



Open in Prison Spaces

The Potential and Limitations of Open
Educational Resources and Practices in
Higher Education in Prison

Ess Pokornowski
Sindy Lopez

October 1, 2026



ITHAKA S+R

Through research, collaboration, and innovation, Ithaka S+R informs policy, guides strategies, and builds evidence-based tools to broaden access to postsecondary education, improve student and workforce outcomes, and advance scholarship.

Ithaka S+R is part of ITHAKA, a nonprofit with a mission to improve access to knowledge and education for people around the world. We believe education is key to the wellbeing of individuals and society, and we work to make it more effective and affordable.

Copyright 2026 ITHAKA. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of the license, please see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

Ithaka S+R thanks the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC) and the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE) for jointly commissioning this study and for their support in engaging stakeholders across their member states.



The Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC) brings together leaders from Midwestern states to strengthen postsecondary education, advance student success, and promote regional economic vitality. MHEC programs and initiatives save member states and students millions of dollars annually through time- and cost-savings opportunities. MHEC research supports workforce readiness and improves the quality, accessibility, and affordability of postsecondary education. MHEC convenings bring together leaders and subject experts to share knowledge, generate ideas, and develop collaborative solutions. One of four regional higher education compacts in the U.S., MHEC was authorized through legislation in 1991. Its contracts, research, programs, initiatives, and convenings are available to all public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education in the Midwest.

NEBHE promotes greater education opportunities for the residents of New England. It works across the six New England states to help leaders assess, develop and implement sound education practices and policies of regional significance; to promote regional cooperation and programs that encourage the efficient use and sharing of educational resources; and to strengthen the relationship between higher education and the economic well-being and quality of life in New England. In February 2024, NEBHE was awarded five years of grant funding from [Ascendium Education Group](#) to establish the New England Prison Education Collaborative (NEPEC) to build upon the recommendations of the 2023 New England Commission on the Future of Higher Education in Prison. Through this initiative, NEBHE seeks to accelerate, support, and collaborate to help create a future where every incarcerated person in New England has access to high-quality, workforce-aligned, equitable postsecondary opportunities with a diverse range of educational pathways.

Executive summary

Ithaka S+R was commissioned by the Midwestern Higher Education Compact (MHEC) to explore the potential for, and limitations of, open educational resources (OER) and open education practices in higher education in prison. Conducted in dialogue with MHEC and the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE), this exploratory study draws on research, interviews, and a focus group with stakeholders from MHEC and NEBHE member states. The report is intended primarily for open education practitioners and advocates interested in understanding how OER is currently used in prison education and how they might begin working with colleagues in this field.

Key findings from this exploratory study include:

- **OER are already available inside prisons, though how they are deployed varies widely.** Interviewees noted using OER as primary course texts, instructional supplements, self-directed online learning tools, and alternatives when other materials were delayed or unavailable.
- **OER can offer prison education programs greater affordability, flexibility, and continuity.** Openly licensed materials can reduce course-material costs, be reproduced or adapted for different formats and settings, provide alternatives when traditional materials are delayed, and help students maintain access when they transfer between prison facilities or return to the community. OER may also expand educational opportunities beyond students formally enrolled in college programs.
- **OER does not eliminate the significant constraints governing education and information access in prison settings.** Technology limitations, including lack of connectivity as well as intensive security and media-review processes and restrictions on physical materials, can all affect whether and how OER can be used. Programs must also account for the time and labor required to identify, review, adapt, format, and maintain high-quality and accessible materials.

- **Collaboration with prison education colleagues is the essential starting point for OER practitioners.** Effective implementation requires coordination among prison education program leaders, faculty, librarians, correctional administrators, technology providers, accessibility specialists, and institutional IT and cybersecurity staff. Practitioners should begin by learning how materials for prison education programs are currently selected, reviewed, delivered, and accessed, and then identify a focused opportunity to pilot OER at a pace that supports trust, care, and appropriate institutional planning.

For OER practitioners interested in entering this space, the important initial steps are to build relationships, listen to colleagues with experience in prison education, and approach the work with care.

Introduction

OER are already inside prisons and jails across the United States, though where they are available, how they are provided, and who has access—under what conditions and for what purposes—all vary tremendously. For example, we know from past research and anecdotal evidence that technology vendors offer resources like Khan Academy, that some states and college programs provide access to textbooks through OpenStax, and that higher education programs with robust commitments to open education use open textbooks and other OER as course texts and supplements. The question is: what are the benefits of using OER in prison spaces and what barriers prevent the implementation of best practices in their use?

