

Massachusetts Department of Correction
Correctional Industries
Program Participation and Recidivism
An Analysis on Incarcerated Individuals
Released in 2019

Calendar Year 2025



Executive Office of Public Safety and Security
January 2026

Maura T. Healey, Governor
Gina K. Kwon, Secretary of Public Safety and Security



Massachusetts Department of Correction
Correctional Industries
Program Participation and Recidivism
An Analysis on Incarcerated Individuals Released in 2019

Massachusetts Department of Correction
Shawn P. Jenkins, Commissioner
Hollie Matthews, Acting Executive Director of Strategic Planning & Research

Author: Research and Planning Division
Hollie Matthews, Acting Executive Director, Strategic Planning and Research
Jiqiang Rong, Statistician, Research and Planning Division
Benjamin Desrochers, Program Evaluation Manager, Research and Planning Division

For questions regarding this report, please contact the Research & Planning Division:

Research & Planning Division
50 Maple Street
Milford, MA 01757
Research@doc.state.ma.us

**This and other Massachusetts Department of Correction publications can be
accessed online at:**

<https://www.mass.gov/research-statistics-and-reports>

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	i
Table of Contents	ii
Executive Summary	1
Key Findings.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Methodology	3
Program Participants, Hours Worked and Payment Received	3
Program Participants and Associated Disciplinary Reports	7
Program Participants and Associated Recidivism.....	10
Program Participants vs. Non-Participants.....	12
Logistic Regression Model.....	13
Summary.....	15
Works Cited.....	16
Appendix.....	17

Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to discuss the Massachusetts Department of Correction (MADOC) incarcerated individuals' participation in Correctional Industries (CI), focusing on the areas of program participation and hours worked, compensation, employment, and disciplinary reports. Recidivism rates¹, based on a three-year follow-up of MADOC incarcerated individuals released during 2019 who participated in CI, are analyzed to see if reductions in recidivism were observed.² Regression analysis was performed to identify differences between the participants and non-participants based on key demographics.

Key Findings

- Less than 10% of incarcerated individuals released in 2019 participated in the CI program. About one-half of those individuals participated in the programs for less than six months.
- Incarcerated individuals who worked for two or more years made an average of \$7,052. In contrast, incarcerated individuals involved with the programs for less than six months made only \$182.
- Working in the CI programs for six months or more is associated with the reduced number of disciplinary reports (D-reports).³
- The incarcerated individuals who did not participate in the programs had the highest recidivism rate of 27%, which was reduced to 15% among incarcerated individuals involved in the programs for less than six months, and to 12% among incarcerated individuals who stayed with the programs for six or more months.

Introduction

Incarcerated individuals returning to the community after a period of incarceration typically face several difficult challenges upon release. Securing employment is one of the most important and difficult tasks for a formerly incarcerated individual to achieve (James, 2015). By obtaining a job that provides a living wage post-release, formerly incarcerated individuals are able to support themselves, build pro-social bonds and add structure to their lives that may help them desist from criminal behavior (Minnesota Department of Corrections, 2011). However, those who seek employment after release are often rejected due to their criminal history, and may lack the necessary education, work experience, or skills needed to maintain a long-term job, and may be barred from receiving occupational licensing depending on state law (Evans and Koenig, 2011; Wang and Bertman, 2022; Sibilla, 2020). A recent publication by the U.S. Justice Department found that one third of a cohort (n = 73,500) of incarcerated individuals released from federal prisons in 2010 did not find employment throughout the entire sixteen quarter follow up period. These

¹ The recidivism rate is calculated by dividing the number of incarcerated individuals reincarcerated by the number of incarcerated individuals in the release cohort.

² Pursuant to its own internal practices, MADOC employees are not permitted to contact incarcerated individuals after release, therefore the follow-up data on incarcerated individual's employment after releases is not included in this report.

³ D-reports used in this analysis include all closed guilty and plead guilty discipline reports that were sanctioned and occurred before the release date of an incarcerated individual.

findings highlight the difficulties that formerly incarcerated individuals face when searching for employment in the community (Carson *et al*, 2021).

