



## Survey of Library and Informational Problems in Correctional Facilities: A Retrospective Review

MARJORIE LEDONNE

IT HAS BEEN three years since the final report of the *Survey of Library and Information Problems in Correctional Institutions* was published by the Institute of Library Research at the University of California in Berkeley. The study was initiated in 1972 under a research grant from the U.S. Office of Education. In subsequent years, other research has been done, and many changes have been brought about against which the observations and recommendations made in the 1974 report should be weighed.

Prison libraries have existed for nearly as long as have prisons, yet major decisions governing their development are, even today, rarely made by librarians. They are most often made by wardens or superintendents of institutions, by directors of educational programs, and occasionally by state directors of correctional agencies. Until recently, no body of information upon which decision-makers could rely was available for their guidance. The most recent statistical survey of the nation's adult correctional libraries was done in 1965.<sup>1</sup> A comprehensive national survey of juvenile correctional libraries has never been done. By the 1970s, library standards adopted by the American Correctional Association (ACA) in 1966 had been challenged as inadequate and their revision was underway. Existing library literature was of little help in facing new issues to either correctional administrators or librarians. David Gillespie's 1968 analysis of correctional library literature showed that analytical theses were few, and that most articles appearing in journals described library programs but gave little evaluation of a program's impact on the total operation of a prison.<sup>2</sup> For the most part, the literature did not discuss problems of service, nor did it address basic issues of library objectives, admin-

---

Marjorie LeDonne is Institutional Specialist, California State Library, Sacramento.

## MARJORIE LEDONNE

istrative procedure or the library's position in the administrative structure. If these issues were seldom discussed in library literature, they were totally ignored in the literature of sociologists and correctional professionals. With the advent of the 1970s, court decisions and a new level of public interest in prisons and civil rights forced many library-related issues to the surface. Decision-makers searched for solutions without benefit of a literature providing the shared thought, the variety of opinion, or the experience and insight of others.

## THE STUDY

### PURPOSE

In 1972 the Institute of Library Research (ILR), working in cooperation with ACA, undertook the two-year study designed to draw upon the experience and observations of inmates, librarians, administrators, and others; to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of correctional library programs; to identify problems and potential solutions; and to develop an overview within which issues could be weighed. The study was to be a major, but beginning, step toward filling an information void. As the study progressed, hope grew that it would also alert librarians in community and academic libraries to ways in which they could cooperate to improve correctional library services; that it would increase the awareness of legislators and correctional administrators of the need for library and information services for confined persons; and, finally, that it would foster a shared sense of responsibility for improving these services.

### PROCEDURE

The study was made up of four components, each one represented by a volume of the final report.<sup>3</sup> These were: (1) an on-site investigation of library programs for adult and juvenile offenders in state and federal institutions in ten sample states, (2) a survey of responses made by each state to the federal Supreme Court mandate for prisoner access to legal reference materials, (3) the development of profiles summarizing correctional library development in each state and federal territory, and (4) a search of the literature and pertinent unpublished documents. Sample states were selected by an advisory committee composed of librarians and correctional experts of national reputation and experience.<sup>4</sup> The committee was guided by predetermined criteria and developed a sample which would provide:

*Survey of Problems: A Review*

Representative geographic, economic, ethnic, and cultural characteristics;

Both small rural and large industrialized states with large metropolitan areas;

A variety of patterns of service to correctional institutions; and

A cross-section of all types of institutions under the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

States selected for the sample were Washington, California, Montana, Arizona, Illinois, Connecticut, New York, West Virginia, Georgia, and Florida.

