



Federal Probation

Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process Probation Division, Administrative Office of the United States Courts

Strategies for Working With Special-Needs Probationers Ellen C. Wertlieb, Martin A. Greenberg

Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector? Robert C. Grieser

of State Correctional Officials regarding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions Fred Holbert, Jack E. Call

Orientation of Prison Guards: Support Rehabilitation? Francis T. Cullen, Faith E. Lutze, Bruce G. Link, Nancy Travis Wolfe

NCJRS

MAY 15 1989

ACQUISITIONS

of Correctional Privatization: An Example of Failed Institutional Reform and for Modern Corrections Alexis M. Durham III

Michigan's Reformatory: A Example of Failed Institutional Reform Beverly A. Smith

Justice Abuse Program: A Private and Probationers and Prisoners Thomas F. Wit

of Juvenile Female Offenders Rose M. Thompson

117255
117263

MARCH 1989

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

117255-
117263

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

This Issue in Brief

Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process.—A community service sentence can serve many purposes—to deter, punish, or rehabilitate, while at the same time assuring that an offender receives a publicly discernable penalty. With increased interest in community service, many questions and issues have arisen regarding its use. This article, an excerpt from the monograph, *Community Service: A Guide for Sentencing and Implementation*, concentrates on the practical aspects of operating a community service program. Among the issues addressed are how to select appropriate agencies to receive community service; how to prepare the offender for community service; how to follow up after the offender is placed with an organization; and how to evaluate the success of a community service program. The information is especially directed to Federal probation officers but will also serve as a guide for other criminal justice and corrections professionals involved in sentencing and sentence implementation.

Strategies for Working With Special-Needs Probationers.—Authors Ellen C. Wertlieb and Martin A. Greenberg discuss the results of a survey of what alternatives to incarceration probation officers use with their disabled clients. Findings indicate a great deal of disparity regarding the approaches used within and across probation jurisdictions. All probation officers agreed, however, that they needed additional training to better serve their special-needs clients. The article concludes with some suggested strategies for improving service-delivery to probationers with disabilities.

Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector?—Correctional industries have been the subject of much attention and often unfavorable publicity over the past several years. Complaints have gotten stronger in recent months as prison industries nationally are seeking to expand to keep pace with rapidly rising prison populations. Author Robert C. Grieser responds to those com-

plaints by addressing some of the numerous myths about prison industries that exist on the part of many in the private sector. The author also suggests ways in which the private sector and prison industries can work together to the benefit of both.

The Perspective of State Correctional Officials on Prison Overcrowding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions.—Overcrowding continues to be a major problem facing prison administrators

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| [Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process | Probation Division, Administrative Office of the United States Courts | 117255 |
| [Strategies for Working with Special-Needs Probationers | Ellen C. Wertlieb Martin A. Greenberg | 117256 10 |
| [Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector? | Robert C. Grieser | 117257 18 |
| [The Perspective of State Correctional Officials on Prison Overcrowding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions | Fred Holbert Jack E. Call | 117257 25 |
| [The Correctional Orientation of Prison Guards: Do Officers Support Rehabilitation? | Francis T. Cullen Faith E. Lutze Bruce G. Link Nancy Travis Wolfe | 117259 33 |
| [Rehabilitation and Correctional Privatization: Observations on the 19th Century Experience and Implications for Modern Corrections | Alexis M. Durham III | 117260 43 |
| [Ireland's Ennis Inebriates' Reformatory: A 19th Century Example of Failed Institutional Reform | Beverly A. Smith | 117261 53 |
| [The Kentucky Substance Abuse Program: A Private Program to Treat Probationers and Parolees | Gennaro F. Vito | 117262 65 |
| [The Forgotten Few: Juvenile Female Offenders | Ilene R. Bergsmann | 117263 73 |
| Departments | | |
| News of the Future | | 79 |
| Looking at the Law | | 85 |
| Reviews of Professional Periodicals | | 89 |
| Your Bookshelf on Review | | 95 |
| Letter to the Editor | | 105 |
| It Has Come to Our Attention | | 106 |

Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector?