Research shows the impact of prison industry programming on the lives of those formerly incarcerated. Many of these programs can provide incarcerated individuals with a necessary level of training and work experience prior to release. Industry programs have been shown to increase employment across many states and demographics and have also been able to show significant reductions in recidivism, in addition to the more direct economic benefits to the state. In turn, those savings can be reinvested into continued programming (Evans and Koenig, 2011; Harris and Goldman, 2014; Prell, 2006)

Results derived from an evaluation of the state of Washington's CI program found that CI program participants displayed statistically lower rates of recidivism, quicker employment times from release, and higher earnings by the end of the study's follow up period (Evans & Koenig, 2011). Similarly promising results were produced in an evaluation of Minnesota's EMPLOY program. 76% of incarcerated individuals who participated in this program secured meaningful employment within the first year post-release and worked, on average, 400 more hours, earning up to \$5,000 more than comparison groups. Not only did participants in this program have lower reconviction rates for new crimes, but they also showed a 17% less likely chance of reincarceration due to technical violations (Minnesota Department of Corrections, 2011). Likewise, recently released incarcerated individuals in Iowa's private sector prison industry programs were also more likely to succeed in transitioning into their respective communities. 80% of individuals who participated in this type of programming obtained employment in the first quarter post-release, while only 60% of the control group--those who did not participate in prison industry programming--obtained employment in the same time frame. By the end of the follow up period, which ranged between just under two years to four and one-half years depending on an incarcerated individual's release date, only 11% of those who participated in programming were unable to find meaningful employment. Of those who did participate and subsequently found employment, nearly half maintained their first job for one year post-release and earned between \$4,381 and \$5,620 more than the comparison group by the end of the follow-up period. In terms of reconviction, between 95.5% and 95.6% of participants of prison industry programming had not been reconvicted by the end of the follow up period (Smith *et al.*, 2006; Prell, 2006).

California's self-supporting program titled the California Prison Industry Authority (CALPIA) aims to achieve similar goals of lowering recidivism while providing integral work experience for the ex-incarcerated individual. This program has been optimized to provide the state more funding while providing a variety of goods and services that are sold in the private sector. CALPIA manages up to 57 manufacturing, service, and consumable factories across 25 California DOC facilities (Harris and Goldman, 2014). Between 2012 and 2013, CALPIA sold \$180.2 million in products and services. Purchases and sales combined gave CALPIA a total economic impact of \$375.4 million, a labor income impact of \$92.6 million and an employment impact of 1,913 jobs. CALPIA participants experienced reincarceration between 26% and 38% less often in the three years post-release than other released California incarcerated individuals who did not participate in such programming. Furthermore, those who participated in CALPIA and the Career Technical Education Program between FY 2007-08 and 2010-11 had a recidivism rate of 7.13% (Harris and Goldman, 2014). A more recent evaluation continues to show significantly lower rates of rearrest and reconviction for CALPIA participants when compared to control groups (Hess and Turner, 2021)

Correctional Industries at the Massachusetts Department of Correction

The mission of Correctional Industries (CI) at the MADOC is to foster a positive work ethic in incarcerated individuals by providing training and skills for a successful reentry into the community through work opportunities. With the acquired skills of on-the-job training and work ethics gained through CI, incarcerated individuals have a greater chance of being gainfully employed and succeeding after their release, thus reducing the possibility of recidivism.

MADOC CI employs approximately 340 incarcerated individuals at six institutions (See Appendix). It has served 255 state agencies and 1,525 non-state customers from July 1, 2023, through March 31, 2025. Eligibility for CI is determined by a Classification Board after receipt of a request by the individual. Its certification programs are offered to all eligible incarcerated individuals, where available. The Tablet Program continues to provide opportunities for valuable training in manufacturing processes, leading to certification where applicable. CI program participants are paid an average hourly stipend rate of \$1.07, ranging from \$0.49 to \$1.89 an hour.

