Trends and Concerns in Library Services for Incarcerated People and People in the Process of Reentry: Publication Review (2020-2022)

Expanding Information Access for Incarcerated People

Libraries provide crucial support for people who are incarcerated, people recently released from incarceration, and their loved ones and dependents. Historically, these services have garnered little attention within the field of library and information services (LIS); however, a recent international increase in publications on the topic (Garner, 2021; Garner, 2022) signifies a promising shift out of historical obscurity.

While a growing body of research proposes that library and information workers should include people who are incarcerated and people negatively impacted by incarceration in their patron base, many library institutions still view serving these patrons as a non-priority or solely within the purview of specialized libraries. Despite ongoing calls for equity, diversity, and inclusion to become explicit and central tenets of LIS work, incarcerated people have not often been mentioned in LIS publications, and were rarely noted in an overview of English-language LIS scholarship related to "anti-racism, equity, inclusion (EDI) and social justice" that was published between 2011 and 2021 (Jones et al., 2022). The social and racial oppression inherent in systems of incarceration has an outsized and negative impact on Black and Indigenous people, people of color, LGBTQ and especially transgender people, people living in poverty and who are unhoused, and people who live at the intersections of these identities and experiences. Because of this, recognizing incarcerated people and their families and social support networks as library users is a critical aspect of EDI and social justice work (Wessler, 2022). The materials reviewed in this brief provide examples of services in a variety of library contexts, illustrating responsive approaches to the consequences of systemic oppression.

Other information fields, such as communications, have noted an absence of attention to incarceration and how it shapes communicative practices (Petricini, 2022). From focused reviews of family interactions as mediated by technology (Petricini, 2022) to theorizations of policing and incarceration as communication practices that are biased against young Black men (Lane & Ramirez, 2022), recent publications in this field offer examples of professional intervention and possibly a reassessment of the repercussions that ongoing cycles of incarceration have for this area of research. Recent LIS publications illustrate several introductory, interdisciplinary, and critically situated approaches to thinking through library services and incarceration. This white paper presents an overview of those publications, within LIS and related fields, and speaks to the range of approaches employed in relation to information access and incarceration.

In addition to the analysis of recent publications, this review includes library service models specifically tailored to meet the needs of people most negatively impacted by incarceration. Incarcerated people face many obstacles when accessing library and information services, and they often must rely on libraries for reading materials, educational resources and support, legal assistance, and general research. This white paper opens with a review of services and programs by library type. It then moves to the themes most prominent within an analysis of recent literature, highlighting recurring themes as a guide for continued research and as a marker of where professional concerns lie today.

To identify emerging trends in library and information services for incarcerated people, people in the process of reentry, and their loved ones and dependents, San Francisco Public Library's Jail and Reentry Services librarians and information workers conducted a literature review of scholarly publications, including academic research articles, books authored and peer-reviewed by subject matter experts, and popular publications related to this topic published from January of 2020 to December of 2022. We prioritized materials related to library services within the United States. In total, we reviewed and analyzed 38 academic articles, 18 chapters, 2 books, 5 commentaries or essays in academic sources, 1 dissertation, and 16 popular sources. Each publication was assigned one or more codes corresponding with the themes that occur within it.

While focused primarily on library and information science, we reviewed publications from a range of disciplines concerned with information access and incarceration, including anthropology, communications, education, public health and medicine, law, and applied technology, among other adjacent fields.[1] The cross-disciplinary scope of this research provides perspective on existing and possible library services for people who are impacted by incarceration, with additional focus on the specific needs of incarcerated college students and incarcerated parents and their children.

Library Services, Outreach, and Partnerships

> *Whether it be for the purpose of bettering their lives, transitioning to freedom, or simply being aware of what is going on in the world around them, incarcerated individuals require access to information (Steele, 2021, p. 130).*

LIS publications between January of 2020 and December of 2022 primarily focus on public, carceral, and academic libraries. They outline library services–both direct and indirect–and include helpful guides for collaborations between facilities. Fifteen publications focus on public libraries, with four articles sourced from a special issue of *Public Libraries* in 2020. Twelve focus on in-facility carceral services, with one highlighting

---

[1] See the white paper titled "Technology in Carceral Facilities: Trends, Limitations, and Opportunities for Libraries" (2023) for a more thorough review of technology than is offered here.

the lack of inclusion of prison librarianship as a career path in LIS classrooms, despite documented student interest in this topic (Raftery, 2021). Five articles address the need for academic library support for incarcerated students. A 2021 issue of *Advances in Librarianship*, edited by Jane Garner, contains chapters that span types of services.[2] Several resources, including those in the special issue of *Public Libraries*, together detail the many types of programs that libraries are currently offering for people negatively impacted by incarceration.

Library Types

People who are incarcerated often rely on libraries within and outside of facilities where they're held in order to access reading materials and information. Libraries offer many resources to assist with preparing for life after incarceration and critical support for people navigating reentry. Throughout the time period examined, library services within and outside of carceral facilities were consistently represented. The majority of publications on direct and indirect library services centered the work of public libraries, followed by those about library services embedded in carceral facilities and those provided by academic libraries. Publications covered a range of outreach opportunities and collaborations, at times noting that specific groups of people may have varying information needs and desires that are amplified by incarceration.

Public

Public libraries provide important services to young people in juvenile facilities and adults that are held within jails or prisons.

Snow's 2021 book, *Outreach Services for Teens*, details a number of public library programs for youth in juvenile detention. Especially important in this review is the focus on libraries that utilize technology in their programming inside of facilities. Other programs for youth in detention that were described in the publications under review include visual art and design, traditional crafts like origami, and also wellness and meditation (McKague, 2022; King, Demske, & Jackson, 2022). In Pima County, AZ, the public library provides in-house services to the juvenile carceral facilities and library cards to newly released patrons, welcoming youth post-incarceration (D'Orio, 2021). Library programs and services for youth are also facilitated by outside groups, such as Dieter Cantu's Books to Incarcerated Youth Project (D'Orio, 2021). Cantu is explicit about the possibilities library services and materials access can afford–"If there's a school-to-prison pipeline, I want them to have an exit plan" (in D'Orio, 2021, p. 64).

---

[2] This volume has an international context; primarily materials relevant to services in the United States were included in this review.

Academic and popular sources highlight a variety of public library services for adults, including hip hop music programs, reference by mail, loading recorded library programs onto tablets in prisons, providing reading materials in-house, video visitation, reentry support, and more (Capers, Anderson, and Ness, 2021; Gibson, 2022; Harris, 2021; Herships, 2021; Riggs, 2022). Pivoting services in the wake of the COVID pandemic was a concern, yet with many opportunities for in-person services curtailed, major library systems still found ways to communicate with their patrons through third-party technology (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022).

Limited information is available about public library services for people who are incarcerated or in the process of reentry, and a set of two popular articles, both of which informed the "Expanding Information Access for Incarcerated People" grant project, sought to identify relevant programming and services (Jordan-Makely & Austin, 2021; Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). That research located a number of libraries across the country who are providing library services for incarcerated people and their social support networks.

Public library services for people negatively impacted by incarceration were not solely situated inside of carceral facilities. A number of libraries provide social workers, reentry desks, restorative justice approaches, or legal assistance (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022; Gibson, 2022; King, Demske, & Jackson, 2022). Several public libraries also provide Reference by Mail or remote reference services, including Brooklyn Public Library, Carson City Library, New York Public Library, Queens Public Library, San Francisco Public Library, and Saint Louis County Library (Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). Harris, in a profile on Harris County's reference service for incarcerated people, notes the longevity and demand for this service. Harris County has been responding to mailed reference requests for over 30 years, and received 2,000 information requests in the year prior to publication (2021).

Other articles on public library services include guides on how to provide patron-centered services (Austin & Jacobson, 2021). Seaver offers a detailed history of an attempt to integrate prescribed reading into youth courts in New York City, which a chief librarian at Brooklyn Public, writing in 1935, glossed as an "amateur-ish prescription of the juvenile judge" (2021). In an article adjacent to discussions of library services and incarceration, Moreno encourages librarians to review how library practices or policies might mimic policing or carceral logics (2022).

Library services embedded within juvenile detention and adult prison facilities were also present in publications during the period reviewed. Publications with this focus moved between approaches that underscored the potential role of literacy in recidivism (a common theme in work on library services and incarceration) to the importance of staffed libraries to in-depth reviews of staffing practices and censorship.