Within each selected state, on-site visits were made to all institutions under federal jurisdiction and to at least one state institution in each of the following categories: adult male maximum security, adult male minimum security, adult female, and juvenile. At each institution structured interviews were conducted with persons who could give a variety of viewpoints—inmates, wardens, superintendents, supervisors of educational programs, librarians, and inmate library clerks. In each state, directors of departments of corrections and of juvenile correctional agencies were interviewed, as well as institutional consultants serving with state library agencies. Interviews were confidential and in most instances held privately. Only within the Federal Bureau of Prisons were prisoners not allowed to meet with the investigator without staff supervision. Arrangements were made in advance for the interviews to be taped, and in only a few instances was permission not granted. These procedures were not designed to gather statistical data, but to acquire new insights into the problem of correctional library service and to illuminate the differences in the perceptions of correctional administrators and library professionals in areas which could affect library policy and development.

Interview questions were developed to test five hypotheses:

1. That correctional library services are generally poor;
2. That services are not appropriate to meet the particular needs of the population being served;
3. That services would be improved by the addition of a librarian at policy-making level within the central office of each correctional agency;
4. That services would be improved if libraries were removed from their present subordinate position within educational programs; and
5. That library services would be improved by closer cooperation with outside libraries.

MARJORIE LEDONNE

Interview questions were based on the particular relationship of the subject to the library program. More than fifty questions in all were developed to ask of six categories of interview subject: (1) superintendents or wardens of institutions, (2) directors or assistant directors of correctional agencies, (3) institutional consultants with state library agencies, (4) directors of educational programs, (5) librarians, and (6) inmates, including both those who used their prison library and those who did not. The following core questions were asked of all interview subjects:

What are the objectives of the library program? Or, why do you think there should be a library in a correctional institution?

How well does the library program in this institution (in this state) meet these objectives?

What do you see as problem areas in the operation of the library program?

What do you see as possible solutions?

All staff members and institutional consultants were asked several additional questions:

What are the objectives of the institution (or of the department)?

Would you prefer to have library services developed internally by the correctional agency or externally from an outside library?

Is there a need for a coordinator or director of library services within the agency's central office?

Should the library program be independent and parallel to the educational program or subordinate to it?

Although many answers addressed legal reference needs, none of the questions asked specifically about legal services; the findings on legal reference services in the second volume of the ILR report were based, not on interview questions, but on a questionnaire developed by Maragaret Hannigan of the U.S. Office of Education and sent to all state library institutional consultants early in 1972.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The hypothesis that correctional library services were generally poor was confirmed. There were exceptions, however, and in several instances prison libraries surpassed nearby public libraries and were providing services to staff and families of staff, as well as to inmates. Where legal collections recommended by the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) had been established, they often surpassed law

### *Survey of Problems: A Review*

library resources in the community.<sup>5</sup> In some states citizens had no access to legal reference collections. For the most part, correctional libraries fell short of community libraries and well below standards set by the ACA in 1966.<sup>6</sup> The one standard consistently met was the number of volumes required per inmate. Because this criterion is so visible, it was frequently cited as evidence of the adequacy of a library even though the materials were outdated, little used, and sometimes inaccessible. Poor building design, inadequate funds, insufficient staff and clerical help, isolation of libraries, lack of training opportunities for staff, and poor administrative support were some of the factors which undermined the quality of prison library programs.

The second hypothesis—that the services provided were not appropriate to meet the particular needs of institutionalized persons—was substantiated in all institutions visited. Library hours were geared to the convenience of staff rather than to client need, and hours were inadequate to provide access for main line populations. Staff shortages did not allow the extension of services to maximum-security areas where restrictive confinement increased the need for reading and listening materials. In contrast, court-mandated legal reference materials were frequently delivered to all areas of the institution, with security staff and counselors serving as couriers. Inappropriate collections were the result of haphazard selection procedures compounded by inappropriate donations. In some states, where services were provided by outside public libraries, even carefully selected materials shared with institutional libraries proved to be far better suited to community interests than to those of prisoners. In the state of Washington this has been corrected by the participation of institutional librarians in the selection process and by soliciting suggestions from inmates.<sup>7</sup> Cumbersome purchasing procedures in some states also made collection development difficult. Unique materials from small publishers were especially difficult to purchase. Moreover, in 1973 most commercial publishers were not producing a sufficient variety and number of materials for ethnic and cultural minority groups, nor were much-needed, high interest/low vocabulary materials with appropriate subject matter and format available. Today the situation has improved with minority interest materials, but those for adult beginning readers are still in short supply. All librarians interviewed also lamented the lack of audiovisual materials and equipment. The needs and interests of prisoners, combined with below average reading skills, demand a variety of media, yet most collections seen were limited to print.