Methodology

The analysis herein is based on the 2019 release to the community cohort and examines recidivism rates over a three-year follow-up period. The cohort includes criminally sentenced incarcerated individuals released to the community via parole or expiration of sentence. Areas examined include the number of program participants, the length of their participation, the amount of compensation, the difference in the number of disciplinary reports between program participants and non-participants, participants' demographics, and ultimately the relation between participation in the CI programs and recidivism. The data used in the analyses were derived from MADOC's Inmate Management System (IMS).

Recidivism data was gathered from the MADOC's IMS, Massachusetts Parole Board's SPIRIT Database, and the Massachusetts Board of Probation (BOP). Data was derived from the information available at the time of collection and is subject to change. The criminal activity of incarcerated individuals released to the community during 2019 was tracked through the Massachusetts Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) to determine any re-incarceration within three years of the incarcerated individual's release to the community.


An incarcerated individual can be re-incarcerated in one of the following ways: technical violation of parole; violation of parole with a new offense; new court commitment to a Massachusetts county, state, or federal facility; technical violation of probation; or probation violation with a new offense. The recidivism rate is calculated by dividing the number of re-incarcerations by the number of releases in a given category.

Program Participation, Hours Worked and Payment Received

The data shows that only a small portion (7%) of the 1,947 incarcerated individuals released in 2019 were enrolled in CI programs at some time during their incarceration. The overwhelming majority of these individuals did not participate in CI programs (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Size of Industries Program Participation


(N = 1,947)



Incarcerated individuals who participated in the CI programs were enrolled in the programs for an average of 430 days, measured from the first day of their first payroll week to the last day of their final payroll week before release. However, about one-half of the program participants (43%) took part in the programs for less than six months and another seventeen percent (17%) participated in the programs for six months to less than one year, resulting in three-fifths of participants remaining in the programs for less than 365 days (Figure 2).


Figure 2. Duration of Program Participation

(N = 137)




Payroll data confirmed that incarcerated individuals who remained with the CI program longer naturally worked more hours than those who did not participate in the program as long. As shown in Figure 3,


incarcerated individuals who participated in the programs for less than six months worked, on average, 191 hours while incarcerated individuals who joined the programs for two or more years worked an average of 6,821 hours each, or 36 times more hours than their counterparts with the shortest participation history.



When examining the average time worked per pay period, the large differences across categories of participation duration were reduced substantially. On average, incarcerated individuals in the two duration groups of six months to less than one year and one year to less than two years worked about the same number of hours per pay period, at 22.7 and 22.8 respectively. Incarcerated individuals in the shortest duration group worked an average of 20.1 hours per pay period, which was about 2.5 hours shorter than the two middle groups. In contrast, incarcerated individuals in the longest duration group worked the longest, 24.4 hours per pay period, which was about 1.5 hours longer than the two middle groups and 4 hours longer than the shortest duration group (Figure 4).




By the same token, incarcerated individuals who participated in the CI programs for a longer period earned more money than those who participated for a shorter duration. As shown in Figure 5, incarcerated individuals who worked for two or more years made an average of \$7,052. In contrast, incarcerated individuals involved with the programs for less than six months earned only \$182. For incarcerated individuals that fell in the two middle categories, the total average payment they received also fell between the two ends of the spectrum. On average, CI program participants were paid an hourly rate of \$0.95, ranging from \$0.40 to \$1.40 an hour.




Program Participation and Its Association with Disciplinary Reports (D-reports)


Of the incarcerated individuals released in 2019, about 60% had at least one D-report during the time they were incarcerated before release. There was no difference in this regard between incarcerated individuals who took part in the CI programs (59.1%) and those who did not participate in the programs (59.2%) (Figure 6).



On average, incarcerated individuals who participated in the CI programs received 3.4 D-reports during the time they were incarcerated before their release in 2019, about the same as the 3.6 D-reports received by the non-program participants. Since the total number of D-reports tends to grow with the length of incarceration, the average number of D-reports received per year revealed that program participants received 0.6 D-reports per year, lower than 1.1 D-reports that non-program participants received per year. Participation in the CI programs appeared to reduce the number of D-reports that an incarcerated individual received on a yearly basis (Figure 7).