BY ROBERT C. GRIESER

Marketing Development Specialist, UNICOR Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

OVER THE past decade, correctional industries programs nationwide have grown considerably in an effort to keep inmates busy and keep pace with rising inmate populations. Correctional industries operate within a limited government market and are generally restricted by statute from placing an undue burden on the private sector and particularly small business.

Its Board of Directors shall provide employment for all physically fit inmates in the U.S. penal and correctional institutions, diversify, so far as practicable, prison industrial operations and so operate the prison shops that no single private industry shall be forced to bear an undue burden of competition from the products of the prison workshops, and to reduce to a minimum competition with private industry or free labor.¹

Notwithstanding, a number of small businesses and private industries have recently begun to voice their concern about the growth in correctional industry sales.

Given the fact that the pressures to expand the number of inmate jobs are expected to continue, legitimate questions are raised about the future of correctional industries and the impact that they may have on the private sector. One question that often arises is do correctional industries adversely impact on private sector business? A corollary question is, given the pressure to expand, what steps can correctional industries take to minimize any impact they may have on the private sector and, perhaps, work more closely with private industry to alleviate its concerns?

Historical Perspective

Work programs for inmates date back to the origin of the penitentiary system in America. Correctional

industries emerged in the early 1800's in an effort to have inmates repay their debt to society and reduce the cost of incarceration to the state. At that time, correctional industries were principally involved in limited operations, i.e., furniture and textiles. Today the past maxim "all they make is license plates" is no longer appropriate, with correctional industries nationwide approaching \$800 million in sales.² Correctional industries now provide a diverse range of products such as electronics cable assemblies for the military to ethenol fuel production and services such as travel reservations, telemarketing, and asbestos removal. Approximately 50,000 inmates, or 10 percent of the total prison population,³ are employed in the 50 states and the Federal system.

During its approximately 150-year history, correctional industries have come nearly full cycle in terms of their relationship with the private sector. At the turn of the century, when correctional industries were thriving, the private sector was integrally involved. At that time, many private sector firms contracted for the use of inmate labor to produce goods for sale on the open market. In the early 1900's, complaints of unfair competition began to surface, which led to the first of a series of market restrictions being placed upon correctional industries. In accordance with these restrictions, which culminated during the time of the Depression, correctional industries were to remain limited in their dealings with the private sector until interest in privatization resurfaced in the mid-1970's.⁴ While private sector involvement has now regained a foothold, the existing linkages with the private sector still remain limited.

While some private sector companies have openly pursued their interest in working jointly with correctional industries, numerous others remain opposed to the re-emergence of correctional industries. Increasing concern on the part of the private sector has led to recent efforts by some groups to oppose efforts by correctional industries aimed at enhancing their ability to meet increased demands to reduce

¹Title 18, U.S. Code, excerpt reprinted in UNICOR Federal Prison Industries, UNICOR Products Condensed Catalog, August 1987.

²Preliminary telephone research conducted by the Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Inc., to update the *Guidelines for Prison Industries* report for the National Institute of Corrections.

³Prisoners in 1986, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, May 1987.

⁴For a complete history on prison industry programs, see *Assets and Liabilities of Correctional Industries*, by Funke, Wayson, and Miller, Lexington Books, 1982.

idleness in ever expanding prison populations around the nation. Industry groups have been forming coalitions and have actively sought after opportunities to voice their concerns about correctional industries expansion.