What are the benefits of using OER in prison spaces and what barriers prevent the implementation of best practices in their use?

The reinstatement of federal Pell eligibility for incarcerated students stipulates that the higher education programs in prison that receive students' Pell grant funds must be “comparable” to analogous programs from the home campus.¹ Access to information, educational materials, and critical support and advising services are major areas of experiential difference between college and university education inside and outside of prison.² Moreover, federal regulations on Pell grant funding for incarcerated students require that federally approved prison education programs provide, “substantially similar offerings” of academic and career advising services as those provided to students who are not confined or incarcerated.³ Our exploratory research on OER suggests that, when implemented deliberately and successfully, OER can help institutions achieve this parity of educational resources to students across these two student populations: those enrolled at programming in prisons and those studying on the outside.

In a broader sense still, open education may offer a pathway to improving information and education access for incarcerated learners; however, little

¹ The 2020 FAFSA Simplification Act restored Pell Grant eligibility for incarcerated students, with implementing regulations finalized in 2022. For more on Pell restoration processes and requirements, see Bethany Lewis, Alex Monday, and Ess Pokornowski, “Pell Restoration and Approval: Following the Data,” *Ithaka S+R*, September 30, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.323742>; Benjamin Collins and Cassandra Dortch, “The FAFSA Simplification Act, CRS Report R46909,” Congressional Research Service, January 19, 2022, <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R46909>; US Department of Education, “Pell Grants for Prison Education Programs; Determining the Amount of Federal Education Assistance,” *Federal Register* 87, no. 208 (October 28, 2022), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/10/28/2022-23078/pell-grants-for-prison-education-programs-determining-the-amount-of-federal-education-assistance>

² The Justice Initiatives team at Ithaka S+R has produced an extensive body of research on higher education in prison, including work on technology and censorship. For an overview and related publications, see Ess Pokornowski et al, “Security and Censorship: A Comparative Analysis of State Department of Corrections Media Review Policies,” *Ithaka S+R*, August 20, 2023, <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/security-and-censorship/>; Ess Pokornowski et al, “Between Two Systems: Navigating Censorship and Self-Censorship in Higher Education in Prisons,” *Ithaka S+R*, April 3 2024, <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/between-two-systems/>; Ess Pokornowski, “Technology in Higher Education in Prison Programs: A Report on Survey Findings,” *Ithaka S+R*, September 7, 2023, <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/technology-in-higher-education-in-prison-programs>; Ess Pokornowski, “Technology Implementation for Higher Education in Prison,” *Ithaka S+R*, December 9, 2024, <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/technology-implementation-for-higher-education-in-prison/>.

³ 34 CFR § 668.241 - Best interest determination.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/34/668.241>

research to date has examined how higher education practitioners in prison use and adapt OER. The following section presents findings from exploratory interviews that illuminate both the opportunities and barriers that shape the use of OER and educational materials in prison settings.

Opportunities and benefits of OER in prison settings

Increasing flexibility in course design and instructional materials

Several interviewees expressed that the role of OER in their prison education programs is both “a blessing and a curse,” as characterized by a program coordinator. On one hand, interviewees lauded the flexibility of OER: instructors are able to modify text as needed; materials can be delivered digitally (in part or whole) via learning management systems; and programs are able to print materials on demand inside facilities to remediate unforeseen barriers, like warehouse backlogs or other spatial or information access issues including facility paper bans. On the other hand, interviewees expressed concerns about quality assurance, formatting and accessibility considerations, faculty awareness, and funding for faculty development or compensation for adapting or revising open course materials. Interviewees see well-planned, well-implemented, high-quality OER as a genuine boon, but face challenges in finding the right resources and creating the framework to implement them successfully.

In addition, higher education in prison program staff noted during a focus group that faculty often select and curate course materials themselves and that the degree of oversight and standardization varies across institutions and departments. Consequently, the extent to which OER is used varies depending on the department, course topic, and individual faculty preferences. As one interviewee from a midwestern private university described “it varies a lot class to class. We have some classes that are almost entirely open educational resources, and we have some

where it's just so specialized that it's not feasible and we're purchasing a lot of materials.”

