Martin University program on the Lady Elizabeth Campus located on the grounds of the Indiana Women's Prison. (What separates the literature of law from the rest of academic holdings, for the purposes of this present study, is the source of its being mandated as a concern of the prison library, not a lack of scholarly nature or content.)

Vogel acknowledges the responsibilities of the prison librarian and offers correctional administrators with a solution to the facility's increasing problem of limited space. Vogel states the "law library is one court-mandated program that can employ this [new] technology." She states that "[replacing shelves of law books with compact disc read only memory (CD-ROM) products has reduced the cost of operating these libraries.]"

Vogel indicates that the majority of states rely on the American Association of Law Libraries' *Recommended Collections for Prison and Other Institution Law Libraries* as the model for individual collections. According to Vogel, although such legal collections are relatively inexpensive to a law library (costing an average of \$40,000 as an original purchase price and only \$5,000 annually to maintain), the cost to a correctional facility can be disproportionately high.

The problem that arises for a correctional institution is the requirement that "these collections must be accessible to all inmates." Hence, adding to the expense of having an adequately stocked legal collection may be the necessity of requiring additional collections so that extra volumes will be available for classifications of offenders not allowed to visit the prison library. These classifications would include offenders who are on death row and those who are segregated from contact with the general prison population.

The advantage of CD-ROM products to the prison library is that they can take the place of printed books. In her third article, "The Print Law Library: From Print

to CD-ROM,"<sup>14</sup> Vogel offers the example of the fact that one disc can hold "an entire state code, an encyclopedia or the *Code of Federal Regulations*." The correctional administrator will no longer be faced with the problem of finding additional space to expand the physical size of the prison library. Less new shelf space is required to accommodate an increase in the size of the legal collection.

Vogel further states that computerization of information systems will also save prisons substantial amounts of time by reducing the time that offenders spend in the library as a result of the speed of electronic searching. It will additionally save time spent by correctional officers who conduct "shakedowns" (searches) of offenders "for materials" (contraband that might be hidden inside books or other library materials).

Vogel states that the initial investment for computerized information systems will be steep for correctional facilities. However, the eventual operational savings that will be realized is well worth such outlays of capital. The prison librarian will save time doing "inventory, returning volumes to shelves, rebinding, mending, photocopying or delivering books on carts to cells."

The prison librarian can learn from practicing attorneys who "cannot justify the cost of maintaining the space needed to house books that are essential to their practice." As a fact, CD-ROM technology has improved the quality of materials donated by attorneys. Today, donated legal collections are often current and have been well-maintained, simply because they rapidly were replaced by a CD-ROM equivalent.

The academic librarian can gain some insight into the actual operation of a prison library and the difficulties of collection development from the encounters in building legal collections. Clearly, the advantages derived from the use of computerized information systems, such as local area networks (LANs) utilizing CD-ROM products, would also be useful to prison librarians attempting to develop academic collections within limited space and, given the long-term operational savings, within limited budgets.

The reluctance of correctional administrators to utilize technology, based on a fear of jeopardizing the security of facilities, will continue to confront prison librarians involved in collection development, academic or legal. This issue is one of several which are common to both the legal mandate to provide offenders with a law collection and the need to provide inmates with academic materials in support of college programs.

Correctional facilities are legal entities created by legislatures to carry out the law of the state. Hence, the fulfillment of a legal mandate takes top priority. How-

ever, from conversations with correctional administrators, the authors have ascertained that a large percentage of those administrators feel that academic collections will prove to be more useful to offender populations as educational programs continue to prepare inmates to re-enter society, becoming productive members of communities. That goal of re-entry may be the new cynosure — a new point of orientation that will have increasing force as the old priorities diminish.

## RECENT CHANGE IN THE LEGAL MANDATE

A de-emphasis of the once-commanding legal priority is currently taking place. The mandate imposed by the *Bounds* case, which created the duty for correctional facilities of providing offenders with legal collections, was substantially changed recently by the United States Supreme Court's ruling in *Casey v. Lewis*.<sup>15</sup> The United States Supreme Court in *Casey v. Lewis* stated that *Bounds* did not establish a "free-standing right to a law library or legal assistance." Thus, in a major recent case, offenders of Arizona state prisons could not claim that they were actually harmed by the Arizona Department of Corrections in this case. The Court held that law libraries and legal assistance programs are not the principal focus of *Bounds*, but only a "reasonably adequate opportunity to present claimed violations of a fundamental constitutional right to the courts."<sup>16</sup>

Since *Bounds* did not establish a free-standing right to law libraries or legal assistance programs, offenders are unable to claim damages by merely proving that correctional facilities law libraries or legal assistance programs are inadequate. They must go beyond proof of that condition to proof that actual harm had resulted from the condition.