Examples of these include the enactment of interstate highway sign legislation in 1987 which, with the intense lobbying support of the Traffic Safety and Sign Manufacturers Association, states that the future production of highway signs by correctional industries cannot exceed the dollar volume produced in 1986.⁵ Also the Federal legislation authorizing UNICOR to borrow requires establishment of a formal process of private sector notification and involvement in its new product and product expansion plans, in order to minimize potential adverse impact on private competition.⁶ More recently, the Business and Institutional Furniture Manufacturers Association (BIFMA) voted in new guidelines to exclude government agencies from its membership, effectively eliminating correctional industries. A recent article published in the wood manufacturers' trade journal⁷ outlines some of the private sector concerns about correctional industries.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this article is threefold: (1) to dispel some of the common misconceptions held by many in the private sector; (2) to show that correctional industries are both cognizant and sensitive to concerns of the private sector as they are being called upon to expand; and (3) to cite examples of ways in which the private sector and correctional industries can work together. While the article is based primarily on experience at UNICOR Federal Prison Industries (FPI), recent experience and discussions with a number of state industry directors would suggest that many of the points made are applicable to state correctional industries. In terms of size, UNICOR recorded over \$300 million in sales in Fiscal Year 1987 and employs nearly 15,000 inmates.⁸ This represents more than one-third of the total business of correctional industries nationally.

Facts About Correctional Industries

There are several facts that must be clearly stated to provide an understanding of the current status of correctional industries. First of all, for better or for worse, correctional industries are here to stay. They have become an integral part of corrections management and programming, and it is safe to say that the corrections system could no longer be operated safely and effectively without them.

Perhaps the most well-known facet of correctional industries is the market limitation imposed upon the sale of their products. The market limitations imposed upon industries have two aspects. In most states, correctional industries can only sell to government markets; in many states, as well as in the Federal system, it is required by law that the government consider correctional industries first. In other words, customers must purchase from FPI when FPI produces a product that meets their need, can deliver on time, and be price competitive. When one or all of these three conditions are not met, FPI will waive the order. (Note that FPI is not a mandatory source for service industries.)

Correctional industries, while still a critical prison program, are, of necessity, beginning to be managed more like a business. This shift, which began in the late 1970's, stems primarily from two factors. First is the influence of the private sector on various aspects of public functions including corrections. Emulation of the private sector has led to professionalization and improved management of many aspects of corrections, including industries. Second, has been the skyrocketing prison populations, which have placed demands upon correctional industries to create more jobs for inmates. With the expansion of correctional industries came the need to operate these programs akin to a private sector business.

Given the continued increase anticipated in prison populations,⁹ correctional industries will continue to come under increasing pressure to expand their operations. In many respects, in the field of corrections, correctional industries have become "all things to all people." The reasons for this are many. To the general public, correctional industries mean putting inmates to hard work to repay their debt to society; to legislators, correctional industries mean a no-cost program which saves the state money; to correctional administrators, correctional industries have the management appeal of reducing idleness among inmates; and finally, to advocates of rehabilitation, championed by former Chief Justice Warren Burger, correctional industries mean providing inmates with

⁵Title 23, U.S. Code, Section 114B.

⁶Amendment to the Omnibus Anti-Substance Abuse Act of 1988.

⁷Prisons Locking Onto Wood Products Manufacturing, *Wood & Wood Products*, July 1988.

⁸UNICOR 1987 Annual Report.

⁹U.S. Bureau of Prisons, *State of the Bureau of Prisons*, January 1988.

useful skills they can use to reenter society as productive citizens.¹⁰

Myths and Realities

There are a number of common misconceptions about correctional industries on the part of various persons and entities in the private sector and the general public. Perhaps foremost among these is that correctional industries compete unfairly with the private sector due to their cheap labor pool. As those familiar with correctional industries know, inmates are typically paid only a token wage, called a gratuity, which averages approximately 50 cents per hour. Yet there are a number of hidden factors (several of which are described below) to operate an industry within a correctional facility that often make the cost of inmate labor higher than that of a free world factory worker.

A second myth that many outside of the corrections arena still have is that the quality of prison-made products is poor. While this was often true in the past, when industries were run like "mom and pop" shops, the past decade has seen dramatic changes in the quality of inmate products. As a result, the current products of correctional industries typically equal and often surpass those produced in the private sector.