Reducing the costs of instructional materials

According to many interviewees, affordability is the main driver of OER adoption. Because prison education programs often rely on different streams of financial aid (including Pell grants), the cost of textbooks and course materials affects how much funding remains available to support students. By relying on OER, programs can often reduce these costs. As one interviewee from a New England community college noted, usage of OER within their prison education program was bolstered by an existing system-wide OER initiative. The use of OER has been valuable because printed and bound open education “materials run under \$50... that's been very beneficial to our Pell [funding] and [our efforts] to keep costs manageable and allow our students to take the maximum amount of classes that they can without getting completely pulled under by textbook fees.”⁴

Navigating logistical challenges in delivering course materials

Interviewees also noted that OER adoption reduced the logistical challenges in delivering educational materials into correctional facilities. As one focus group participant noted, because the timing of textbook delivery through bookstores can be unreliable, OER provides programs with greater flexibility and control over instructional materials. Interviewees mentioned instances where staff were able to print alternative readings or course materials on short notice and distribute them to students while waiting for print materials to arrive. As one interviewee from a New England community college shared, “it's been

⁴ There was disagreement among interviewees on whether Pell grants could cover textbooks and course materials for incarcerated students. The “Confined or Incarcerated Student Fact Sheet” from the Department of Education notes that “Pell Grants for PEPs will only cover tuition, fees, books, course materials, supplies, equipment, and the cost of obtaining a license, certification, or a first professional credential.”

<https://fsapartners.ed.gov/sites/default/files/2023-03/ConfinedIncarceratedStudentFactSheet.pdf>

beneficial if there's an emergency or if there's an issue, we can immediately get at least the cursory chapters in for our students to use.” This flexibility is helpful given the strict scheduling and approval processes that govern the movement of materials into prison facilities.

If broadly used, OER has the potential to facilitate or smooth media and security review procedures. In facilities with paper bans, strict materials screening, and limited technology access, printing and binding customized open textbooks or course readers could enable greater information access while complying with strict policies and procedures. And, in places where course texts may be accessed digitally in some areas but not others, having both printed and digital materials can significantly increase the quality of access and use.

Reproducing and re-distributing educational materials

Because OER can be copied and adapted, programs can print additional materials, and adjust text, layouts, or examples without navigating licensing restrictions or purchasing additional copies. Higher education in prison programs therefore would not incur additional licensing costs or need to repurchase textbooks when students transfer between facilities, misplace or lose books, or progress through different courses that rely on shared materials. Additionally, programs can use these materials across multiple facilities, allowing instructors to offer consistent content across different sites. OER also cuts down on administrative burdens in reproducing educational and instructional materials, as one interviewee noted, “once they do it once, they have stuff they can reuse or at least revise and retry.”

Supporting academic continuity and access

Interviewees also described how OER can help with academic continuity. A couple explained how students who have access to digital versions of OER on portable devices, like tablets or laptops, experience fewer educational disruptions when they are transferred within or between facilities. When materials are tied solely to physical textbooks, transfers can result in students losing access to the resources they need to complete

assignments. Interviewees suggested that this portability benefits not just individual students but also helps institutions manage the logistical complexity of operating educational programs within prison systems. As one interviewee from a community college in the Midwest noted, “open educational resources for us were a godsend when I had students who were transferring prisons. How do I help them port their learning from point A to point B? This allows them to stay enrolled. They don't have to withdraw from classes, and it keeps the cost down of trying to repurchase materials.”

The same interviewee also noted that, in the current arrangement between the higher education program, prison, and the technology provider serving them, students with access to educational materials through tablets can log into their accounts after release and retain course materials. They shared that “all they have to do is log back into [the learning management system] ... so that when they are released and they go home, they can immediately start working on their assignments again because their readings are still there. They can just keep on going.” This can help reduce disruptions in learning as students continue their academic journey after incarceration.

Democratizing education access beyond enrolled students

Interviewees see that OER has the potential to extend learning opportunities beyond enrolled students in prison education programs. One interviewee hopes that prison libraries could offer open textbooks, course readers, or public-domain literature to students who are not formally enrolled in an education program. This could dramatically increase information access in prison settings, especially where libraries are often under-resourced and educational materials are often limited by program participation. As one interviewee commented:

It would be really nice if they had access to “open archives” or “open libraries” and books that they could read for fun on their tablets. [Incarcerated people have] a wide range of reading interests, they like history, reading about psychology, reading about education, business... if they could create a curated collection of

OER books that they could read that were approved, I think it would be cool.