With such limitations placed on *Bounds* through court interpretation, the force of *Bounds* will be diminished and the other roles of the prison library should rise to greater importance.

## CONCLUSION

The development of academic collections may be the emerging role of the prison library. Many of the issues that need to be resolved for development of academic collections to take place (e.g., the acceptance and controlled governance of computer use) have already been faced in maintaining and bettering the legal collections of prison libraries. Indeed, in many respects, development and maintenance of the legal collection has been a testing ground for academic collection development within prisons.

The mandate imposed by the *Bounds* case, which created for correctional facilities the duty of providing offenders with legal collections and services, was substantially changed by the United States Supreme Court's ruling in *Casey v. Lewis*. This change in Court interpre-

tation seems to indicate a shift of direction and in importance among the three roles that the prison library has played.

There is a shortage of resources available for developing collections in support of prison-based college and technical educational programs, as there are shortages in other academic libraries throughout the state of Indiana. Academic collections in prisons have, up to now, been forced to take a subordinate role when competing for resources with court-mandated legal collections. However, with the advent of the recent decision in *Casey v. Lewis*, correctional facilities now have a greatly reduced obligation to provide offenders with legal materials. This apparent de-emphasis of an old obligation may be interpreted as a new and excellent opportunity for prison librarians to turn their attention to developing adequately stocked academic collections to meet the educational needs of offender-students.

Academic librarians of institutions of higher education in the State of Indiana can be of the greatest assistance to prison librarians by offering professional advice.

This new investment of time in academic collection building and academic programming holds great promise. In one of the author's experience as a former director of a college program offered within an Indiana prison, he can give personal testimony that none of the graduates from his program who have been released has been re-incarcerated — an end result that librarians, correctional administrators, politicians, educators, offenders, and members of the public in general, all desire.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Indiana Public Law 240-1991(552), I.C. 35-38-1-23.
- <sup>2</sup> J. V. Barry, "Alexander Maconochie (1787-1860)," in *Pioneers in Criminology*, ed. by H. Mannheim, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.(Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1972)
- <sup>3</sup> J. V. Barry, *Alexander Maconochie of Norfolk Island: A Study of Prison Reform*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1958).
- <sup>4</sup> *The Bureau of Justice Statistics: Comparing Federal and State Prison Inmates*, 1991 (Washington: GPO, 1991)
- <sup>5</sup> State of Indiana, Department of Corrections, "Average Daily Cost and Per Diem and Average Population by Security Levels." 1996
- <sup>6</sup>Carles V. Perrine, "A Correctional Institution's Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin* 30 (November 1955): 249.
- <sup>7</sup> Stone V. Boone, No. 73-1083-T, Consent decree (D. Mass. Oct. 10, 1974).
- <sup>8</sup> Recommended Collections for Prison and Other Institution Law Libraries' rev. ed. (Chicago: American Association of Law Libraries Contemporary Social Problems Special Interest Section), 1997
- <sup>9</sup> B. Gordon, "Correctional Libraries: Provide Service by the Book," *Corrections Today* 51, no.7 (December 1998): 60,62,64
- <sup>10</sup> A. R. Roberts, "Library Services and Censorship in Corrections," *Journal of Offender Counseling Services and Rehabilitation*, v.5, no.2 (Winter 1980): 75-84.
- <sup>11</sup> American Library Association, *Library Bill of Rights*, Adopted June 18, 1948; amended February 2, 1961, and January 23, 1980, by the ALA Council.
- <sup>12</sup> Brenda Vogel, "Ready or Not, Computers Are Here," *Corrections Today*, v.57, no.6 (August 1995): 162
- <sup>13</sup> Brenda Vogel, "Meeting Court Mandates: The CD-ROM Solution," *Corrections Today*, v.57, no.7 (December 1995): 158
- <sup>14</sup> Brenda Vogel, "The Prison Law Library: From Print to CD-ROM," *Corrections Today*, v.58, no.3 (June 1996):100
- <sup>15</sup> *Casey v. Lewis*, 116 S.2174
- <sup>16</sup> *Bounds v. Smith*, 430 U.S. 817 (1977)