It was the conclusion of the investigator that inappropriateness of services was due in part to library objectives that were out of touch with new trends in correctional thinking. Librarians consistently emphasized "rehabilitation" as an overall library objective, whereas correctional administrators cited most frequently "assistance to prisoners in achieving successful reentry into the community" as their primary objective. The concept of "rehabilitation" assumes the presence of an abnormality which "treatment" will restore to normalcy.<sup>8</sup> It is not surprising, then, that librarians focused on the period of confinement—the period of "treatment"—and gave little attention to the information needs of persons leaving the institution. Librarians emphasized enriching intellectual experience, self-directed education, recreational and "escape" reading, the provision of a pleasant library environment, and the treatment of prisoners with dignity, respect, and individual attention as a means of improving the prisoner's self-image. These are worthy aims and should not be abandoned, but they do little to assist persons to return to the community from isolation, locate a job, find housing, develop social and recreational contacts, or overcome myriad other hurdles. The information services needed call for a new direction for correctional libraries which parallels the effort of community libraries establishing information and referral services for their information poor.

In 1975 Brenda Vogel, Library Coordinator for the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, conducted a survey of the information needs of prisoners in seven Maryland institutions.<sup>9</sup> The needs identified by the study are given below in order of their priority:

1. In-house information on institutional procedures, regulations, current happenings, etc.;
2. Information concerning families and community resource information for family assistance;
3. Legal information concerning criminal charges, appeals, etc.; and
4. Job market information and other reentry information.

Meeting these information needs will require new levels of communication and cooperation among institutional libraries and between them and outside information resources. At the Correctional Training Facility at Soledad, California, an inmate committee took over a reentry information project when the staff member serving as reentry counselor was reassigned to other duties. The inmate project director

### *Survey of Problems: A Review*

contacted major corporations and potential employers, inquired about their hiring policies for exoffenders, and prepared a listing of designated contact persons in California for exoffenders seeking employment. With LSCA funding the project was expanded, and produced statewide directories of halfway houses, community services, and local information and referral services.<sup>10</sup> An exoffender group in Sacramento, California, produced a directory especially for use by released prisoners of community resources in the Sacramento area.<sup>11</sup> Similar directories were developed by the Missouri State Library and by the librarian at Cook County Jail in Chicago.<sup>12</sup> At the California Medical Facility in Vacaville, an inmate committee has gathered together statewide information on current educational programs, available scholarships, and support services for exoffender students. These information services have much to contribute to public libraries and to public library clienteles, and would certainly benefit from closer ties with community library-based information and referral services.

The third hypothesis—that services would be improved by the addition of a library coordinator within each correctional agency—was strengthened by interviews and observations, but not proven. Directors of educational programs and local administrators did not always see this as desirable; most librarians did, but also feared central office control as much as they desired central office support. Since the ILR study, the Illinois Department of Corrections has discontinued its position of library coordinator and has turned over responsibility for library services to the Illinois State Library. Centralized coordination continues but under the direction of the Illinois State Library's institutional consultant.<sup>13</sup> Where administrative responsibility for library programs rests with the correctional agency, most top-level administrators and all institutional consultants saw the establishment of a coordinator as desirable; consultants, however, gave it a higher priority than administrators did. In California, where both hospital and correctional institution libraries have developed with very little centralized coordination, five state agencies have formed an interdepartmental task force to address staffing problems of libraries in the state's residential institutions. The question of central office coordination is one of the problems to be considered. During 1977-78 an LSCA grant will initiate a library coordinator position within the California Youth Authority as a pilot project. If the position has a favorable impact on the quality of services provided, it will be retained on a permanent basis. In any case, the project will provide the task

force with valuable information which should be applicable to other state agencies administering residential institutions.