Prison

Canning and Buchanan's 2021 review of international literature on prison library services and information seeking found three central themes across multiple geographic contexts.[3] They are summarized as:

- Incarcerated people have the same information needs as most people, with additional needs created by incarceration
- Information is difficult to obtain inside of facilities, which might be why incarcerated people depend on one another as information sources
- Incarcerated people may face both institutional and personal barriers to information access (Canning & Buchanan, 2021, p. 19)

Functioning institutional libraries are aware of and meet individuals' information and recreational needs. This is an explicitly collaborative approach, and the authors call for "further collaboration between cultural agencies and prison libraries to provide a continuity of support" for incarcerated people (Canning & Buchanan, 2021). This finding underlines the importance of creating library services and collections that are informed by and responsive to the needs and interests of incarcerated patrons.

While the majority of publications on library services for youth reviewed services from public libraries and non-profits, two resources pressed the importance of embedded library services in juvenile facilities. Advocates for incarcerated youth argue that improved literacy can potentially reduce recidivism rates. They call for a holistic approach to services that includes studying the interaction between access to libraries and media centers and future rates of recidivism (Formby & Paynter, 2020, p. 19).[4]

The overarching importance of a full-service library for incarcerated youth was clear in Garner's cross-country examination of juvenile services in Australia and South Carolina. Garner notes that "[t]he South Carolina example demonstrates that the presence of a professionally qualified and experienced youth librarian in a facility that funds and values its library leads to positive outcomes for the young people living in custody and the educational goals of the facility itself. Thoughtful collection development and physical arrangement can encourage reading and subsequent literacy development. Well-chosen resources can support the education of inmates, provide them with an understanding of lives other than their own and can help fill in the large

---

[3] Another broad review reveals how institutional practices change over time and how difficult it can be to access correct information about current practices, which leads to research perpetuating myths about actual library services and resources availability (Hussain, Batool, Rehman, Zahra, & Mahmood, 2022). This possibility might be mediated by research that directly or indirectly incorporates information about the lived realities of incarcerated people.

[4] As Milsap's 2021 dissertation research shows, the link between behavior and literacy may be tenuous at best. Rather, it may be best to contextualize incarceration and recidivism rates within larger social and political policies and practices that both shape how recidivism is defined and may further systems of oppression.

amounts of unstructured time that characterize their experience of incarceration" (2021, p. 177). Young people are subject to compulsory education requirements, and juvenile detention centers must provide some level of schooling (Korman & Pilnik, 2018). Tensions between library services and education departments may develop when there are not established collaborations, resources are scarce, or other facility-generated issues arise (Garner, 2021).

Incarcerated adults have the protected right to access religious information and the law, though this access varies from facility to facility and across carceral systems. Elis' ethnographic research with incarcerated women found that religious programs were the most prevalent resources in that facility, and that religious materials and activities indicate the possibilities for information flows within facilities and between incarcerated people and people who are not incarcerated (2021). Access to the law was a more contested area; two resources noted that the introduction of existing prison technologies as a means to access the law further limits incarcerated people's access and ability to gain legal literacy (Brown, 2020; Chase, 2022). Chase focuses on the move from physical law libraries (which at times are staffed by incarcerated people who work as peer legal advocates) and access to the law through technology in a review of state prison practices, showing that

> Thirty-nine states' departments of corrections–along with over a thousand jails–have access to Lexis for incarcerated litigants. In other states, access to legal research in prisons is achieved through Westlaw, Conway Greene, or books, exclusively (though that number is small). Nine states' prison libraries have begun providing inmates access to the Internet for the purposes of gathering legal information. (Chase, 2020, 124)

Censorship in facilities is a pressing topic for librarians and groups that provide information to incarcerated people. In a high-profile case, materials from the Education Justice Project in Illinois were censored by a prison where the higher education program provides classes and access to library resources. This decision continues to have ramifications in conversations about censorship, including in legal reviews of the power of prisons to censor materials (Hux, 2020). Furthermore, this is not an isolated case. Steele reviews data gathered in interviews with carceral staff, lawyers, and others involved in legal cases to resist censorship of materials sent through the mail to people incarcerated in a jail and a prison in Mississippi (2021). Looking to juvenile detention center libraries, Zeluff states that censorship is pervasive and advocates for juvenile detention center librarians to establish formal collection development policies (2021).

Steele finds that censorship of materials inside is "a phenomenon that is all too common," and that justifications for censorship vary (2021, p. 122). While facility staff might claim that books are a means of introducing contraband into the facility, organizations that provide access to books argue that it is more likely that there is not enough available staff to review materials entering facilities through the mail. It is notable

that in one instance, a lawsuit against the facility's censorship practices led to policy change at the institutional level (Steele, 2021).

In order to change the power of facilities to censor materials with little recourse, Boyington recommends that

> Nationally, we need transparency. Only accountability has and will continue to prevent correctional institutions from repeating their damaging mistakes. Correctional institutions should be required to make all of their censorship policies and individual decisions (with the justifications behind them) publicly accessible on a regular basis. (2020, p. 92)

Staffing and funding are perennial concerns for libraries within carceral facilities, and these concerns are not always addressed by prison systems. Boyington and Barnes provide a model for conducting systemwide reviews of working conditions and practices that might limit the staffing of prison libraries, including librarians and staff being told to conduct the duties of correctional officers. Their chapter includes tools for restructuring funding within prison systems to reflect the importance of staffed prison libraries and outlines the infrastructure needed to recruit new librarians and retain existing staff (2021). It builds on the passion that current prison librarians and LIS students express for this work, while realistically addressing the material and professional concerns of people employed in these positions (Campbell, 2021; Raftery, 2021).

Academic

Publications on academic library services for people who are incarcerated heavily emphasize how incarceration limits students' access to the information needed to conduct their coursework. In conversation with three prison librarians, Bushman and Monobe identify academic resources and research support as necessary aspects of library services for people who are incarcerated and students in the process of reentry (2021). Their list includes a variety of possible approaches to collaborations, including ILL service agreements, and provides a starting place for crucial services that are not often offered by academic libraries (Dent, 2022; Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). Library services were mentioned, very briefly, as part of the overall assessment of higher education projects for incarcerated people (Dewy, et al., 2020).

Publications on academic library services were concerned with information literacy, both that of students who are incarcerated and of students who were recently released. Dent, in a description of work with the Emerson Prison Initiative, outlines the implementation of a remote reference service for students' academic research (2022). In part, this is because "[i]ncarcerated individuals face insurmountable information literacy gaps upon release into an ever-evolving technological world" (Dent, 2022, p. 131). This impacts students' ability to access information, both in print and through technology, upon their release.

In addition to burgeoning and established library services for incarcerated and formerly incarcerated students, outside initiatives to increase students' access to databases and other tools for academic research and learning offer promising possibilities for increasing information access inside of facilities. Recent work at Ithaka S+R (Tanaka & Cooper, 2020; Pokornowski & Tanaka, 2022), implementation of no-cost, scaled JSTOR access, and work by EBSCO speak to the importance of information access for all incarcerated people.

Given the recent re-introduction of PELL funding for incarcerated people, the need for academic library services for incarcerated people is likely to increase quickly in the coming years.

Outreach

> *Library outreach to incarcerated and formerly incarcerated individuals ultimately has the potential to positively affect both the life of the individual, and society as a whole.* (McKague, 2022, p. 27)

Outreach to people who are incarcerated can be directly tied to library mission statements and to American Library Association (ALA) policies (McKague, 2022). Many of the resources on public library services published during this period include examples of outreach to youth and adults who were incarcerated and unable to otherwise access the library. Outreach examples include direct or remote services, library programs, and responsive approaches to the realities of incarceration and reentry.

Outreach to youth in juvenile detention centers can center on traditional library services, providing access to library materials or specific collections for incarcerated youth (McKague, 2022, Snow, 2020). Outreach programs in juvenile detention centers can also introduce supportive technology like tablets or e-readers, computer-based learning/media programs, and more, though this will likely involve some modifications to meet the security requirements of carceral facilities. McNair, based at the Johnson County Library in Kansas, describes an outreach library program that brought 3D printing into a juvenile detention center and provides a step-by-step approach to running the program (Snow, 2020). Allen, with Colorado State Library, has also introduced STEM programming and playaway book players into library outreach programs for incarcerated youth (in Snow, 2020).