Across the durations of program participation, incarcerated individuals in the two longest duration categories or who participated in the CI program for one or more years had fewer D-reports than their shorter duration counterparts measured in both the total number of D-reports and the average number of D-reports per year. The differences revealed that working in the CI programs for one or more years is associated with the reduced number of D-reports (Figure 8).




The number of D-reports reported in Figure 8 covers the entire time in which an individual was incarcerated. Figures 9 and 10 look at these numbers in two separate time periods: the time before program participation, and the time since program participation before release. As shown in Figure 9, incarcerated individuals in

the less than six months group (0.8, 0.2) and the six months to less than one-year group (2.1, 0.7) had higher total number of D-reports and higher average number of D-reports per year than their longer duration counterparts, those who participated in the programs for one year to less than two years (0.1, <0.1) and for two or more years (0.0, 0.0).



Compared with the number of D-reports that incarcerated individuals received before they joined the CI programs, participation in the programs for six months or more appeared to reduce the number of D-reports received. The average total number of D-reports decreased from 4.3 in the shortest duration group to less than 2 in the three longer duration categories. The average number of D-reports per year also dropped from 1 in the shortest duration group to 0.3 or less in the other three groups. This confirms that participation in the CI program for six months or more is associated with a reduced number of D-reports in total and per year (Figure 10).




In summary, participation in the CI programs did not appear to lower the number of D-reports that incarcerated individuals received when compared with non-participation group. However, staying with the programs for six months or more is associated with a reduced number of D-reports both in total and per year.

Program Participation and Its Association with Recidivism

A look into the relation between the length of program participation and recidivism reveals little difference between the rate of recidivism and program participation duration. The incarcerated individuals who participated in the programs ranging from six months to less than one year had the highest recidivism rate of 17%, which was reduced marginally to 15% among incarcerated individuals who stayed with the programs for less than six months and to 9% for incarcerated individuals who were involved in the programs for one or more years. However, the differences were not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level⁴ and hence duration of program participation had little impact on the rate of recidivism (Figure 11).


⁴ Statistical significance refers to whether any differences observed between groups being studied are “real” or due to chance. In most sciences, results yielding a p-value of .05 or 95% confidence level are on the borderline of statistical significance. At this level or higher, we would conclude that the differences observed between groups are not due to chance.

Figure 11. Recidivism by Duration of Program Participation



Combining the above three length categories into two categories along the six-month line and comparing the data with that of non-participating individuals reveals that enrollment in the programs was associated with reduced rate of recidivism. Compared with the recidivism rate (27%) of incarcerated individuals who were not enrolled in the programs, the rate of recidivism was lower among incarcerated individuals who participated in the programs for less than six months (15%), and for six or more months (12%). The differences were statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (Figure 12).

Figure 12. Recidivism by Program Participation



Program Participants vs. Non-Participants

An investigation revealed that the key demographics of incarcerated individuals participating in the programs were statistically different from the same demographics of those individuals not participating in the programs in terms of governing offense category, post-release supervision, age at release, general recidivism risk score, and time served in prison. There was no statistical difference between participating and non-participating individuals in relation to the demographics of gender, race/ethnicity, mandatory sentence, and release institution security level.

Incarcerated individuals who worked less than a half year or a half year or more were more likely to be in the violent (person and sex offenses) as opposed to non-violent (drug, property, and other offenses) category, and more likely to be subject to post-release supervision (parole only or parole and probation) than individuals who did not participate in the programs. They were also more likely to be older than non-participants at the time of release, had a lower recidivism risk score, and served longer time in prison (Figure 13).