Interviewees also mentioned that as incarcerated individuals already use self-directed learning software like Edovo, there is a precedent and demand for additional supplemental learning materials that can be used to increase informal education opportunities.

In addition to expanding informal learning, interviewees noted that long-term initiatives aiming to produce high-quality OER for all incarcerated individuals, packaged with ancillaries and self-paced learning modules, could increase college readiness and provide credit for prior learning opportunities. For example, one program administrator in the Midwest suggested that future coordination with testing agencies might enable them to provide exams in the College Board's College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) to create an avenue for additional college credits.⁵

The availability of open and licensed learning resources could provide individuals with the opportunity to chart their own educational journey with some potential pathways to credit.

This represents one of the great areas of potential for open education in the prison setting: the availability of open and licensed learning resources could provide individuals with the opportunity to chart their own educational journey with some potential pathways to credit. However, the limits to openness inside are also demonstrated here, as nearly all interviewees noted that access to specific educational resources is limited to those participating in education programming. This suggests that, even where there are opportunities for open education to enable new learning pathways, who can access them, how, and where is likely to be profoundly limited. These limitations underscore that the flexibility of OER does not remove the technological, policy, and operational constraints that shape information access in prison settings.

⁵ Several prisons already contract with testing services that provide certified exam conditions for other existing standardized tests, such as the High School Equivalency Test, or HiSET, which made this interviewee optimistic that similar arrangements could be reached to establish a certified testing site for [CLEP](#) exams.

Challenges of using OER in prison settings

Prison infrastructure shapes the design and delivery of educational materials

While OER offer flexibility and adaptability, their use in prison education depends on designing materials that can function within restricted technological environments. Throughout interviews, participants emphasized that poor or limited internet connectivity, institutional firewalls, and restrictions imposed by departments of corrections (DOC) on tablets and learning management systems present real challenges to education delivery. For example, many mentioned that even though tablets and learning management systems like Lantern or BrightSpace create opportunities for course delivery and communication with incarcerated students, they also introduce other constraints due to slow download speeds, limited bandwidth, and inconsistent connectivity. Multiple interviewees mentioned that these constraints make it difficult for students to access large PDF files.

Even where network connections are available and reliable, internet restrictions often prevent students from accessing embedded links and multimedia content if it is not proactively and preemptively added to DOC-approved lists. For example, interviewees noted that embedded hyperlinks within educational materials do not function if the linked websites are not on DOC-approved lists for access. Instructors then need to remove links, turn materials into static files, or seek approval for specific websites. Interviewees explained that these limitations can make born-digital OER challenging to adapt and integrate in some correctional contexts.

One interviewee also described how complex infrastructure challenges can shape course material selection, adaptation, and mode: for example, the “department has already provided open source textbooks, so the challenge then was how to get a fully digital textbook onto paper? But you can't bring paper into the facility and at that time [our program didn't have digital devices].” For these reasons, many interviewees explained that they have open education textbooks printed, sent through the prison

warehouse, and delivered inside. As multiple interviewees noted, property limits and facility fire codes, however, dictate how many books individuals can have at a given time. In some cases, students taking multiple courses with multiple texts may not be able to keep other books or supplemental learning materials. In other cases, educational resources are housed in classrooms or education wings, and student access is physically restricted.

The complexity of accessibility

In some cases, OER can potentially increase accessibility by allowing content reformatting and conversion; however, when providing access to digital educational materials it is important to ensure that they can be accessed by students with disabilities and, potentially, interfaced with by available adaptive technologies, making it a good idea to consult with accessibility experts and IT staff on campus and within prison facilities.

Security review processes extend course planning timelines

Although the details varied, interviewees described how the review procedures for educational content create logistical and temporal challenges. Many emphasized the challenges these extended approval timelines impose. As one explained, “if we want materials to be in the facility, we have to drop those materials off at the warehouse weeks ahead of our start date. And sometimes, depending on how our campus bookstore is working or, you know, how UPS handles orders, things fall through and we aren't able to get those sources in immediately and we have to band-aid it.” They went on to describe a failsafe procedure where education staff printed OER materials in small batches on an ad hoc basis, a compromise that not all educational programs would be fortunate enough to enact.

Operating at the intersection of two bureaucracies

Those looking to increase access to information and education inside must do so at the intersection of two large bureaucracies with different values and objectives: the higher education institution and the prison agency. Prison agencies define and determine surveillance and security needs, host and often provide digital infrastructure, and oversee the conditions in which technology is accessed and used: they will determine what data collection and surveillance procedures are necessary in dialogue with technology vendors and information access providers. When university resources are provided inside via a learning management system or secure link to campus digital infrastructure or resources, campus IT and cybersecurity staff will ultimately make their own security and risk assessments.