Queens Public and Brooklyn Public Library staff conduct outreach to support people who are incarcerated and in the process of reentry. Their programs help bridge the divide created by carceral facilities through outreach to families of incarcerated people and the facilitation of video visits, by bringing in community members as creative program leaders, and through technologies (Capers, Anderson, Ness, 2021; Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022). Capers, Anderson, and Ness offer the following recommendations for library and information workers seeking to begin outreach services inside of carceral facilities:

- Frame programs as advantageous to facilities
- Build from existing services
- Exhibit trustworthiness through passive services
- Provide consistent programming
- Utilize consistent library branding
- Engage in consistent over-communication (2021)

Queens Public and Brooklyn Public Library staff also conduct outreach to support people who are incarcerated through at-a-distance programming and virtual library services. Through Library Hub, the libraries were able to "offer on-demand, pre-recorded library programs, an Ask a Librarian! reference service, a Mail-a-Book/BookMatch service, and other resources" (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022. p. 50). They also provided smart phones and technology assistance to people who were recently released from incarceration (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022. p. 50). The authors outline best practices and approaches to providing these types of outreach services.[5]

Hancock recommends that librarians engaging in all work with incarcerated people, including outreach, critically approach their work and develop services that recognize the realities of incarceration and prioritize the needs and desires of incarcerated people (2021). In a review of library services and LIS-adjacent projects, including the American Prison Writing Archive, Hancock asks that public library workers consider whether their approaches to services and programs are "either reinforcing or dismantling the hegemonic power structures with which it intersects" (2021, p. 87).

This approach carries to public library programs that are directed toward those who have been impacted by incarceration. In addition to direct and indirect services for youth and adults who are incarcerated, the St. Louis County Library has partnered with The Bail Project and others to coordinate the removal of pending arrest warrants. This situates the library as a partner in working to prevent the ongoing incarceration of community members, a responsive approach to the pervasive policing of Black people and people of color in local communities (Gibson, 2022).

Partnerships

Partnerships and collaborations across different types of libraries and between libraries and community groups can increase the amount of information, library services, and library programs available to people who are incarcerated (Monobe, Bushman, & McCall, 2021). Snowballing research on library services and surveys of library and information workers has revealed that in addition to services provided to incarcerated people, it is a common approach for academic, legal, and public librarians to collaborate either with librarians or

---

[5] A more thorough review of this topic is available in Technology in Carceral Facilities: Trends, Limitations, and Opportunities for Libraries.

programs embedded in facilities and with outside partners (Jordan-Makely & Austin, 2021; Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). Libraries and library staff also partner or otherwise collaborate with community-based groups that provide books or information to incarcerated people, such as Books through Bars groups or the Public Library Support Network (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022; Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022).

Many of the outreach projects detailed in this overview involve some level of collaboration. At times, librarians and information workers generally define their work with the facility as a collaboration or partnership, such as Alameda County Library's embedded library branch in the local juvenile detention center (Snow, 2020). In others, as at St. Louis County Library, partnerships involve outreach that invites people into the library to receive personal legal services (Gibson, 2022). Additional approaches include identifying key community figures involved in creative pursuits and business development and leveraging their existing partnerships with facilities to create new programs that allow for community members to enter facilities and provide direct services or programming (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022; McKague, 2022).

Within academic programs, many partnerships focus on information literacy and digital literacy. Styslinger, describing a collaboration between the university and the juvenile detention center, notes the importance of utilizing a social justice-informed approach that critically situates materials in the lived realities and identities of incarcerated participants (2021). This type of partnership is also a way that preservice teachers might come to develop better literacy teaching practices through experiential learning (Weaver, Murnen, Hartzog, & Bertelsen, 2021). Inside-Out, a higher education program that brings incarcerated students and students who are not incarcerated together in the classroom, follows a similar model of teaching and learning through interaction and mutual goals (Perez, & Leon, 2020).

At times, outside groups providing literacy support might utilize the public library as a partner and resource provider. For instance, a team of researchers creating digital literacy support for women in the process of reentry held in-person sessions in a public library and utilized library devices in their programming (Seo, et al., 2021). As with many other services and programs, these were interrupted by COVID, forcing services to create hybrid or fully digital approaches to literacy development and academic programming (Seo, et. al, 2021, Collica-Cox, 2021).[6]

Two resources focused on archival research offer cautions about a romanticized approach to partnership and collaboration as a necessary good. Alexander's review of the regulation of music, including performance and as a shared listening activity, in Leavenworth prison and a prison in Atlanta, notes that media technologies

---

[6] It is likely that this impact went beyond materials in the dataset for this analysis–the research set did not include materials from the *Journal of Correctional Education* or the *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry* that were not explicitly tied to library services, literacy, or similar themes.

can easily become tools of control, "not by intensifying punishment or by forbidding radio, but by implementing radio completely within the oversight, command, and control of the prison" (2020, p. 3231). Alexander also details how a collaboration between the Atlanta prison and a public radio station to broadcast the performance of incarcerated musicians was used to reinforce the public's understanding of the prison as a necessary part of social function, rather than a site of ongoing oppression (2020).

Seaver's 2021 work on the top-down demand that libraries enter collaborative relationships with departments responsible for the disciplining and detaining of New York City's youth, mentioned above, provides a detailed timeline of the problems of coercive collaborations. In addition to an intricate history of the failures of this program, and the players involved, it also illustrates how collaborations that are not infused with adequate resources are strained by the expectations of court systems and similar entities.

The creation and utilization of archives related to campaigns to end solitary confinement and other anti-carceral activities in the Southern California Archive speak to the difficulties and promise of finding appropriate archival homes. Speer and Jones document how hard it was to locate an archive that would appropriately maintain and curate the personal materials of individuals involved in campaigns against solitary confinement. There were several instances in which they encountered resistance from the archival institutions with whom they sought to collaborate (2021). The authors note that this "circuitous path reveals not only the anxieties of official archives but the key role played by individuals and institutions willing to preserve dangerous papers" (2021, p. 573). Relatedly, Sojoyner's reflective review of Black youths' engagement with archives on the Gang Truce and gang databases highlights the potential that (what he describes as) dangerous archives hold for archival fugitivity–"the eclectic lived experience of Black life"–in ways that ultimately counter criminalizing narratives and are anti-carceral (2021, p. 559).[7]

Incarcerated Women

The majority of publications that center the experience of women focus on women's digital literacy skills after incarceration. Two discuss services related to creating broad digital literacy skill support for women in the process of reentry, and one article includes women in research on digital literacy skill development (Reisdorf, DeCook, Foster, Cobbina, & LaCourse, 2021; Seo, et al., 2020; Seo, et al., 2021). Two emphasize the overlapping need for digital literacy support and health information literacy and practices (Geana, et al., 2021; Schuster, et al, 2022). One of the articles on the Inside-Out higher education program is set in a women's prison (Perez & Leon, 2020). Similarly, the sole article that focuses on access to religious information was set in a women's prison (Ellis, 2021). Richland Library describes their work to provide a library-embedded social worker as a resource to people in their community who are incarcerated, and they

---

[7] See Sojoyner's 2023 book *Against the Carceral Archive: The Art of Black Liberatory Practice* for more on archives and carcerality.

were able to extend the initial program in a men's facility to services for women and to youth in juvenile detention (King, Demske, & Jackson, 2022).

Incarcerated Parents and Family

The incarceration of a parent has damaging emotional and social effects on children, and incarceration, along with the attendant isolation from family and support networks, has negative implications for young people's mental health (Poehlmann-Tynan, et al, 2021; Toliu-Shams, et al., 2022). Recent research has shown that resources that reflect children's experiences and circumstances can alleviate some of this effect. In a study on Sesame Street resources for children with incarcerated parents, researchers found that "[w]hen children had been told honest, developmentally appropriate explanations about the father's incarceration prior to the observed jail visit, children were more likely to exhibit positive emotions and behaviors during the visit with their fathers" (Poehlmann-Tynan, et al., 2021, p. 329).

Facilities can utilize communications technology that facilitate virtual engagement opportunities to maintain contact with children, family members, friends and support networks, an especially pressing need when in-facility visiting is impossible due to conditions, staffing, or public health concerns. This need for continued communication has led researchers to advocate that "when in-person visits are not possible, we recommend that in-home video chat be offered by corrections at low or no cost. Given the benefits of visits, there are likely cost savings in the long run. In addition, there is technical, organizational, presentation, behavioral, and scaffolding work necessary on the part of the child's at-home caregiver to ensure the chat is successful" (Skora Horgan & Poehlmann-Tynan, J., 2020, p. 403).

Technologically mediated forms of communication were prominent in publications coded for family and social networks; five of the ten publications shared both codes. This is the case even when technologies were obsolete or exploitative. In instances where fathers could not interact directly with their children, creating and sending a video recording of themself reading left fathers feeling more connected to and present with their children (Stickel, Prins, & Kaiper-Marquez, 2021). Despite the high costs associated with communicating through (or accessing information on) prison tablets, prison officials state one of "the most common uses for tablets is communicating with family" (Mufarreh, Waitkus, & Booker, 2022, p. 425).

