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FOREWORD

This Issue is based on the 2013 National Conference on Prison Higher Education hosted by the St. Louis University (SLU) Prison Program. The focus of the conference was “Building and Sustaining Programs” for higher education in prisons, which is directly on-point with the mission of the St. Louis University Public Law Review. As a law review, we aim to serve as an open forum for discussing issues of public interest and public policy through a lens broader than that of just a legal academic; we strive to appeal to a collection of academics, practitioners, government officials, civic leaders, business leaders, and students. It is through this broader lens that we are able to truly capture perspectives and insight from all who play a part in formulating the solutions to today’s issues in public policy. In an attempt to narrow our focus to provide a more direct answer to these policy questions, this Issue serves as a platform for academic and correctional institutions to directly address the problems outlined by the Prison Program’s conference.

The 1994 Omnibus Crime Bill eliminated Pell Grant eligibility for millions of incarcerated men and women, leaving them without the opportunity to attain postsecondary education. As a result, prisons and prison educators throughout the country had the significant challenge of developing higher education systems in prisons during a time of diminishing prison funding and high levels of incarceration. St. Louis University, among other academic institutions, stepped up to the challenge.

This Issue discusses how St. Louis University and other institutions have developed programs that are allowing incarcerated men and women to earn an education and improve their lives. By taking in perspectives and insight from previous prison educators, program directors, and librarians, this Issue serves as a model for how to build, operate, and sustain these programs—with benefits not only for the prisoners, but also for the educators and facilitators themselves. Additionally, this Issue offers the unique perspectives from those who have built the programs from the ground up, a student who has participated in the SLU Prison Program, and even from the perspective of the Missouri Director of Corrections George Lombardi. Overwhelmingly, the programs that have developed have correlated into lower recidivism rates, safer and more socially equal prisons, and personal growth in prisoners and educators.

Three Public Law Review members also contributed to this Issue, providing intriguing and thought-provoking articles. First, former staff member
Clay Counts’s comment discusses the relationship between the Contract Clause and the Takings Clause in the potential taking of contractual debt by the government. Assistant Notes and Comments Editor Alexandra Wells then provides a novel article on the constitutional and evidentiary issues surrounding the admissibility of historical cell site data from phone records at trial. And finally, Rohini Roy, a Public Law Review Articles Editor, provides a thorough analysis of the Second Circuit’s holding in Christian Louboutin S.A. v. Yves Saint Laurent America Holding, Inc., and its rippling effects in trademark law and the fashion industry. We’d like to thank all three of them for their contributions and their dedication throughout the editing process.

The Public Law Review would like to give a special thank you to SpearIt and Professor Mary Gould for their support and collaboration in putting this Issue together, as well as Professor Anders Walker for his continued advisement throughout the publishing process. We also would like to thank all of the contributors for their hard work and intriguing insight into prison education. Moving from a general issue to a specific area of public interest has allowed us to further our mission, but also to provide an issue that is far overdue. It has been an honor and privilege to partake in the publishing of a topic so direly needed in the academic and correctional fields. Further, we would like to thank the SLU Prison Program for allowing us such an honor.

Finally, we owe a final thank you to Susie Lee, the Public Law Review Coordinator, and her assistant, Theresa Campbell. They have both been an enormous help throughout the publishing process of not just this Issue, but also all of Volume 33. Without their help, the completion and success of this Issue simply would not have been possible.