Figure 13. Participation in Correctional Industries Programs by Key Demographics

Variable Name	Category	Not Worked	Worked Less Than Half-a-Year	Worked Half-a-Year or More	Count
Gender	Male	92.6%	3.3%	4.1%	1,576
	Female	94.6%	1.9%	3.5%	371
Race/Ethnicity	White	93.3%	2.7%	4.0%	939
	Black or African American	93.0%	3.7%	3.3%	457
	Hispanic	93.2%	2.9%	3.9%	515
	Other	80.6%	5.6%	13.9%	36
Mandatory Sentence	Yes	93.0%	3.1%	3.9%	458
	No	92.9%	3.0%	4.0%	1,489
Governing Offense Category **	Non_violent	96.1%	2.4%	1.5%	1,050
	Violent	89.3%	3.8%	6.9%	897
Release Institution Security Level	Maximum	94.9%	2.9%	2.2%	272
	Medium	93.4%	2.6%	3.9%	946
	Minimum	91.8%	2.9%	5.3%	449
	Pre-Release/ELMO	91.4%	4.6%	3.9%	280
Post-release Supervision*	No supervision	94.7%	2.7%	2.6%	771
	Parole & Probation	88.8%	5.9%	5.3%	187
	Parole Only	92.3%	2.2%	5.6%	324
	Probation Only	92.5%	3.0%	4.5%	665
Age at Release **	Mean Age	38.7	41.6	49.5	1,947
General Recidivism Risk Score **	Mean Risk Score	6.31	5.59	4.05	1,803
Time Served **	Mean Number of Days	1,274	2,153	3,794	1,947

* denotes $p < .05$, ** denotes $p < .01$

Given the demographic differences among the three categories of program involvement recognized above, a logistic regression analysis was performed to determine whether these variables had stronger influences on recidivism than program participation.

Logistic Regression Model

The ten predictor variables in the logistic regression analysis included seven binary variables and three continuous variables. The binary variables were program participation, gender, race/ethnicity, mandatory sentence, governing offense category, release institution security level, and post-release supervision. The continuous variables were age at release, general risk score, and time served.

- Program participation was measured using two binary indicators of whether an incarcerated individual worked for less than six months (3.0%) or for six months or more (4.0%); incarcerated individuals who did not participate in the programs served as the reference group (93%).
- Gender was measured using a binary indicator of whether an incarcerated individual was male (80.9%); females served as the reference group (19.1%).
- Race/ethnicity was measured using three binary indicators of Black or African American (23.5%), Hispanic (26.5%) and other races (1.8%). White was in the reference group (48.2%).
- Mandatory sentence was measured using a binary indicator of whether the Massachusetts General Law governing an incarcerated individual's governing offense contains a mandatory restriction (23.5%); those not having a governing offense containing a mandatory restriction served as the reference group (76.5%).
- The Governing offense category was measured using a binary indicator of whether an incarcerated individual committed a violent governing offense (46.1%); non-violent governing offense served as the reference group (53.9%).
- Release institution security level was measured using three binary indicators: medium security level (48.5%), minimum security level (23.1%), and pre-release/Electronic Monitoring (ELMO) (14.4%); maximum security level served as the reference group (14.0%).
- Post-release supervision was measured using three binary indicators of whether an incarcerated individual was placed under post-release supervision of parole and probation (9.6%), parole only (16.6%) or probation only (34.2%); no post-release supervision served as the reference group (39.6%).
- Age at release was a continuous variable that measured the age of an incarcerated individual at the time of release. Incarcerated individuals in this study had an average age of 39.2 when they were released from prison, ranging from age 20 to 84.
- General risk score, another continuous variable, was a measure of incarcerated individuals' recidivism risk based on the COMPAS Risk Assessment⁵. On average, incarcerated individuals under analysis had a risk score of 6.2, ranging from a score of 1, the lowest risk, to a score of 10, the highest risk score.
- Time served was a continuous variable that measured the number of days an incarcerated individual stayed in MADOC custody plus jail credits received prior to sentencing. Incarcerated individuals released in 2019 served an average of 1,402 days prior to their release, ranging from 1 to 18,588 days.