In the last decade, paper ban policies have proliferated across prison institutions throughout the United States. These policies have been adopted in many states as a security precaution in response to a sudden increase in the rate of drug overdoses among people who are incarcerated and related concerns about potential mailroom staff exposure to harmful substances. Related policies have further restricted how books might be sent into prisons.

For these reasons, those attempting to increase information and education access through open educational resources and practices will need to work closely and collaboratively with both their home institution and the department of corrections. In some cases, this process may be relatively straightforward and consist primarily in finding strong allies in university and prison leadership positions who may carry the work forward in tandem. In others, this may mean a longer and more involved process and may require working directly with campus and prison leadership, IT and cybersecurity, educators, librarians, technology vendors or providers, and other relevant stakeholders. The fact that procurement and vendor processes and timelines differ across these large organizations means that coordinating new services across them can be particularly challenging and protracted.

For OER practitioners, then, the most productive starting point is not selecting a resource but building relationships with colleagues who understand and operate within these systems.

Next steps: Collaborating with your colleagues in prison education

While relatively little research exists explicitly examining the intersection of higher education in prisons and OER and open practices, it is clear that increasing access to information and education in prison settings is aligned with the mission and values of the open education movement. And, while prison contexts provide additional, unique constraints to successful implementation of open education best practices, many of the core challenges to implementation will be familiar to open education experts and practitioners, even though the context may require novel solutions. While we have not gathered sufficient evidence to provide recommendations on best practices, below, we suggest some potential starting points for individuals or campuses interested in exploring the potential for open education in prison settings.

- **Start by speaking with and coordinating across stakeholders.** The first step is to get to know all the different people responsible for providing and ensuring access to information or educational resources in your school's prison education program. Getting information access and educational materials inside prisons regularly requires the consent and cooperation of prison administrators and staff, as well as program faculty and staff. Campus and, in some cases, prison librarians can also be particularly helpful if you are considering increasing or offering access to OER inside. Regardless of what resources you want to make available, you will need to think and speak across agencies and departments. If you are the open education expert in your department, unit, or campus, who are the prison education experts you can partner with?
- **Pilot programs and move at the speed of care and trust.** Administrators that have successfully rolled out OER across courses and programs recommended moving slowly and deliberately. They suggested taking a course-by-course pilot and beginning with courses that already have high-quality OER

available. They also suggested considering how you might provide multiple forms of access to the same content—such as print and digital copies—and where those will (and will not) be made available (i.e., housing unit, classroom, study hall, library, etc.).

- **Prepare for the labor costs.** Program administrators emphasized that rolling out new OER for a course or line of study requires a tremendous amount of planning and labor from educational faculty, and that such labor should be planned for and distributed accordingly. It should also be compensated—either with additional funding or course release—when possible, to acknowledge the time and labor involved.
- **Consider how to align educational materials across instructional settings.** The eligibility approval process for Prison Education Programs to receive students' Pell grant dollars requires that individuals who are incarcerated have “substantially similar” academic and career advising services as those available to students attending the same institution that are not incarcerated. Some of the individuals we spoke with saw OER as a way to ensure that course materials were not just comparable, but equitable across programs, regardless of campus location. They suggested that the customizability of OER allows programs to adjust content that might otherwise be banned from prisons, while maintaining the educational integrity of the course materials. How might you align educational content and access across different contexts?

Building connections between open education and prison education

Without doubt, prison education programs are already using open education content. And, from a small sample of exploratory conversations, we can see that OER deployment varies widely from site to site. Some individuals we spoke to described programs, like one run out of a community college in the Midwest, that take a coordinated approach and ensure that open and/or licensed educational content being used inside are used in the exact same curriculum and format as they are in courses outside prisons. Others—like a program coordinator in New England and a program administrator in the Midwest—told us that individual instructional faculty make all educational content decisions, including whether to assign OER, and that the program simply plays a procurement and delivery role. Many interviewees, across roles, expressed interest in providing OER and public domain or creative commons-licensed texts inside. They were also interested in providing supplemental educational resources or tools for autodidactic learning.