Another common myth about correctional industries is that they exert pressure to enforce the mandatory-use law provisions. Once again while this was the case in the past, when quality was poor, the onset of business-run operations in correctional industries has brought with it a whole new modus operandi or philosophy of serving its customers. While the mandatory-use laws are still in effect, most of the more progressive industrial programs around the nation now attempt to sell their products with the theme of "wanting" to buy from them rather than "having" to buy from them. The emphasis on producing a quality product comparable to that available from the private sector has brought about this change.

Recent research into the number of "waivers" or clearance requests received from agencies seeking exemption from buying from Federal Prison Industries supports this point. Based upon waivers received during Fiscal Year 1988, the data show the potential sales volume cleared represents only a frac-

tion of the total Federal government purchases in these product areas.

A fourth myth is that correctional industries capture an adverse share of the market from the private sector. Recent data assembled by UNICOR demonstrate that Federal Prison Industries has only .16 percent of the total Federal market for goods and services. To place this figure in perspective, it should be emphasized that government is the only vehicle in which correctional industries can sell their products. If the overall private sector market were included in these figures, the share would shrink to less than one-one hundredth of a percent. The State of New York recently completed a similar study yielding very similar results, i.e., that correctional industries' share of the state-use market was between 1 and 2 percent.¹¹

Operating Constraints of Correctional Industries

As indicated above, there are a number of reasons why it is inappropriate to say that correctional industries have an unfair labor advantage over private industries. Included among these reasons are:

- Security Issues
- Unskilled Workforce
- Inmate "Featherbedding"
- Inmate Turnover
- Inefficient Equipment
- Capital Investment Constraints
- Need to Diversify
- Procurement Constraints

Security Issues. First of all, the reader who is not familiar with corrections must keep in mind that the paramount concern in any correctional industry program will always be security. As a result, even though correctional industries try to emulate a private sector operation, a number of security issues may arise which make that difficult, if not impossible. Foremost, custodial requirements dictate a higher supervisory to worker ratio than in the private sector, which translates directly into a higher operating cost.

Related issues range from special considerations about tool control, the time it takes to implement inmate count procedures, periodic "callouts" from the job which occur for other institutional needs, and occasional "lockdowns" in which the factory must be down since all inmates have to be back in their cells until further notice. Furthermore, there are occasions where the facility warden will instruct industry staff or inmates to divert from their normal duties in the factory to fulfill some special institutional

¹⁰For a further discussion on this subject, see article on the "Goals of Correctional Industries," published in *A Study of Prison Industry: History, Components, and Goals*, American Correctional Association, January 1986.

¹¹The Economic Impact of Corcraft Correctional Industries in New York State, by Robert C. Grieser, Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Inc., March 1988.

need. Most if not all of these costs, from the salaries of correctional officers where needed, to the cost of production time lost as a result of the examples described, are typically borne by correctional industries.

The net impact of these security considerations described is the loss of work hours. Even under the best of circumstances, correctional industries consider a full workday to be 7 hours and more typically must manage with a 6 to 6½ hour workday. Here again, the shorter day has an adverse impact on efficiency and, hence, the cost of production.

Unskilled Workforce. Another factor that is unique to correctional industries involves the characteristics of the inmate workforce. The inmate worker is typically unskilled with little if any prior work experience. In addition, the inmate workforce is often unmotivated making it difficult to expect the same level of production as that of a free world employee. Thus the training time required is longer.

"Featherbedding." Another operational constraint which negatively affects correctional industries' profitability is the implicit and often explicit demand by correctional administrators for "featherbedding," i.e., the intentional overemployment of inmates. Featherbedding is accepted since it represents a means for reducing inmate idleness in crowded correctional facilities. While correctional industries have been moving away from featherbedding as they attempt to operate more businesslike, a certain amount of it still exists.

Inmate Turnover. To compound these workforce problems, there is often a very high turnover among correctional industries workers. There are several reasons for the turnover, including release of inmates back into the community and, more commonly, transfers to another correctional facility, due to a security classification change, a disciplinary problem that may arise, or the need for an additional bed or program slot in the system as a result of prison crowding. Whatever the reason may be, turnover in the inmate workforce translates directly into a higher operating cost.