The hypothesis that library services would be improved if libraries were separated from educational programs was not supported by the study. Although correctional library development has been neglected under educational program administrators, there was no evidence that libraries would do better if shifted to some other position in the administrative hierarchy. More important changes would be the establishment of adequate, line-item budgets; the provision of in-service training opportunities for library personnel; improved communications with institutional staff and with outside libraries; integration of library planning into overall correctional planning and statewide library planning; and improved managerial techniques which establish program objectives, performance standards, time limits, and reliable methods for evaluating progress. It was the conclusion of the investigator that unless these steps were taken, there would be little advantage in having librarians report to a different department head.

It is unlikely that these changes will be achieved by educators alone; they are beset with their own problems which absorb their attention. Moreover, the needs of their own programs tend to limit educators' concepts of the library function to the provision of support for classroom programs, a function to which neither teachers nor librarians give high priority. In studies carried out by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), correctional educators in both adult and juvenile institutions gave libraries a low priority in describing educational program needs. In the WICHE study, only 40 percent of the educators polled who served in adult institutions saw library materials as badly needed; they considered the need for librarians to be less serious than the need for: (1) additional teachers, (2) vocational counselors, (3) psychologists, or (4) research personnel.<sup>14</sup> Only 38 percent of educators in juvenile institutions saw a need for improved library services.<sup>15</sup> In a recent issue of *Journal of American Corrections*, David Friend, assistant project director for still another study of correctional education, was quoted as calling for improved correctional library services and stronger ties to outside libraries. Nevertheless, the final document which emerged from the study, *Correctional Education: The Forgotten Human Service*, itself did not mention the need for library development in correctional institutions, nor did it recognize the contribution libraries have made in the past.<sup>16</sup>

### *Survey of Problems: A Review*

If changes for the better are to be realized, correctional librarians, administrators, and others who see a larger role for libraries than as backup for classroom programs must take the lead, and the library profession must support them in their effort.

The final hypothesis, that library services would be improved by closer cooperative ties with outside libraries, was supported by the ILR investigations and has been further substantiated by experience in all areas of the country. The ACA "Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions" and the new unpublished standards for adults<sup>17</sup> call for cooperation and backup services from outside libraries. Each year the number of states with statewide arrangements for institutional/public library cooperation grows. In some states, all services are provided by outside library agencies, i.e. Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Illinois. In others, correctional library programs are supplemented through statewide reference and interlibrary loan networks. New York, Nebraska, Connecticut, and many others fall into this category. In California, interlibrary cooperation varies from one area of the state to another. Proposed legislation, if passed, will provide funds to reimburse public libraries for interlibrary loans made to institutions.<sup>18</sup> A recent study of state institution and public library cooperation in Ohio reported similar unevenness of service, with 89 of Ohio's 249 public libraries serving local, city and county institutions.<sup>19</sup> Figures were not broken out for either state institutions or for correctional institutions, but the data indicate a trend that has advanced considerably since the 1974 ILR report.