Libraries have created responsive programming to the circumstances that children with incarcerated parents face. For example, Alameda County Library has facilitated visiting room storytimes and book giveaways for children visiting their incarcerated parent(s) (Riggs, 2022). Brooklyn Public and Queens Public libraries, among other library systems, facilitate video visitation programs at library locations (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022; Riggs, 2022). Televisit mental health services have been proposed as a means to assist youth with maintaining connections to family that will promote their mental health while incarcerated (Toliu-Shams, et al., 2022).

Technology also provided a means for people in reentry to engage with social support networks composed of their peers during the depths of the COVID pandemic (Moak, Leban, Reuter, 2022). Building from an established social network of previously incarcerated people who had met face-to-face, a pilot study on the effectiveness of virtual support networks found that formerly incarcerated people "reported strong social support, low emotional loneliness, as well as strong social networks and low social isolation" when meeting in a virtual context (Moak, Leban, Reuter, 2022).

Incarceration and Immigration

A limited number of publications in this period prioritize the information needs and experiences of people who are in immigrant detention facilities. One article on the care work involved in legal aid notes that facility policies make it especially difficult for families to connect when receiving needed legal information, with facility staff banning access to crayons and disputing access to coloring books during meetings with legal support (Routin, 2021). This inhibited access to needed legal information. Immigration and immigrant detention were also mentioned in relation to e-carceration, the practice of surveilling people through worn technology or cell phone applications (or both) after they are released from a carceral facility (Kilgore, 2022; Ledvora, 2021).

Emerging Research Concerns

Prevalent themes in the materials reviewed relate to research limitations caused by COVID, perspectives on incarceration, and professional concerns within LIS. The most frequent professional concerns include information literacy, access to education and the law, technology[8], censorship, and standards and best practices. In the discussion that follows, codes are discussed in relation to broader themes and concerns. All topics included here occurred at least ten times during the period reviewed.

Research and Limitations (COVID)

Overall, 27 publications are based on research. These include pilot studies of technology in the context of reentry, ethnographic research with incarcerated women, focus groups with people in reentry, interviews, case studies, surveys of prison staff, and more.

---

[8] Discussed in Technology in Carceral Facilities: Trends, Limitations, and Opportunities for Libraries.

Half of the publications that detail research projects were also coded with information literacy. Other prominent code co-occurrences were reentry, standards and best practices, and technology. There was notable overlap between information literacy, research, and reentry (eight publications coded for all three codes), and information literacy, research, and technology (six publications coded for all three codes). This suggests that there is growing attention to a pressing information need for people in the process of reentry: digital literacy (and broader information literacy) is a central focus of research on reentry.[9]

From studies on the impact of representative Sesame Street materials for children of incarcerated parents to a review of the Language Partners ESL course to dyslexia rates among incarcerated people, research ran the gamut of topics of interest within library and information science (Cassidy, et al., 2021; Poehlmann-Tynan, et al., 2021; Sosnowski & Murillo, 2021). Research scaled from single-site observation to global systematic reviews of literature on information and healthcare (Ellis, 2021; Tian, Venugopalan, Kumar, & Beard, 2021). Two research pilots focus on developing applications for health information and probation, with varying degrees of successful implementation (Link & Reece, 2021; Fuller, et al., 2021).

A few notable articles make research-based policy recommendations for technological interventions that will support people while incarcerated and after reentry. Reisdorf and DeCook's research calls for increasing educational and vocational support for incarcerated people, including access to computers and the internet (2022; see also Reisdorf & DeCook, 2021).[10] Research by Seo and others lays groundwork for this recommendation, with an eye toward the needs of women in the process of reentry:

> To support women in breaking this vicious cycle, we must develop technology education programs that properly address the complex set of barriers and needs in their digital access and use (2020, p. 21).

Writing elsewhere, Seo and a team of researchers recommend that contacts for authoritative health information be embedded in reentry sites, and push for Universal Basic Healthcare as a policy solution to incarceration's impacts on people's health and well-being (Schuster, et al., 2022).

Seven publications mention COVID, a pressing concern for the period examined, especially in regard to the pandemic's impact on incarcerated people's mental and physical health. Most frequently, authors note that COVID curtailed access, including to support networks and to libraries both inside and outside of facilities (Collica-Cox, 2021; Fuller, et al., 2021; Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022; Seo, et al., 2022; Skora

---

[9] More on digital literacy is available in Technology in Carceral Facilities: Trends, Limitations, and Opportunities for Libraries. A video featuring prominent researchers in the field, including Dr. Reisdorf and Dr. Seo, is available as part of the Expanding Information Access for Incarcerated People training series.

[10] Garcia, an incarcerated person, reiterates the importance of internet access and the impact of not having access in his 2021 commentary in *MIT Review*.

Horgan & Poehlmann-Tynan, 2020; Toliu-Shams, et al., 2022). While in some instances new modes of communication were opened in response to pandemic-related limitation on in-person visits, technologies introduced into facilities at this time were frequently for surveillance of incarcerated people (and increased surveillance under the claim of monitoring contagion) (McKay, 2022; Moak, Leban, Reuter, 2022; Unruh, Dharmapuri, & Soyemi, 2021).

The limitations on information access caused by the pandemic may have increased reliance on public libraries, including for reentry information and for general information needs (Herships, 2021; Harris, 2021).

Attitudes Toward Incarceration

As noted in the introduction to this paper, all library and information services for people who are incarcerated and people in the process of reentry take place within a frame of racialized systemic oppression. While not all publications included within this review emphasize, or even acknowledge, this context, many pointed to the inequality that people negatively impacted by incarceration face in accessing information. In addition to few opportunities to develop digital literacy skills through access to technology and the internet and limited and inconsistent access to current legal resources, publications touch on the lack of access to culturally responsive or representative texts, the need for academic support, and the need for accurate health information (Balcer, 2020; Fuller, et al., 2021; Geanna, et al., 2021; Reisdorf, et al., 2021; Styslinger, 2021).

The services and programs that libraries provide clearly align with needs created by incarceration, especially in relation to digital literacy skill development, job seeking, ensuring that information is accurate, and accessing technologies and the internet at no cost.

That stated, how librarians and information professionals discuss the purpose of incarceration will shape what types of services and materials they offer (Austin & Jacobson, 2021). The review of recent publications found that few (7) centered carceral logics of punishment or were written under the assumption that carceral staff were the main audience. The majority of publications that fell into these categories were about technologies deployed within facilities, including technologies for the surveillance of incarcerated people (Diyasa, Fauzi, Idhom, & Setiawan, 2021; Guerico, 2021; Link & Reece, 2021; Unruh, Dharmapuri, & Soyemi, 2021; Yang, 2021; Zheng, 2021). A few articles in this subset were also critical of surveillance and data gathering capacities, with reservations ranging from full scale critique of technologies to descriptions of possible technological failures in the development process (Arrigo, Sellers, Sellers & Butta, 2021; Iverson,2022; Kaun & Stiernstedt, 2022).[11]

---

[11] This analysis may skew toward publications on technologies within carceral facilities due to our inclusion of technology-related search terms in the publication gathering process.

Publications that take a critical approach to incarceration and information access spanned many codes, most frequently co-occurring with information literacy.

Historical articles on radio and juvenile collections in New York City contain critical perspectives, as do those on archives (Alexander, 2020; Seaver, 2021; Sojoyner, 2021; Speer & Jones, 2021). On archives, Speer & Jones foreground the ways in which archival erasure and displacement continue the dehumanization of incarcerated people. Sojoyner turns the lens to the archival practices of the state, noting that

> The power of the carceral state archive is its breadth and ability to maintain hierarchies through a profound yet quiet infiltration of all parts of state governance, and as a consequence, is rendered normal/essential to daily life (2021, p. 668).

Looking to publications that engage in some level of critique of carceral systems and information access may provide tools for de-normalizing carceral records, systems, and practices. In addition to publications on digital literacy and internet access previously discussed, this emerges in regard to teaching ESL without situating materials in the lived realities of incarcerated English learners (Sosnowski& Murillo, 2020), teacher education (Styslinger, 2021), how information literacy is taught (Hancock, 2021), legal access and legal literacy (Brown, 2020), accessing information in immigrant detention centers (Routin, 2021), and more. It intersects with conceptualizations of censorship, an increasingly prominent concern across many library types, in Birch's 2022 article, where Birch urges that

> [o]ur professional discourse on book banning is in dire need of transformation – in how we talk about banned books and who is included in the conversation (p. 415)

Publications reviewed in this period both center and counter the prioritization of rehabilitation in discussions of library services and information access for incarcerated people. Within LIS publications, rehabilitation was often noted as a possible outcome of library services and programs. These pieces maintain that increased literacy decreases the chance of young people being incarcerated again after release and that library access plays an inherently rehabilitative role within prisons (Formby & Paynter, 2020; Canning & Buchanan, 2021). Academic programs in jails are at times positioned as useful to students because they provided tools that students could use to "possibly alter their crime trajectory" (Collica-Cox, 2021, p. 50). Some tech-centered intervention projects propose rehabilitation through what is equivalent to psychological monitoring and control (Zheng, 2021).