Along similar lines, yet on a much broader scale, correctional industries are periodically affected by facility mission changes that are made to accommodate changing inmate populations. A facility mission change requiring a reclassification in security levels can often lead to a plant's closing or moving a particular industry from one location to another.

Inefficient Equipment. Another issue that may be overlooked in making charges of unfair competition is that correctional industries often operate with an-

tiquated equipment on the production line. While this has changed somewhat over the past several years, a number of correctional industry factories have opted to use slower, suboptimal equipment in production in order to maximize the employment of inmates. The labor intensive nature of many correctional industries, however, makes it difficult to price competitively on some items that are produced using automated equipment in the private sector.

Investment Constraints. For the most part, correctional industries can accumulate little retained earnings with which to reinvest in new products, equipment modernization, and other capital expansion projects. This is because earnings are often used for offsetting other costs of incarceration, including an inmate's vocational training, education, and other institutional expenses. Moreover, a number of states have imposed limits on their earnings from correctional industries, above which monies must return to the state general fund.

Need to Diversify. Correctional industries' continuing sensitivity to minimizing impact on the private sector by not taking too large of a market share in any one particular product area has led to their continuing efforts to diversify. The fact that correctional industries provide products and services in many different areas, rather than specializing in any one particular area, detracts from the ability to achieve economies of scale and adds significantly to production and overhead costs.

Procurement Constraints. The procurement of raw materials is another area in which correctional industries typically operate under constraints not facing the private sector. This is because correctional industries follow the government procurement process, which calls for competitive bidding and related procedural regulations, which do not always enable them to obtain the best price in the most expeditious fashion. For example, correctional industries are restricted from buying materials cheaply on the spot market.

Personnel Constraints. Another constraint that is unique to correctional industries has to do with personnel. Since correctional industries is indeed a part of government, it must follow the appropriate regulations, which can often lead to delays in hiring. Similarly, terminating an ineffective employee is also a tedious process. Moreover, limited flexibility in the pay scales and incentive structure available for government employees leads to problems with recruiting the kinds of personnel needed. As a result, correctional industries historically have hired staff directly from the corrections field and provided them

with training needed in the required business and production skills.

In sum, the several factors described should illustrate to any private sector manager the additional costs and constraints within which correctional industries must operate. These constraints lead to much lower production per inmate worker as compared to a freeworld employee. In numerical terms, the average value of production per inmate is well below \$20,000, which is less than one-fourth that of the production per worker in the private sector. While correctional industries establish prices for their products and services on a scale competitive with private industry, the net impact of these constraints is that correctional industries are often hard pressed to generate a profit even at a fair market price.

Benefits of Correctional Industries

The benefits that can be realized by correctional industries may be summarized succinctly into three general areas:

- Good Management Sense,
- Good Economic Sense, and
- Good Training Sense.

Good Management. Good management sense derives from the significant role that industries play in facilitating the job of correctional administrators through the reduction of inmate idleness. Correctional industries have become such a critical part of the corrections management structure that it is safe to say that facilities could not be operated safely and effectively without them. Studies have shown work programs to be an effective means of reducing incidents and other disciplinary infractions within correctional facilities.¹² Moreover, the courts have ruled on numerous occasions that such programs should be made available to inmates to keep them from being idle.

Good Economics. Good economic sense can be seen in a number of ways. These include direct savings to the government since correctional industries are self-sustaining programs that operate at no cost to the taxpayer. In the absence of correctional industry programs, the cost of additional security and/or alternative programs that would be required (probably

in the form of education) would be significant. A recent study completed for New York State calculated such replacement costs for that state alone to be in excess of \$15 million annually.¹³

Another economic benefit is the savings to the government in purchasing that result from eliminating the need to go through the competitive bid process. Since government agencies can purchase from correctional industries directly, this saves both time and money.

Further economic benefits include the direct civilian jobs that are employed as a result of correctional industries, that is, for production foremen, factory managers, and administration. In the case of UNICOR (the Federal system), this translates into nearly 2,000 jobs.