### LEGAL REFERENCE MATERIALS

Because legal reference materials will be discussed elsewhere in this issue, recent developments will not be detailed here. I would, however, like to report a development which has stemmed in part from ideas expressed in the ILR report. I refer to the potential use of microfiche for prison legal collections. The Young Lawyers Section of the American Bar Association (ABA) has established a committee on prison libraries which has joined forces with the ACA Library Committee to negotiate with law book publishers for the provision of legal reference materials on microfiche to prisoners. The National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture has also recognized the potential of microfiche for solving many prison law library problems.<sup>20</sup>

MARJORIE LEDONNE  
PROFILES OF STATE PROGRAMS FOR CORRECTIONAL  
LIBRARY SERVICE

ILR profiles of state programs are now badly out of date. A recent article by Jean Marie Zabel in *Special Libraries* gives a brief overview based largely on a review of published materials.<sup>21</sup> More recent but very limited information is in the ABA report *Behind Bars*.<sup>22</sup> This document describes an on-site visitation program carried out by the ABA Young Lawyers Section over a four-year period from 1970 to 1975. Accounts from twelve sample institutions were included in the final report representing various sections of the United States and a U.S. military prison in Germany. The major library focus was upon law library facilities and services, but some accounts also describe general library programs. All in all, these reports indicate little improvement since 1974. The best source of current program information is the continuing publication of correspondence and reports appearing in *Inside/Outside*, a newsletter for correctional librarians.<sup>23</sup> The newsletter, published by Joan Stout and Gilda Turitz, did not exist at the time of the ILR survey. It has done much in the years since then to relieve the isolation and obscurity of correctional library service.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SEARCH

The following selected list of titles identifies most major documents published since 1973, some of which have not previously been cited in this review:

Akey, Sharon. *An Annotated Bibliography of Recent Prison Literature*. San Jose, Calif., San Jose State University School of Librarianship, 1974. (ED 094 784)

Alliance of Information and Referral Services. "National Standards for Information and Referral Services." Minneapolis, Minn., Interstudy, 1974.

These standards are designed for community-based services, but would also be helpful to institutional libraries providing reentry information services.

American Bar Association. *Gaming: An Annotated Catalog of Law Related Games and Simulations*. Chicago, ABA, 1975.

Descriptions of more than 130 games and simulations, grades K-12, which would be invaluable in training law library clerks or library patrons.

*Survey of Problems: A Review*

\_\_\_\_\_. *Media: An Annotated Catalog of Law Related Audiovisual Materials*. Chicago, ABA, 1975.

Containing descriptions of more than 400 films, filmstrips, and tapes for classroom and library use for grades K-12, and includes teacher reference.

American Correctional Association. *Guidelines for Legal Reference Service in Correctional Institutions: A Tool for Correctional Administrators*. 2d ed. College Park, Md., ACA, 1975.

Contains lists of basic and expanded collections recommended by the AALL, directors of law libraries offering services to prisoners, and a listing of law librarians willing to serve as consultants to prison law libraries.

American Correctional Association. Committee on Institution Libraries. "Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions." These standards are still unpublished but are available on request from Barratt Wilkins, chairman of the ACA Library Committee, Florida State Library, Tallahassee, Fla. The standards were adopted by ALA but not by ACA. Components will be incorporated into correctional standards now being developed by the National Accreditation Commission for Corrections, and will be used as criteria for institutional accreditation.

American Correctional Association and American Library Association, Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division. Joint Committee on Institution Libraries. "Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions." College Park, Md., ACA, and Chicago, ALA, 1975.

Juvenile standards have been adopted by both ALA and ACA.

American Library Association. Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries. Special Committee on Library Service to Prisoners. "Jails Need Libraries, Too; Guidelines for Library Service Programs to Jails." Chicago, ALA, 1974.

Much of the information in this pamphlet is applicable to larger state prisons as well as to jails.

American Library Association. Office for Intellectual Freedom. *Intellectual Freedom Manual*. Chicago, ALA, 1976.

Topics covered include the Library Bill of Rights, Freedom to Read, Intellectual Freedom, Before the Censor Arrives, Intellectual Freedom and the Law, and Assistance from ALA.

MARJORIE LEDONNE

Association of American Publishers. General Publishing Division. *Books for Prisoners: A Report of a Project*. New York, Association of American Publishers, 1974. (Available from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, NCCD Center, Paramus, N.J., Order No. S 14103.)