Other publications provide more nuanced approaches to the function of information access. Preliminary research on the effects that literacy development has on behavior infractions within facilities found that these were not related, countering the researcher's initial assumptions (Millsap, 2021). Rehabilitation as a prescriptive element of information access was a central concern of historical reviews. Articles on radio

access and embedded juvenile collections for prescriptive reading illustrate that conceptions of rehabilitation often relate to the ability to control and restrict access to information and to share in collective experiences with other incarcerated people; top-down, prescriptive approaches to information access that do not recognize people's agency were unsuccessful (Alexander, 2020; Seaver, 2021). Critiques of state-enforced rehabilitation are most prominent in discussions of digital literacy and technological surveillance, which show that rehabilitation can be utilized as a premise to justify austere conditions or exploitative practices (Iverson, 2022; McKay, 2022; Reisdorf & DeCook, 2021; Reisdorf & DeCook, 2022).

Rehabilitation is often utilized by facilities to justify library access and services. Given this, resource allocations to libraries within jails, immigration detention centers, prisons, and juvenile detention centers might relate to whether or not facilities prioritize information access as part of their self-defined rehabilitative role. Two publications, one on juvenile detention services in South Carolina and the other a review of employment practices in Colorado's prison system, can be viewed as signposts here. In the first example–a robust library collection (one that is not focused only on education and access) and a dedicated librarian provide meaningful library services to incarcerated youth–the library is not solely a disciplinary rehabilitative service (Garner, 2021). In the second, dedicated library staff do not consistently receive the resources needed to provide library services and access to information, including self-help and other general information, and are at times called on to perform the tasks of correctional officers (Boyington & Barnes, 2021).

Similarly, many library services provided by outside libraries–public and academic–are dependent on the library's limited budget or on grants. Staffing and institutional support are ongoing concerns for staff involved in these projects (Jordan-Makely & Austin, 2021; Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). Beyond this, readers might consider the consequences of un- and under-resourced and unstaffed libraries, in which there is little or no possibility to access desired resources, including those that people who are incarcerated might deem to be part of their own path to well-being and self-fulfillment.

Information Literacy

> In prison… anyone who wants to gain knowledge or try to change their life–
> eventually, they find their way to the library (Herships, 2021).

> [I]t was clear that our patrons' information seeking behavior was heavily
> impacted by the general lack of available resources (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-
> Hernandez, 2022, p. 56).

Information literacy is vital to people's ability to access legal resources, pursue educational development opportunities, and assess and manage personal health during and after incarceration (Brown, 2020; Balcer,

2020; Schuster, 2022). Balcer positions the need for information literacy within the context of disparities created or exacerbated by incarceration, writing that

> [b]ecause incarcerated students often don't have the opportunity to develop the same research skills and use of practical tools as their peers in the community, understanding foundational information literacy concepts and being able to apply them across a variety of information contexts is integral (2020, p. 180).[12]

Access to opportunities to develop and maintain information literacy skills is a pressing concern in the publications reviewed in this white paper; information literacy was the most common code in the dataset. It was applied across thirty separate materials including those on language learning and reading differences (Cassidy, et al., 2021; Sosnowski & Murillo, 2021), ideas of rehabilitation (discussed above), and across library types.

Over half of the publications that concern information literacy also discuss reentry, at times creating a continuum between an individual's print and technological literacy and the anxieties and difficulties they faced during reentry. This trend clearly demonstrates a need for libraries and library services in carceral facilities.

A recent survey of librarians in academic, public, and other libraries located outside of carceral facilities found that 26 libraries provide some kind of focused digital literacy support for formerly incarcerated people, and a few more (28) offer programs or services related to reentry (Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). Libraries are also creating new and responsive programs and partnerships as part of their reentry support operations, including the IMLS-funded Immediate Access Project at Queens Public Library, which, in partnership with the Queens Defenders, supplied recently released people with free telephones and digital literacy training, as well as access to pre-recorded library programs (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022). Additional programs and resources, including legal programs, are presented in the 2022 special issue of *Public Libraries*, which highlights multiple library programs for people who are incarcerated or in the process of reentry.

---

[12] Padgett, in a recap of LaPierre's "How Data Bias Obscures the Underserved," notes that libraries need to take literacy and access into account when surveying patrons and creating new programs, hinting at a reiterative cycle in which people with lower literacy or who are unable to go to the physical library may be further removed from library access because of these circumstances (2022).

Education

Information and education access are intersecting concerns in the publications reviewed. Eleven publications were coded for education content[13]. Where historical research critically reviewed the overlap between enforced education and state-sponsored rehabilitation (Alexander, 2020), more modern approaches concern assessing education programs, supporting information and digital literacy, and contextualizing academic library services for incarcerated people, often with an eye toward reentry (Balcer, 2020; Bushman & Monobe, 2021; Dewey, et al., 2020; Fuller, et al., 2021; Perez & Leon, 2020; Reisdorf, DeCook, Foster, Cobbina & LaCourse, 2021).

LIS-specific publications attend to the possibility of forming collaborative partnerships with prison librarians and other stakeholders to enhance academic support and to provide at-a-distance reference and research services for incarcerated students (Bushman & Monobe, 2021; Dent, 2022).

Legal

Ten publications in the period reviewed were coded for legal content. These describe the mandates for meaningful access to the law, contextualize legal access within prisons, and address the implications of a turn toward fully digital legal access (Brown, 2020; Chase, 2022; Guerico, 2021; Mufarreh, Waitkus, & Booker, 2022). An industry article for correctional employees lauds the turn to technology as a boon that aligns with guidance from the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) (Guerico, 2021), while an outside researcher offers a caveat to proceed with caution–"law library collections are moving online because of massive shifts in the industry that do not take criminal litigants' needs into account, and their access to justice hangs in the balance" (Chase, 2022, p. 125).

Literacy and access to legal resources are clearly related, as demonstrated in the countless instances in which people navigate the law with widely varying degrees of success. This is a continuing concern in the context of immigrant detention, where access to materials is extremely limited, materials have not historically been available in the languages that people who are detained speak and read, and facility policies can limit access to legal assistance (Routin, 2021).

Libraries are responding to the need for accessible legal information and services. At least twelve academic and public libraries in the United States provide some type of legal assistance that includes criminal legal assistance, from virtual rights workshops to free legal assistance in the library (Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). The Tap In Center, at the St. Louis County Library (discussed earlier in this paper), provides a

---

[13] This analysis does not include the bulk of publications in two prison education journals.

model for situationally-aware, context-specific partnerships that meet patrons' needs prior to incarceration (Gibson, 2022).

The American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) established an Advancing Access to Justice Special Committee in 2021, with a focus on facilitating public access to legal materials (Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022). The Special Committee includes outside law library access for incarcerated people as a focus of their work.[14]

One publication pointed to the legal power prison systems hold to limit access to books and information. In reviewing the censorship of materials in the Education Justice Project collection, Hux found that "[t]he grant of power given by the Illinois legislature to the Department of Corrections, while not absolute, is vast. As a result, the greatest concentration of law, as it relates to prisoner access to publications, falls securely into the administrative law of the Illinois Department of Corrections" (2020, 117). Carceral facilities' legal power to censor has ongoing implications for library services for incarcerated people.

Censorship

There is a long history of denying reading skills or access to particular groups, including incarcerated people, unpaid and low-wage workers, enslaved and colonized communities, and women (Hall, 2022, p. 6).

Whether it be for the purpose of bettering their lives, transitioning to freedom, or simply being aware of what is going on in the world around them, incarcerated individuals require access to information (Steele, 2021, p. 130).

The Marshall Project released a banned books list for many states toward the end of 2022. This resource is continuously updated, and includes over 50,000 banned titles across approximately half of the state prison systems in the U.S. Despite the number of titles and the frequency of bans, recent research has found that "there does not appear to be broad consensus of what specific materials constitute harm and risk" (Steele, 2021, p. 108). Justifications for censorship vary: various facilities claim security issues and contraband concerns, while those who provide access to books often believe that bans and book refusals are more likely due to institutional concerns like lack of staff (Steele, 2021). Additionally, access to books and information can be restricted with punitive intent, depending on individual staff or the type of restrictions an individual is under.