Finally, we should not forget that a large volume of the dollars that comprise correctional industries sales revert back into the economy for the purchase of materials. Since correctional industries are, in most cases, not primary manufacturers, this capital in turn creates additional jobs in the private sector. In 1987, for example, a year in which UNICOR had \$317 million in sales, approximately \$250 million was spent on raw materials, construction, installation, and related contractual services in the private sector. It is important that these positive impacts not be overlooked when discussing the adverse impact of correctional industries on the private sector economy.

Good Training. The third category of benefits that is derived from correctional industries is the training that these jobs provide inmates. While it is recognized that these inmates have broken the law, it must also be considered that these individuals will someday return to society. At least two states (Iowa and New York) have conducted studies documenting that inmates employed in correctional industries were less likely to recidivate than other inmates in the general prison population.¹⁴ If we do not make these training opportunities available, all citizens will bear the ultimate burden of the higher costs to society.

Marketing Considerations

Contrary to what many may lead us to believe, correctional industries do not simply get into a new industry or product line without giving it much thought. Several factors enter into a decision as to whether to move into a new industry area. These factors are listed below. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Market Potential
- Profitability

¹²The Organization and Management of County Jails, by Guynes, Grieser, and Robinson, Report to the National Institute of Justice, April 1985.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴The Recidivism of Releasees from the Iowa State Penitentiary at Fort Madison, State of Iowa Division of Adult Corrections, January 1983. The New York findings are based on preliminary results only; the full study being conducted by the State University of New York at Albany is yet unpublished.

- Inmate Employment Potential
- Capital Investment
- Impact on Small Business
- Training Value
- Security Considerations.

It is important to note that these decision criteria are not necessarily in order of importance. Rather *all* of these items are considered when making a decision to expand.

Market Potential. The potential market is probably the first prerequisite to entering any new industry or product area. No industry will be successful without the market to justify it. Correctional industries increasingly start by determining the needs of the customer. Moreover, correctional industries attempt to identify those markets for new products that are large enough so that potential adverse impact on the private sector is minimized. To date, correctional industries have tried to ensure that they would not capture more than a reasonable share of the market, in order not to impose any undue burden on any particular market segment or business concern. The definition of market share will vary depending upon how competitive the particular industry is. Correctional industries will continue to operate in this manner in the future in accordance with recently passed Federal legislation, which formalized this market share analysis.¹⁵

Can Correctional Industries Make a Profit? While it is the principal goal of correctional industries to employ inmates, this objective must be carried out within a self-sustaining operation. Consequently, the entry into any new product or industry area must also include an analysis determining that it is feasible to produce an item while making a profit. The profits in turn are reinvested into the cost of expansion or used to offset the costs of training and related custodial care of inmates.

Inmate Employment Levels. As correctional industries are looking to expand, they are continuously searching for industries that are labor intensive. The principal reason for labor intensity is, of course, the pressing need to reduce inmate idleness in severely crowded correctional facilities. While this is not always possible, these industries are given priority whenever possible.

Capital Investment. Like any private sector firm, correctional industries are always cognizant of the outlay that is required to enter a new industrial area.

Though it is not always possible, correctional industries have historically tried to get into labor intensive industries where the capital cost for expansion can be minimized.

Impact on Small Business. Given the charter of correctional industries, market research into any new industry includes an analysis of the impact that it might have on the private sector and small business. While it is virtually impossible to enter a new industry without affecting another business, correctional industries will only enter a new industry or product area after a determination is made that any adverse impact will be minimized. For example, if entry into a new industry area would significantly impact one firm (versus taking a small percentage of an overall product class which could be spread across several firms), correctional industries would most likely not enter that market. Furthermore, because of this charge to minimize private sector impact, correctional industries have been forced to diversify and are continuously searching for new products.

Training Value. While it is not always possible to establish jobs for inmates that provide the most current training in jobs available in the private sector upon release, the particular skills or training value to be gained from a particular industry operation are another consideration. For the most part, correctional industries have taken the approach that coping in a realistic work setting is often the most important skill that an inmate employed in an industry program can learn.