Bar Association Support to Improve Correctional Services (BASICS). *Offender Legal Services*. 2d ed. Washington, D.C., 1976.

Includes a discussion of prisoners' rights to legal materials and services and current listing of pertinent court decisions, and an evaluation of existing programs.

Davison, Susan E. *Bibliography of Law Related Curriculum Materials; Annotated*. 2d ed. Chicago, ABA, 1976.

This bibliography should be in every correctional library, especially those for juveniles. Although it is designed for juveniles (grade levels are given), it would be helpful for adults with low reading skills.

Ensley, Robert F., ed. "Correctional Library Services," *Illinois Libraries* 56:501-81, Sept. 1974.

This issue includes articles on a variety of subjects from all areas of the country and represents the views of correctional administrators, librarians and inmates.

Lack, Clara, and Bettencourt, Bruce. "The Santa Clara County Library Adult Bibliotherapy Discussion Group Bibliography." San Jose, Calif., Santa Clara County Library, 1975.

McAlister, Annette. "Adult Correctional Libraries: A Bibliography." Harrisburg, State Library of Pennsylvania, 1976.

An unpublished bibliography of selected materials dating back to 1916.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Juvenile Correctional Institutions: Library Services." Harrisburg, State Library of Pennsylvania, 1976.

An unpublished selective list spanning the 1970-75 period.

Rubin, Rhea, J. *Barred Visions*. Chicago, Chicago Public Library, 1974.

An excellent bibliography of prisoner writings compiled by librarians working at the Cook County Jail, Chicago.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. "Bibliotherapy," *Health and Rehabilitative Library Services* 1:14-27, Oct. 1975.

### *Survey of Problems: A Review*

Smith, Joshua I. *Library and Information Services for Special Groups*. New York, Science Associates/International, 1974.

A collection of six papers covering services to American Indians, blacks, Mexican-Americans, Appalachians, and to prisoners.

Statsky, William P. "Inmate Involvement in Prison Legal Services: Roles and Training Options for the Inmate as Paralegal." Washington, D.C., American Bar Association, 1974.

A discussion of the all-important role of inmate clerks providing legal counsel and law library services.

Werner, O. James. *Manual for Prison Law Libraries* (AALL Publication Series No. 12). South Hackensack, N.J., Rothman & Co., 1976.

An invaluable handbook for assisting untrained inmate clerks and patrons unfamiliar with the use of a law library. The manual is well indexed and easy to use.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

In reviewing the recommendations made in 1974, I find none that I do not endorse today. Although the recommendations were based upon the secondhand experiences and observations of others, their validity has been confirmed for me by subsequent work serving as the California State Library Institutional Specialist. The preparation the ILR research project provided has been truly appreciated, as well as the great good fortune I have had in working under Carmela Ruby, whose reputation in the development of institutional library services is nationally acknowledged. Equally valuable has been the experience of working with, getting to know, and learning from the librarians, teachers, administrators, and the small army of men, women, and young adults who fill more than thirty correctional institutions and camps in California. There is no way that this rich experience could not affect and expand my perceptions; so, while I may not wish to change earlier recommendations, I would like to add one more. I feel that it is fitting that it should now head the list, for it is especially important. Marie Logan, librarian at the Atascadero State Hospital, once stated most eloquently (and I should like to borrow her words), "People confined in institutions are among the most troubled and needful in our society, and it takes a special kind of person to serve them well." I have come to realize that while space, time, money, training, and adequate support staff are all important, the key to

MARJORIE LEDONNE

quality correctional library service is the turn of mind, the energy, and sense of dedication which the librarian, teacher/librarian, or inmate clerk brings to the job.

1977 RECOMMENDATION

State civil service specifications must be redesigned to identify persons with a special interest in and aptitude for institutional library service. Library school job counselors must assist in channeling appropriate, interested people to this most rewarding branch of library service.