---

[14] The Online Legal Information Resources directory created by the AALL Special Committee is available at https://www.aallnet.org/advocacy/government-relations/online-legal-information/.

Many individuals who provide library and information services for people who are incarcerated report some experience of censorship (Jordan-Makely, Austin, & Brammer, 2022).

In addition to outright bans and the maintenance and enforcement of banned books lists, censorship in carceral facilities occurs through a general lack of access to materials, library spaces, and technologies and the skills or guidance needed to navigate these (Balcer, 2020; Bushman & Monobe, 2021). As is illustrated in the contextualization of the VHS story program for incarcerated fathers, shifting policies around access to mail, including the enforcement of third-party mail digitization, and around access to books continuously reshape information access inside, disrupting connections between incarcerated individuals and their support networks and stymying access to needed and desired books (Stickel, Prins, & Kaiper-Marquez, 2021). Given this, many library collections for incarcerated people involve formal or informal selection and censorship policies and practices (Snow, 2020; Zeluff, 2021).[15]

Aligning with The Marshall Project's public list, advocacy from librarians aims to reduce censorship and to increase the transparency of censorship practices.

Nearly half of the publications coded for censorship were also coded for standards and best practices, illustrating the need for professional guidance and, conversely, the lack of resources available.

Standards and Best Practices

Fifteen publications mention the need for professional standards and best practices. These range from mention of existing professional association Standards to outlines of best practices by type of service (Anderson, Ness, & Sandoval-Hernandez, 2022; Bushman & Monobe, 2021). As discussed earlier in this paper, standards and best practices also emerged as policy recommendations, especially in relation to information access, literacy, and technology (Chase, 2022; Reisdorf & DeCook, 2021; Reisdorf & DeCook, 2022; Schuster, et al., 2022).

Within the United States, these discussions are framed by inconsistent and varying practices between state prison systems, the federal Bureau of Prisons, thousands of local jails, and hundreds of juvenile detention and immigration detention centers. Each facility within a system might function under its own set of formal and informal practices. Where in some instances, as discussed in Sojoyner's work on anti-carceral archives, this "dismantles one of the more pernicious myths of carcerality: the notion that the carceral state operates under a national framework" and "demonstrates that the carceral state is primarily a regional apparatus, and thus not controlled by a monolithic power bloc" (Sojoyner, 2021, p. 665), it also means that standards and best practices that do not acknowledge the variety of restrictions or allowances made by individual facilities

---

[15] Censorship in carceral facilities is so pervasive that it is included in a short list of censorship sites in an LIS trade publication (Pekoll, 2021).

may not easily transfer between context.[16] Inconsistencies in practices arise around how and whether incarcerated people are able to communicate with their support networks, access accurate legal information, contest censorship, and access staffed and maintained libraries (Brown, 2020; Toliu-Shams, et al., 2022; Zeluff, 2021).

Standards of practice emerge as key advocacy tools in Boyington and Barnes' comparison of policies for prison libraries against actual staffing of libraries in Colorado prisons (2021). Moving from a focus on libraries and information science, Hux illustrates how prison policies can be utilized to assess internal violations of policy (in relation to censoring access to materials) and can be positioned as tools for accountability and areas to demand greater transparency (2020).

Professional standards were largely absent in the publications reviewed. Boyington and Barnes briefly mention some improvements to the portion of the American Correctional Association's *Standards* for accrediting prisons that mention prison libraries; those revisions add minimal tools for reviewing prison libraries (2021). Zeluff calls for an update to the American Library Association's *Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Facilities*, last published in 1999 (2021).

The need for new standards has implications for many publications in this period. Prior to 2023, the most recent version of the IFLA *Guidelines for Library Services to Prisoners* was published in 2005. ALA's juvenile detention standards have not been updated since 1999, and the Association's standards for adult institutions have not been updated since 1992. Recent interest in updating these standards, led or guided by several authors of works examined in this dataset, has led to exciting recent developments. IFLA published the 4th Edition of their *Guidelines* in 2023 (Garner & Krolak, 2023). A forthcoming, comprehensive revision of ALA's standards for library services in carceral facilities was approved by ALA Council in June of 2023 and is likely forthcoming in 2024.[17]

---

[16] Conversely, it speaks to the possibility to begin locally and then extend from a perspective informed by local contexts.

[17] More information about this revision is available at https://alaeditions.org/standards/.

Conclusion

> *Meeting people where they are is as much a part of the mission of public libraries, as providing diverse, inclusive collections and services for everyone who walks through our doors; and often involves reaching those not within our walls (King, Demske, & Jackson, 2022, p. 10).*

> *The library serves people who are working to avoid incarceration, people who are currently living in correctional facilities, people who are living in transitional facilities, and people who are being released. In the pursuit of providing much needed support to these members of the community, the library has developed partnerships with community groups and advocates who are passionate about collaborating to improve the lives and outcomes of people who are navigating the justice system (Gibson, 2022, p. 44).*

Models for library services and opportunities for professional discourse about information access for incarcerated people are becoming increasingly available. This is demonstrated by a wave of publications in academic and popular resources, chapters, and books that discuss library services for people who are incarcerated, people in the process of reentry, and their social support networks. Work of librarians and information professionals around the country is also featured in San Francisco Public Library's video series on a variety of library services for incarcerated people and people in reentry, including examples of academic, law, prison, and public library services.[18]

Reviewing recent publications in library and information science journals and trade magazines reveals that many libraries can engage in outreach to people who are incarcerated and people in the process of reentry. Opportunities for possible partnerships abound, including opportunities to collaborate with education programs, nonprofits that support the well-being of incarcerated people, legal advocacy groups, and more. A broader view of recent research provides paths for future considerations, including digital literacy programs and resources, services specifically designed for women and young people who are incarcerated, and the pressing need to increase information access, including access to legal resources, for people who are in immigrant detention centers.

Recent publications also give attention to areas for further research. This includes assessing how information and library services, and the technologies they can employ, might support literacy development and well-being, including mental and physical health (Formby & Paynter, 2020; Fuller, et al., 2021; Poehlmann-Tynan, et al., 2021). There is a clear need for research on building support for access to personal-use technologies

---

[18] The video series, and additional information, is available at https://sfpl.org/services/jail-and-reentry-services/expanding-information-access-incarcerated-people-initiative.

that are not prohibitively expensive among carceral facility staff and the general public (Mufarreh, Waitkus, & Booker, 2022). The increasing deployment of advanced technologies in carceral settings, often falling under the overarching idea of "smart prisons," is an area for further research, both on how this impacts incarcerated peoples' abilities to access information and library services and for how it impacts people's perceptions and future uses of technologies.[19]

Incarcerated people's experiences were incorporated into some articles in this review, but few featured feedback from incarcerated people about their experiences, and fewer still highlighted the generative practices that people who are incarcerated or have experienced incarceration undertake. From maintaining a sense of self through reading, sharing materials and information and creating communities of literacy practices, to generating records of their experiences, art, fiction, journalism, and research, incarcerated people can and do engage with the wider world.

Moving ahead, there are many opportunities for librarians, information professionals, and educators to support this work.[20] These include utilizing writing resources like PEN America's *The Sentences That Create Us* and engaging with campaigns to limit book bans in prisons, promoting the creative works of incarcerated people in library spaces, and including materials in the American Prison Writing Archive in college courses (Leuner, Koehler, & Larson, 2022). These and similar efforts to offer information, resources, and services that are informed by incarcerated people and contextualized within their experiences may provide new approaches to library services for incarcerated people and people in the process of reentry. They will also, inevitably, reveal the deep and ongoing need for more libraries to offer collections, resources, services, outreach, and programs that are responsive to the ongoing consequences of incarceration.

---

[19] See Sun's comprehensive and very technical guide (2022).

[20] See Nicole Fleetwood's *Marking Time* for more on how incarcerated artists create art and meaning for themselves and in community with one another (2020).

Citations Included in Literature Review: 2020-2022

Alexander, I. (2020). Rewiring the Prison: Early Radio as a Carceral Technology. International Journal of Communication, 14, 20. Retrieved from https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/14398.

Anderson, J., Ness, N. & Sandoval-Hernandez, D. (2022). Creating new correctional programs and services in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Librarianship*, 7(2), 46-60.

Arrigo, B.A., Sellers, B.G., & Sellers, B. & Butta, F. (2021). Introduction: The ultramodern age of criminology, control societies and 'dividual' justice policy. In B.G. Sellers & B.A. Arrigo (Eds.) *The pre-crime society: crime, culture and control in the ultramodern age* (pp. 1-14). Bristol University Press.