While we've learned much from this initial work, it has also raised important questions. How should we define success in using open education inside prison education programs? What OER is currently available to incarcerated learners, and under what conditions? How can we balance the tenets of providing free and open access to information and education with the security, surveillance, and content restrictions demanded in the name of security and safety in prison contexts? Further study should also examine how OER can be made accessible to incarcerated students with disabilities, particularly given the high rates of disability and limited access to assessment, documentation, and adaptive technologies among learners in prison settings.⁶

⁶ See Susan Dewey et al, "Higher Education in Prison: A Pilot Study of Approaches and Modes of Delivery in Eight Prison Administrations," *Journal of Correctional Education* 71, no. 1 (April 2020): 57-89, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26915042>.

Answering these questions will require stronger connections between the open education and higher education in prison communities. A community of practice at this intersection could support shared learning, identify common needs, develop resources tailored to prison education, and deepen understanding of the conditions under which OER can be used effectively and responsibly.

The opportunity is not simply to bring more open content into prisons. It is to work alongside prison education practitioners and incarcerated learners to determine where OER can meaningfully improve access, continuity, and educational opportunity—and where additional resources, infrastructure, or policy changes are needed. For OER practitioners interested in entering this space, the most important first step is to build relationships, listen to colleagues with experience in prison education, and approach the work with care.

Appendix A: Methods and scope

This report draws on a combination of desk research and interviews to better understand policies and practices within higher education in prison programs and departments of correction in selecting, reviewing, and delivering course materials. One of our core research questions was also to assess how open educational resources are used in prison settings and whether these types of resources can expand access and ease logistical and administrative constraints in delivering educational materials.

Landscape review

The team conducted a literature review to understand current research on open educational resources. Academic databases and relevant publications were examined to identify studies discussing the development, use, and impact of OER in educational contexts. We also reviewed whether existing research addressed the implementation of OER within correctional education settings. This work occurred concurrently with a scan of existing policy, the methods and results of which are detailed in the companion brief, “Open Education in Higher Education in Prison Programs: A Landscape Review of State Policies and Institutional Initiatives on Open Educational Resources and Their Potential Application in Carceral Settings.”

Interviews

To deepen this understanding, between February and March 2026, we interviewed 13 individuals. Interviews were drawn from a combination of MHEC and NEBHE member states and included departments of corrections (DOC) staff, higher education in prison program administrators and staff, and a librarian. We conducted one focus group of five individuals who all represented higher education in prison programs. The focus group participants represented two MHEC and two NEBHE member states. Additionally, we conducted eight individual interviews: seven from MHEC member states and one from a NEBHE member state.

Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and was conducted virtually via Webex. With the participants' permission, interviews were

recorded to support accuracy. The team also assured participants of the confidentiality of findings and that no names or identifying details would appear in the report. Interview protocols followed a flexible, semi-structured format and evolved over time. Analysis was conducted by reviewing notes and transcripts. Afterwards, we synthesized key themes and observations across interviews with particular attention to current opportunities and challenges in adapting OER in prison spaces.

Appendix B: Glossary

Open Educational Resources (OER). Information and learning materials that could be copyrighted but are in the public domain and licensed to make them freely available to use, customize, and distribute.

Open Educational Practices (OEP). Instructional and information practices that use open educational resources to promote learning that is flexible, collaborative, and driven by learners.

Ancillary materials. A variety of materials supplemental to textbooks, such as slides, quizzes or practice tests, etc. Also known simply as ancillaries.

Prison Education Program (PEP). Since the reinstatement of federal Pell grant funding for incarcerated learners in 2023, the term has become shorthand for Pell-eligible prison education programs.

Higher Education in Prison. An extremely broad term for college or university-level instruction taking place in prisons. May refer to postsecondary education programs, programs that offer degrees or college credits but have not gone through the Pell approval process, or noncredit courses offered inside by colleges or universities.

Pell. Shorthand for federal Pell grants, which are need-based financial awards provided by the Federal Student Aid organization, overseen by the US Department of Education.

Paper Ban. Colloquial term for policies, regulations, or procedures that restrict, or ban altogether, the distribution and circulation of paper materials in correctional facilities.

Media Review. A set of policies, regulations, procedures, and practices that determine what informational materials are allowed in correctional environments, in what form, through what means.

Education director. The individual in charge of supervising educational programming within a correctional agency (may be a formal title or a de facto role).

Correctional librarian. A specific role within a correctional agency or facility. Individuals may have broad duties related to information access, catalogs, purchasing, holdings, and/or instruction.