1974 RECOMMENDATIONS

*Planning*

1. Coordinated long range planning should be done for correctional library development.
2. Immediate plans should be specific, quantitative, and scheduled.
3. Specialists in library planning should serve as consultants to architects through all phases of design development for correctional institutions.

*Funding*

1. Funding for ongoing operations should be provided by local sources.
2. Recognition should be made of the library and information needs of institutionalized citizens as well as those in the community.

*Interaction with the Community*

1. Correctional libraries should expand services to provide practical, current information to assist inmates in successfully reentering the community.
2. Public, school and academic libraries should recognize their responsibility to develop new methods of gathering and sharing reentry information.
3. Educational institutions, private foundations, community service organizations, labor unions, and government agencies should recognize their value as sources of reentry information and include institutional libraries on their mailing lists.
4. Libraries in correctional institutions should be included in cooperative interlibrary loan networks.

### *Survey of Problems: A Review*

5. Library services for correctional institutions should be augmented or provided under contract with community and/or state libraries.
6. In contractual arrangements, correctional personnel should participate in decisions affecting the library program.

### *The Organization of Community and Institutional Support*

1. Library advisory committees composed of inmates and staff should be established at each institution.
2. An advisory council for institutional libraries (including those in hospitals, charitable, and correctional institutions) should be formed at the state level, composed of representatives of participating agencies, the state library, and state government.
3. Concerned outside citizens, both professionals and the general public, should band together to form a cadre of support for correctional administrators and librarians as they seek to improve library services to confined persons.

### *Staffing*

1. A professional librarian should serve as agencywide coordinator of library programs within each correctional agency.
2. Professional librarians should serve as administrators of institutional library programs.
3. Paraprofessionals should be hired to carry out the daily operations of library programs.
4. Opportunities for paraprofessionals to advance in grade and salary should be provided.
5. Positions of inmate library clerk and law library clerk should be developed as a job-training and educational activity.
6. Continuing job-related educational opportunities should be provided for the staff of correctional libraries.
7. Outside volunteers should be used wherever possible to augment library services.

### *Policies*

1. Library services should be predicated upon the individual's right granted under the First Amendment of the Constitution to read and have access to all information and all points of view.
2. A statement of overall library policy should be developed jointly by librarians and administrators and displayed prominently.

MARJORIE LEDONNE

3. Each correctional agency and each institution should develop and publicize a clearly articulated statement of censorship policy.
4. The personal purchase of reading materials by inmates should be encouraged and facilitated.
5. Clientele should be closely involved in planning library collections, services and programs.
6. High priority should be given to meeting the acute library and information needs of those confined in isolation and segregation.
7. High priority should be given to the library and information needs of the staff.
8. All necessary methods of delivery should be utilized to provide maximum service to inmates and staff in all areas of the institution.
9. Access to library services should be extended to evening and weekend hours.
10. A handbook of library procedure should be developed for the use of inmate library clerks and volunteers.

*Materials*

1. An adequate selection of current acquisition tools should be available to inmates and staff.
2. Emphasis should be placed upon the acquisition and use of audiovisual materials in correctional libraries.
3. A broad range of materials should be provided for adult beginning readers.
4. Legal reference materials should be provided in accord with recommendations of the American Association of Law Libraries.
5. Instruction and assistance in the use of legal reference materials for both inmates and staff should be provided.
6. More appropriate and more economical methods of providing legal reference information to prisoners must be found.
7. Photocopying machines should be made available as a means of expanding access to legal reference materials and as a protection for them.