Austin, J. & Jacobson, E. (2021). Patron-centered services: Disrupting the narrative of reformation and reading in American jails and prisons. In Garner, J. (Ed.) (2021). Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 291-309.

Balcer, C.K. (2020). The framework for information literacy for higher education (in prison). *C&RL News*, 81(4), 178-181.

Birch, S. (2022). A new prohibition: Book banning, prison abolition, and librarians. *Education for Information*, 38, 415-422.

Boyington, E. (2020). The fox and the hedgehog: When libraries are behind bars. In V. Nye (ed.), Intellectual Freedom Stories from a Shifting Landscape. Chicago: ALA Editions, pp. 83-94.

Boyington, E. & Barnes, R. (2021). Mandatory minimums: Staffing correctional libraries. In Garner, J. (Ed.) (2021). Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 261-290.

Brown, K. (2020). How twenty-first century technology affects inmates' access to prison law libraries in the United States prison system. *Marquette Benefits & Social Welfare Law Review*, 21(1), 83-110.

Bushman, B. & Monobe, D. (2021). Assisting students attending school after or during incarceration. In J. Skinner and M. Gross (Eds.) *Underserved Patrons in University Libraries: Assisting Students Facing Trauma, Abuse, and Discrimination* (pp. 109-122). Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Campbell, S. (2021). In the PaLRaP spotlight: Susan Williams. *Pennsylvania Libraries: Research & Practice*, 9(2), 71-73.

Canning, C. & Buchanan, S. (2021). Exploring the rehabilitative role of the prison library: Addressing sensitive information needs via cultural activity. In Garner, J. (Ed.) Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 11-37.

Capers, K. M., Anderson, J., Ness, N. (2021). Expanding library service in jails and prisons through hip hop, meditation, and creativity. In Garner, J. (Ed.) Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 39-56.

Cassidy, L., Reggio, K., Shaywitz, B. A., Holahan, J. M., & Shaywitz, S. E. (2021). Dyslexia in incarcerated men and women: A new perspective on reading disability in the prison population. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 72(2), 61-81.

Chase, A. (2022). Exploiting prisoners: precedent, technology, and the promise of access to justice. *Wake Forest Journal of Law & Policy*, 12(1), 103-148.

Collica-Cox, K. (2021). When 'Inside-Out' goes 'Upside-Down': Teaching students in a jail environment during the COVID pandemic and implications for the use of correctional technology post-pandemic. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 17(1), 50-69.

D'Orio, W. (2021, September). Free to read: Talking books with incarcerated teens. *School Library Journal*, 64-66.

Dent, C. E. (2022). Paywalls, firewalls, prison walls: Bridging the digital divide within the prison education system. In M. Gellman (Ed.) *Education behind the wall: Why and how we teach college in prison* (pp. 118-134). Brandeis University Press.

Dewey, S., Codallos, K., Barry, R., Drenkhahn, K., Glover, M., Muthig, A., Roberts, S. L., & Abbott, B. (2020). Higher education in prison: A pilot study of approaches and modes of delivery in eight prison administrations. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 71(1), 57-89.

Diyasa, G.S.M., Fauzi, A., Idhom, M., & Setiawan, A. (2021). Multi-face recognition for the detection of prisoners in jail using a Modified Cascade Classifier and CNN. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series. 2020 2nd International Conference on Science & Technology* (2020 2nd ICoST).

Ellis, R. (2021). Prisons as porous institutions. *Theory and Society*, 50, 175-199.

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

Fuller, J.M., Ho, Y.X., Morse, R., Fix, G., Cutrona, S.L., Gaziano, T., Connolly, S.L., Hass, R., Jackson, J., & McInnes, D.K. (2021). A mobile health tool for peer support of individuals reentering communities after incarceration. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 32(2), 148-165.

Garcia, J. (2021). Left behind: How are prisoners supposed to reenter society when technology has moved on? *MIT Review*, 18.

Garner, J. (2021). Exploring juvenile justice facility library provision in Australia and South Carolina, USA. In Garner, J. (Ed.) (2021). Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 157-181.

Garner, J. (2021) Introduction. In J. Garner, Ed. Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 1-7.

Garner, J. (2022) Fifty years of prison library scholarly publishing: A literature analysis. *The Library Quarterly*, 92(3), 241-257.

Geana, M.V., Anderson, S., Lipnicky, A., Wickliffe, J.L., & Ramaswamy, M. (2021). Managing technology, content, and user experience: An mHealth intervention to improve women's health literacy after incarceration. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 32(2), 106-127.

Gibson, J. H-L. (2022). Library support every step of the way. *Public Libraries*, 61(3), 38-44.

Guerico, M.J. (2021, September/October). Mobile corrections software: A catalyst for change. *Corrections Forum*, 10-16.

Hancock, E.J. (2021). Power to the people: Public libraries using critical information literacy pedagogy in prisons. In Garner, J. (Ed.) Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 85-101.

Hall, T. D. (2022). Fugitive literacies. *American Libraries* (June), 6.

Harris, S. (2021, Summer). Research by Mail: A Reference Service for People in Prison. *Texas Library Journal*, 137-138.

Herships, S. (2021). Libraries are key tools for people getting out of prison, even during a pandemic. *NPR.* Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/2021/03/28/980434263/libraries-are-key-tools-for-people-getting-out-of-prison-even-during-a-pandemic.

Hussain, S. T., Batool, S. H., ur Rehman, A., Zahra, S. K., & Mahmood, K. (2022). Examining the status of prison libraries around the world: A literature review. *IFLA Journal*, 49(1), 180-200.

Hux, S. (2020). Law of publication review in the Illinois Department of Corrections. *Public Interest Law Reporter*, 25(2), 115-122.

Iverson, J. (2022). Surveilling potential uses and abuses of Artificial Intelligence in correctional spaces. *Lincoln Memorial University Law Review*, 9(3).

Jordan-Makely, C. & Austin, J. (2021, September). Outside and in: How libraries are providing services for people impacted by incarceration. *Library Journal*, 21-25.

Jordan-Makely, C., Austin, J., & Brammer, C. (2022, August). Growing services: How libraries outside of prisons create access to information for incarcerated people. *Library Journal*, 24-29.

Kaun, A. & Stiernstedt, K. (2022). Prison tech: Imagining the prison as lagging behind and as a test bed for technology advancement. *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 15(1), 69-83.

Kilgore, J. (2022). *Understanding E-carceration: Electronic monitoring, the surveillance state, and the future of mass incarceration*. New York: The New Press.

King, T., Demske, N., & Jackson, S. (2022). The true measure of our character: Spotlighting how public libraries are supporting the justice-involved. *Public Libraries*, 61(3), 10-12.

Ledvora, L. (2021). (No) libre by nexus: the fight against immigrant e-carceration and exploitation. *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal*, 35(2), 687-694.

Link, T. C. & Reece, B. (2021). Barriers to the adoption of technological innovations in corrections: A review and case study. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 65(2-3), 262-281.

McKague, J. (2022). Strengthening communities: Outreach services to persons who are incarcerated and those reentering society. *Public Libraries*, 61(3), 21-27.

McKay, C. (2022). The carceral automaton: Digital prisons and technologies of detention. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 11(1), 100-119.

Millsap, K. (2021). Effect of increasing literacy skills to improve inmate behavior: A quantitative study. Dissertation. St. John's University, Jamaica, New York.

Moak, S. C., Leban, L., Reuter, T. K. (2022). Reentry during a pandemic: A pilot study of access to peer support through technology to reduce social isolation. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*.

Monobe, D., Bushman, B., & McCall, S. (2021). Collaborations among prison libraries, public, and academic libraries and the impact of censorship. In Garner, J. (Ed.) (2021). Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 105-117.

Moreno, T.H. (2022). Beyond the police: Libraries as locations of carceral care. *Reference Services Review*, 50(1), 102-112.

Mufarreh, A., Waitkus, J., & Booker, T. A. (2022). Prison official perceptions of technology in prison. *Punishment & Society*, 24(3), 410-432.

Padgett, L. (2022). In other words: Under-the-radar Discrimination. *Information Today*, 30.

Pekoll, K. (2021, July/August). A deeper look: Censorship beyond books. *American Libraries*, 26-28.

Perez, G., & Leon, C. S. (2020). Bonds beyond bars: Impact of an Inside-Out prison exchange program. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 71(3), 33-53.

Poehlmann-Tynan, J., Cuthrell, H., Weymouth, L., Burnson, C., Frerks, L., Muentner, L., Holder, N., Milavetz, Z., Lauter, L., Hindt, L., Davis, L., Schubert, E., & Shlafer, R. (2021). Multisite randomized efficacy trial of educational materials for young children with incarcerated parents. *Development and Psychopathology*, 33(1), 323-339.