A simple logistic regression model that tested the impact of CI work participation on recidivism confirmed the findings shown in Figure 12. Compared with the incarcerated individuals who did not take part in the

⁵ COMPAS: Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions is an automated risk/needs assessment tool utilized to inform the development of an incarcerated individual's personalized program plan. COMPAS has been normed and validated to the Massachusetts Department of Correction population.

CI programs, participation in the programs for less than six months and for six months or more would reduce the odds of recidivism by a factor of 0.496 and 0.359 respectively. The reduction was statistically significant at the 95% confidence level for the six months or more group and very close to statistically significant for the less than six months group (Figure 14).

Figure 14. Impact of Program Participation on Three-Year Recidivism (N=1,947)			
Variable Name	Coefficient (B)	Odds Ratio Exp (B)	Significance (p)
Worked Less Than Six Months	-0.701	0.496	0.055
Worked Six Months Or More **	-1.023	0.359	0.004

* denotes $p < .05$, ** denotes $p < .01$

The impact of program participation on recidivism remained largely intact. Incarcerated individuals who worked in the programs for less than six months and for six months or more when other predictor variables were introduced into the model could reduce the odds of recidivism by a factor of 0.580 and 0.494 respectively. However, neither effect is statistically significant (Figure 15).

Figure 15. Impact of Correctional Industries Programs on Three-Year Recidivism (N=1,803)			
Variable Name	Coefficient (B)	Odds Ratio Exp (B)	Significance (p)
Worked Less Than Six Months	-0.544	0.58	0.161
Worked Six Months Or More	-0.706	0.494	0.098
Gender	0.117	1.124	0.551
Race/Ethnicity: Black or African American	-0.077	0.926	0.606
Race/Ethnicity: Hispanic	-0.221	0.801	0.14
Race/Ethnicity: Other	-0.266	0.767	0.587
Mandatory Sentence	-0.135	0.874	0.427
Offense Category	0.117	1.125	0.41
Release Security Level: Medium	-0.16	0.852	0.326
Release Security Level: Minimum **	-0.784	0.457	<.001
Release Security Level: Pre-release/ELMO **	-0.98	0.375	<.001
Supervision: Parole & Probation **	1.344	3.834	<.001
Supervision: Parole Only **	1.71	5.531	<.001
Supervision: Probation Only **	0.844	2.326	<.001
General Recidivism Risk Score **	0.19	1.209	<.001
Time Served	0	1	0.275
Age at Release **	-0.026	0.974	<.001

* denotes $p < .05$, ** denotes $p < .01$

On the other hand, release institution security level, post-release supervision, general recidivism risk score, and age at release had statistically significant impacts on recidivism. Compared with incarcerated individuals with no post-release supervision, supervision by parole and probation, parole only, and probation only increased the odds of recidivism by a factor of 3.834, 5.531 and 2.326 respectively. As the risk score increased from low to high, the odds of recidivism increased by a factor of 1.209. In contrast, compared with incarcerated individuals released from maximum security institutions, incarcerated individuals released from minimum and pre-release/ELMO security institutions would decrease the odds of recidivism by a factor of 0.457 and 0.375 correspondingly. Furthermore, as the age of the incarcerated individuals increased, the odds of recidivism would decrease by a small factor of 0.974.

Gender, race/ethnicity, mandatory sentence, offence category, and time served appeared to have no statistically significant impacts on the rate of recidivism.

Summary

Less than 10% of incarcerated individuals released in 2019 participated in CI programs. On average, they were enrolled in the programs for 430 days with about one-half remaining in the programs for less than six months. Incarcerated individuals who stayed with the programs longer worked more hours and earned more money during the time they were with the programs than the incarcerated individuals who were not with the programs as long. On average, they also worked more hours per pay period than their shorter-participating counterparts.

Participation in the CI programs for six months or more was associated with a reduced number of D-reports. Support for this association was found with both a reduced number of total D-reports and a reduction in the average number of D-reports per year that an incarcerated individual received during the time they were enrolled in the programs before release.