*Accreditation*

1. An accreditation program should be established for libraries in correctional institutions.

*Survey of Problems: A Review*

**References**

1. Castagna, Edwin. "National Inventory of Library Needs." In *National Inventory of Library Needs*. Chicago, ALA, 1965, pp. 1-11.
2. Gillespie, David M. "A Citation-entry Analysis of the Literature on Prison Libraries," *AHIL Quarterly* 8:65-72, Spring 1968.
3. LeDonne, Marjorie, et al. *Survey of Library and Information Problems in Correctional Institutions*. 4 vols. Berkeley, Calif., Institute of Library Research, 1974.
4. Advisory committee members for the project were: Andree Bailey, chairman of the ACA Library Committee; Phyllis Dalton, president of the Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries; Richard McGee, president of the American Justice Institute; Ira Phillips, executive secretary of AHIL, ALA; E. Preston Sharp, secretary general of the ACA; and Ty Jordan, librarian at Raiford Prison, Florida.
5. American Correctional Association. *Guidelines for Legal Reference Service in Correctional Institutions: A Tool for Correctional Administrators*. 2d ed. College Park, Md., ACA, 1975.
6. ————. *Manual of Correctional Standards*. 3d rev. ed. Washington, D.C., ACA, 1966, pp. 502-18.
7. Clement, Keith G. "Library Service—It's for Everyone!" In *Proceedings of the One Hundred and Third Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association, Seattle, Wash., Aug. 12-17, 1973*. College Park, Md., American Correctional Association, 1973, pp. 207-14.
8. Morris, Norval. *The Future of Imprisonment*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1974.
9. Vogel, Brenda. *Final Report: Inmate Informational Needs Survey*. Baltimore, Md., Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, Division of Correction, 1976.
10. Gentry, J. Khalil Malij. *Social Services, Welfare Organizations and I&R Services*. Soledad, Calif., Department of Corrections, 1976.
11. Community Resources Project. "Community Resources for the Exoffender in Sacramento." Henry Castro, dir. Sacramento, Calif., Community Resources Project, 1975.
12. Missouri Association for Social Welfare, et al. *Directory of Groups Concerned with Adult Corrections*. Jefferson City, Mo., Missouri State Library, 1976; and Vetter, Paul, and Rubin, Rhea J. "Referral Resource List for Exoffenders Services and Groups in the Chicago Metropolitan Area." Chicago, Chicago Public Library, 1975.
13. Ensley, Robert F. "Library Service in State Correctional Facilities; An Illinois Viewpoint," *Illinois Libraries* 56:509-16, Sept. 1974.
14. Dell'Apa, Frank. *Educational Programs in Adult Correctional Institutions*. Boulder, Colo., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1974.
15. ————. *Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions: Issues*. Boulder, Colo., Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1974.
16. Correctional Education Project of the Education Commission of the States. *Correctional Education: The Forgotten Human Service*. Denver, Colo., Education Commission of the States, 1976.

MARJORIE LEDONNE

17. American Correctional Association and American Library Association, Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division. Joint Committee on Institution Libraries. "Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions." College Park, Md., ACA, and Chicago, ALA, 1975; and American Correctional Association. Committee on Institution Libraries. "Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions" (prepared for the 105th Congress of Correction, American Correctional Association, Louisville, Ky., Aug. 1975). 2d draft. (unpublished)
18. California Library Association. Government Relations Committee. "A Plan for an Improved Program of California Library Services," *California Library Association Newsletter* 18:3-13, Dec. 1976.
19. Luciola, Clara E. *Trend toward Partnership: A Study of State Institution and Public Library Cooperation in Ohio*. Columbus, State Library of Ohio, Feb. 1976 (ED 124 216)
20. Wise, Olga B., and Smith, J. MacGregor. *Planning a Legal Reference Library for a Correctional Institution*. Urbana, University of Illinois, National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, 1976.
21. Zabel, Jean Marie. "Prison Libraries," *Special Libraries* 67:1-7, Jan. 1976.
22. American Bar Association. *Behind Bars*. Charlottesville, Va., Reynolds Co., 1975.
23. *Inside/Outside*. Joan Stout and Gilda Turitz, eds. P.O. Box 9083, Berkeley, Calif. 94703. Oct. 1974-