Raftery, P. J. (2021). Prison Librarianship and LIS Schools: Is there a career-path?. *Urban Library Journal*, 27 (1).

Reisdorf, B.C. & DeCook, J.R. (2021). The digital technologies of rehabilitation and reentry. In B.G. Sellers & B.A. Arrigo (Eds.) *The pre-crime society: crime, culture and control in the ultramodern age* (pp. 365-385). Bristol University Press.

Reisdorf, B.C., & DeCook, J.R. (2022). Locked up and left out: Formerly incarcerated people in the context of digital inclusion. *New Media & Society*, 24(2), 478-495.

Reisdorf, B.C., DeCook, J., Foster, M., Cobbina, J. and LaCourse, A. (2021) Digital reentry: Uses of and barriers to ICTs in the prisoner reentry process. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(14), 2028-2045.

Riggs, K. (2022). Library services during incarceration and reentry. *Public Libraries*, 61(3), 13-16.

Routin, E. (2021). Legal care and friction in family detention. *Cultural Anthropology*, 36(2), 312-339.

Schuster, B., Britton, H., Seo, H., Altschwager, D., Booton, E., Ault, M., Wickliffe, J., & Ramaswamy, M. (2022). "I don't just take whatever they hand to me": How women recently released from incarceration access internet health information. *Women & Criminal Justice*.

Seaver, B.W. (2021). Preventing juvenile delinquency with An Invitation to Read. *Libraries: Culture, History, and Society*, 5(2), 176-203.

Seo, H., Altschwager, D., Choi, B-Y., Song, S., Britton, H., Ramaswamy, M., Schuster, B., Ault, M., Ayinala, K., Zaman, R., Tihen, B., & Yenugu, L. (2021). Informal technology education for women transitioning from incarceration. ACM Transactions on Computing Education, 21(2), 1-16. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1145/3425711

Seo, H., Britton, H., Ramaswamy, M., Altschwager, D., Blomberg, M., Aromona, S., Schuster, B., Booton, E., Ault, M., & Wickliffe, J. (2022). Returning to the digital world: Digital technology use and privacy management of women transitioning from incarceration. *New Media & Society*, 24(3), 641-666.

Skora Horgan, E. & Poehlmann-Tynan, J. (2020). In-home video chat for young children and their incarcerated parents. *Journal of Children and Media*, 14(3), 400-406.

Snow, J.X. (2020). O*utreach Services for Teens: A Starter Guide*. Chicago: ALA Editions.

Sojoyner, D. (2021). You are going to get us killed: Fugitive archival practice and the carceral state. *American Anthropologist*, 123(3); 658-670.

Sosnowski, J. & Murillo, L. (2021). Incarcerated languages and literacies: Attempting liberatory language and literacy pedagogies in a prison setting. In L. Henry, & N. Stahl (Eds.). *Literacy across the community: Research, praxis, and trends* (pp. 114-127). New York: Routledge.

Speer, J. & Jones, S.C. (2021). Dangerous papers: Building an archive of antiprison resistance. *The Professional Geographer*, (74)3, 573-579.

Steele, J.E. (2021). Books behind bars: Cases of censorship in two south Mississippi prisons. In Garner, J. (Ed.) (2021). Exploring the Roles and Practices of Libraries in Prisons. *Advances in Librarianship*, 49, 119-131.

Stickel, T., Prins, E. & Kaiper-Marquez, A. (2021). 'The video is an upgrade from them all': how incarcerated fathers view the affordances of video in a family literacy programme. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 46(2), 174-189,

Styslinger, M.E. (2021). Behind the fence: A reading partnership with the Department of Juvenile Justice. In L. Henry & N. Stahl (Eds.) *Literacy across the community: Research, praxis, and trends* (pp. 289-300). New York: Routledge.

Tian, E.J., Venugopalan, S., Kumar, S., & Beard, M. (2021). The impacts of and outcomes from telehealth delivered in prisons: A systematic review. *PLoS One*. 16(5).

Toliu-Shams, M., Bath, E., McPhee, J., Folk, J.B., Porche, M.V., & Fortuna, L.R. (2022). Juvenile justice, technology, and family separation: A call to prioritize access to family-based telehealth treatment for justice-involved adolescents' mental health and wellbeing. *Frontiers in Digital Health*, 4.

Unruh, L.H., Dharmapuri, S., & Soyemi, K. (2021). The utility of video technology and enhanced infection control in reducing COVID-19 disease burden in a custodial setting. *American Journal of Infection Control*, 49(6), 852-854.

Weaver, J.C., Murnen, T.J., Hartzog, M.K., & Bertelsen, C. The evolution of the MILE reading mentoring program: The role of collaboration in a teacher education-juvenile corrections partnership. In L. Henry & N. Stahl (Eds.) *Literacy across the community: Research, praxis, and trends* (pp. 301-314). New York: Routledge.

Yang, J. (2021). Big data technology and prison management analysis. *2021 International Conference on Big Data Analysis and Computer Science* (BDACS), 35-38.

Zeluff, K. (2021). Collection development policies in juvenile detention center libraries. In A.M. Dawking (Ed.) *Intellectual Freedom Issues in School Libraries* (pp. 62-65). Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Zheng, L. (2021). Application of Virtual and Reality (VR) technology in prison correction. *2021 International Conference on Computer Technology and Media Convergence Design* (CTMCD), 143-147.

Additional Citations

Alliance for Higher Education in Prison (2023). Retrieved from https://www.higheredinprison.org/

American Library Association. (2022). Revisioning Standards for library services for the incarcerated and detained. Retrieved from: https://alaeditions.org/standards/.

Fleetwood, N. (2020). *Marking Time: Art in the Age of Mass Incarceration*. Harvard University Press.

Garner, J. and Krolak, L. (eds.) (2023). IFLA Guidelines for library services to prisoners (4th edition). The Hague, IFLA. Retrieved from: https://repository.ifla.org/handle/123456789/2538.

Jones, E.P., Mani, N.S., Carlson, R.B., Welker, C.G., Cawley, M. and Yu, F. (2022). Analysis of anti-racism, equity, inclusion and social justice initiatives in library and information science literature, *Reference Services Review*, 50(1), 81-101.

Korman, H.T.M. & Pilnik, S. (2018). How does education in the juvenile detention center measure up? It doesn't. *Education Week*. Retrieved from https://www.edweek.org/leadership/opinion-how-does-education-in-the-juvenile-justice-system-measure-up-it-doesnt/2018/10.

Lane, J. & Ramirez, F.A. (2022). Carceral communication: Mass incarceration as communicative phenomenon. *New Media & Society*.

Leuner, K.J., Koehler, C., & Larson, D. (2022). Activist bibliography as abolitionist pedagogy in the American Prison Writing Archive. *Criticism*, 64(3).

PEN America. (2022) *The Sentences That Create Us*. Chicago: Haymarket Press.

Petricini, T. (2022). Family communication disrupted by incarceration and the role of technology: An overview. In M.R. McGinley, J.K. Burk, & J.S. Ward (Eds.) *Communicating with our families: Technology as continuity, interruption, and transformation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Pokornowski, S., & Tanaka, K. (2022). Technology access in higher education in prison programs. *Ithaka S+R*. Retrieved from: https://sr.ithaka.org/blog/technology-access-in-higher-education-in-prison-programs/.

Sojoyner, D.M. (2023). *Against the Carceral Archive: The Art of Liberatory Practice.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Sun. (2022). *Smart Prisons*. Singapore: Springer Nature.

Tanaka, K., & Cooper, D.M. (2020). Advancing technological equity for incarcerated college students: Examining the opportunities and risks. *Ithaka S+R*. Retrieved from: https://sr.ithaka.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/SR-Report-Advancing-Technological-Equity-Incarcerated-College-Students-050720.pdf/

The Marshall Project. (2022). What books are banned in your state's prisons? Retrieved from https://www.themarshallproject.org/2022/12/21/prison-banned-books-list-find-your-state.

Wessler, M. (2022). Updated charts provide insights on racial disparities, correctional control, jail suicides, and more. Prison Policy Initiative. Retrieved from https://www.prisonpolicy.org/blog/2022/05/19/updated_charts/.

Follow San Francisco Public Library's Expanding Information Access for Incarcerated People grant work at https://www.ala.org/aboutala/offices/diversity/expanding-access-incarcerated-initiative and https://sfpl.org/services/jail-and-reentry-services/expanding-information-access-incarcerated-people-initiative.

San Francisco
Public Library

Mellon
Foundation