Participation in the CI programs was associated with a lower rate of recidivism in bivariate analysis. Such associations did not pass statistical testing when other predictor variables were introduced into the model. On the other hand, our analyses on the 2015 to 2019 release cohorts revealed that other variables, such as general recidivism risk score (2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019), age at release (2015, 2018, 2019), post-release supervision (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019), release institution security level (2016, 2017, 2018, 2019) and mandatory sentence (2016, 2017, 2018) had stronger influences on the rate of recidivism than participation in CI programs.

Works Cited

- Carson, A., Sandler, D. H., Bhaskar, R., Fernandez, L. E., & Porter, S. R. (2021, December). *Employment of persons released from Federal Prison in 2010*. Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics - Special Report. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/eprfp10.pdf>
- Evans, M., & Koenig, S., Does Participation in Washington's Correctional Industries Increase Employment and Reduce Recidivism? (2011). Washington State Department of Corrections. Retrieved from <https://www.doc.wa.gov/docs/publications/reports/200-SR003.pdf>.
- Harris, T. R., & Goldman, G., California Prison Industry Authority's Economic Impact on California Fiscal Year 2012-2013 (2014). California Prison Industry Authority. Retrieved from https://www.calpia.ca.gov/wpcontent/uploads/calpia/news/Reports_and_Publications/Economic%20Impact%20Report%202012-13.pdf.
- Hess, J., & Turner, S. F., CALIFORNIA PRISON INDUSTRY AUTHORITY, The Effect of Prison Industry on Recidivism: An Evaluation of California Prison Industry Authority (CALPIA) (2021). California Prison Industry Board. Retrieved April 4, 2024, from https://www.calpia.ca.gov/wpcontent/uploads/calpia/news/Reports_and_Publications/The%20Effect%20of%20Prison%20Industry%20on%20Recidivism-V2-PIA.pdf.
- James, N., Offender Reentry: Correctional Statistics, Reintegration into the Community, and Recidivism (2015). Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/RL/RL34287/25>.
- Minnesota Department of Correction, AN OUTCOME EVALUATION OF MINNCOR'S EMPLOY PROGRAM (2011). Retrieved from https://mn.gov/doc/assets/0311EMPLOYEvaluation_tcm1089-272766.pdf.
- Prell, L., Iowa Private Sector Prison Employment Works (2006). Iowa Department of Corrections. Retrieved from <http://publications.iowa.gov/13108/1/ICONDataDownloadIssue2-IowaPrivateSectorPrisonEmploymentWorks.pdf>.
- Sibilla, N. (2020, August). *Barred from working - A Nationwide Study of Occupational Licensing Barriers for Ex-Offenders*. report/barred-from-working. <https://ij.org/report/barred-from-working/>
- Smith, C. J., Bechtel, J., Patrick, A., Smith, R. R., & Wilson-Gentry, L. (2006, May 1). *Correctional Industries preparing incarcerated individuals for reentry: Recidivism & Post-release employment*. National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/correctional-industries-preparing-incarcerated-individuals-reentry-recidivism-post-release>.
- Wang, L., & Bertram, W. (2022, February 8). New Data on formerly Incarcerated People's employment reveal labor market injustices. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/blog/2022/02/08/employment/>