Security Considerations. Another factor which correctional industries must look at carefully before entering a new industry is the security aspect of the particular manufacturing or service endeavor. Consideration of many manufacturing operations is eliminated due to the nature of the machinery or materials that would be involved. Likewise many service-type operations that might otherwise be feasible (e.g., moving services) cannot be initiated due to the lack of minimum security inmates available for work outside of the prison grounds.

Thus we can conclude that the markets of correctional industries are limited in more ways than simply government-use markets. There are a host of factors, many of which do not even enter the picture in the private sector, that must be given consideration prior to entering a particular industry. Nonetheless, it is both the task and the challenge facing correctional industries to continue to diversify and develop new products which minimize the potential impact on the private sector in terms of market share.

¹⁵Op cit.

Examples of Private Sector Partnerships

The partnership between correctional industries and private industry has recently emerged, partly as a result of the increasing private sector involvement in correctional industries operations. Partnerships can result in shared benefits between correctional industries and private industry and may allay some concerns about unfair competition with the private sector. New York State provides a clear example of this type of model, which has also been called joint venture, licensing, or franchising.

Corcraft Correctional Industries in New York State has developed partnerships with several companies, including Tetrad, Inc., the Gunlocke Corporation, Voyager Emblem Company, and Burlington Industries in the areas of furniture and textile products. In brief, the partnership typically involves a contract with a private firm whereby the firm provides the parts/materials and correctional industries do the assembly/finish work. Correctional industries buy a recognized product name or design in exchange for sharing the benefits of an exclusive government-use market. The benefits to correctional industries include reduced start-up costs of introducing a new product and the potential for generating increased sales, while benefits to the private sector include greater access to the government marketplace. Training, technical assistance, and provision for royalties are generally part of the partnership agreement.¹⁶

One telling case in point about the mutual benefits to be gained through cooperation between correctional industries and the private sector is the situation that existed between Federal Prison Industries and the Association of Federal Drapery Contractors. What began as an adversarial relationship in 1984 when UNICOR announced it would expand its drapery manufacturing industry turned into a solid working relationship after much compromise. In brief, a series of meetings led to opening channels of communication, whereby UNICOR agreed to utilize private drapery contractors for the raw mate-

rials, installation, and hardware portion of the government contracts it receives. Moreover, both UNICOR and the Federal Drapery Contractors now have a better understanding of each other's concerns. As a result, the Drapery Contractors have been an advocate of correctional industries, speaking out in support of UNICOR on several occasions.

Conclusion

Given the continuing pressure that will be placed upon correctional industries to expand, while at the same time maintain a reasonable share of existing markets, expansion into new product lines can be anticipated. As the more traditional labor-intensive markets become saturated, correctional industries may look toward more capital-intensive industries as future candidates for expansion. As concerns about adverse impact continue to be raised, we can expect that all opportunities to expand into areas where the impact on the private sector (especially small business) is negligible will be vigorously pursued. Correctional industries will continue to search for partners in the private sector where shared benefits to the corrections community and private industry may be found.

As stated at the outset, this article has attempted to dispel some of the myths that are often associated with correctional industries. Correctional industries must continue to be publicly accountable as they have in the past. They need to do a better job at outreach in order to bring about more success stories such as the relationship developed between UNICOR and the drapery manufacturers. Joint ventures between correctional industries and the private sector represent an increasingly desirable option for both industries and their competitors.

The benefits of organizing "advisory councils" as a vehicle to address some of these concerns also merit some discussion. These councils could be comprised of representatives from both the private sector and correctional industries. It is inevitable that correctional industries will be called upon to grow along with the burgeoning prison population. As this occurs, correctional industries will continue to play the balancing act between sensitivity to the private sector and the need to expand.

¹⁶For a more detailed description of how these partnerships operate, see "Model Approaches: Prison Industry That Works" in *Corrections Today*, August 1988.