Appendix

Massachusetts Correctional Industries Programs

FACILITY NAME	CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIALS PROGRAM SPECIFICATION
NORTH CENTRAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION (NCCI-GARDNER)	MassCor's Optical Shop is a full-scale eyewear manufacturing laboratory, providing services to many optical providers throughout Massachusetts. Using state-of-the-art technology and equipment, the lab produces high-quality eyewear and services. Incarcerated individuals working at this site are properly trained to operate our advanced equipment. Industrial instructors at NCCI-Gardner facilitate the process of recertifying incarcerated individuals working in the Optical Shop with the American Board of Optometry, a nationally recognized organization, so that their certification stays current. This will allow them to show valuable qualifications and a work history to potential employers.
MCI SHIRLEY	In the Sew Shop at MCI Shirley, incarcerated individuals learn how to sew by producing sheets, towels, t-shirts and socks. In addition, they learn valuable skills that are related to various employment opportunities in the sewing/textile industry. The Sew Shop also manufactures cemetery flags which are in high demand. MCI Shirley also offers a woodshop program where incarcerated individuals learn to build various types of wood furniture including desks, lockers, bookcases, kitchen cabinets, outdoor furniture, and credenzas. Participating incarcerated individuals are trained on current, state-of-the-art equipment including CNC (Computer Numerical Control) machines. A laser engraving site can also be found at this location. Here, incarcerated individuals design and create such items as coasters, memorial plaques, wooden cutting boards and signs. They learn the latest technology in software design and machine work. It should be noted that with the closing of the institution in Concord, all viable equipment from those shops was relocated to the Shirley Woodshop.
MCI FRAMINGHAM	The Flag Shop at MCI Framingham currently manufactures United States, Commonwealth of Massachusetts and POW/MIA flags as well as laundry bags. Here, incarcerated individuals learn valuable skills that are related to various employment opportunities in the specialty sewing and manufacturing industry. Incarcerated individuals within MCI Framingham's Embroidery Shop embroider caps, jackets, t-shirts, and many other apparel items utilizing current software applications and embroidery equipment.
OLD COLONY CORRECTIONAL CENTER	Printing is the trade that incarcerated individuals learn at Old Colony Correctional Center's state-of-the-art Print Shop. Incarcerated individuals working in the Print Shop use the latest technology to produce a large variety of quality products and therefore also gain valuable skills which are easily transferable to private industry. Products offered include letterhead, continuous forms, city and town reports, and business cards. There is also a Validation Shop that produces Registry of Motor Vehicle stickers and decals.

MCI NORFOLK	MCI Norfolk houses numerous shops, allowing incarcerated individuals to work in a wide range of manufacturing settings. The Metal Shop manufactures custom-fabricated metal products such as benches, trash receptacles and picnic tables for cities, towns and state agencies as well as for our institutions. They also make modifications to our institutions as needed. We recently added an in-house powder coating operation which provides incarcerated individuals with additional skills while adding a quality finish to manufactured metal products. We have made significant investments in our machinery and equipment in the Metal Shop. While these increase capacity and improve quality and production of metal products, the new machinery and equipment were added with worker safety as the priority. Also, in collaboration with our Work Force Development Group, MassCor, along with Mastercam, held its first Mastercam training certification class at MCI Norfolk. In the License Plate Shop, formerly located at MCI Cedar Junction, incarcerated individuals produce license plates in accordance with requirements set forth by the Registry of Motor Vehicles. In the Clothing Shop, fabric is cut from rolls and sewn to create garments used in a number of areas throughout the Commonwealth. Blankets used throughout the MADOC are manufactured here as well. The Mattress Shop produces a variety of mattresses used in shelters, colleges and universities, jails and prisons, and local police and fire departments. The Upholstery Shop produces quality upholstered furniture, such as chairs and sofas, for both public entities such as libraries, hospitals and nursing homes, and private customers as well. Major reupholstery projects include several high school auditoriums and reupholstering seats for our very own Boston Red Sox at Fenway Park. The Binder Shop produces products integral to the MassCor product line and employee office needs such as vinyl binders and padfolios. Lastly, the Furniture Assembly Shop assembles various furniture items, most commonly, office chairs, from a number of outstanding furniture providers.
MASSACHUSETTS TREATMENT CENTER	The Massachusetts Treatment Center houses the Silkscreen and Sign shops. Incarcerated individuals working in the Sign Shop manufacture a variety of standard street signs that are used on many roadways within the Commonwealth, in addition to wall-mounted signs for indoor and outdoor use and signs posted at parks, beaches, and other recreational areas. Incarcerated individuals in the Silkscreen Shop produce high-quality custom decals for a variety of uses such as cornhole boards, silk-screened clothing and many other applications. These products continue to be in high demand and we can offer them at a fair value.