

**Utilization of
Community Corrections Centers
Statistical Report, FY 2015**



**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Trial Court
Office of Community Corrections**

January 2016

Office of Community Corrections
220 Forbes Road, Suite 301
Braintree, MA 02184

Voice: 781-848-2649
Fax: 781-848-3503

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Administrative Office

Pat Horne, Deputy Director
Kimberly Norton, Fiscal Manager
Karen Noonan, Office Manager
Melissa Repici, Fiscal Operations Supervisor
Addie Walker, Program Specialist
Genevieve O'Brien, Administrative Assistant
Carol Campbell, Administrative Assistant

Field Managers

William Friedman, Regional Program Manager
Kevin Kearney, Regional Program Manager
Vincent L. Lorenti, Regional Program Manager
Yardley Theolien, Regional Program Manager
Sandra Brown, Clinical Program Manager
Daniela Lopes, Clinical Program Manager
Christine Costa, Program Manager
Terance Ryan, Program Manager
Scott Gomes, Program Manager

Community Service Program

David Skocik, Statewide Supervisor
Christopher Cannata, Assistant Statewide Supervisor
Lisa Hickey, Assistant Statewide Supervisor
Michael LeCours, Assistant Statewide Supervisor
Tim Callahan, Assistant Statewide Supervisor
John Monahan, Regional Manager
Angela Griffin, Administrative Assistant
Chandra Shultz, Administrative Assistant
Christine Pagan, Administrative Assistant
Phyllis James, Administrative Assistant

Court Services Coordinators

Brian Kennedy
Connor Doherty
Domenico Cirelli
John Gibbons
John Woodward
Joseph Finn
Kevin Spitz
Micheal Bolles
Micheal Collins
Nicole Dublin
Nicole Sidlowski
Paula Therrien
Walter Skinner

Assistant Court Services Coordinators

Amy Kinzer
Angelo Camerta
Anthony Saraiva
Carrie Gwozdzik
Christopher Ashman
Christopher Resendes
Daniel Lynch
Darryl Odom
Debbie Mclean-Hamilton
Devyn Keith
Douglas Cloutier
Eric Iwaniec
Frank Baptista
Hector Gomes
James Ferrera
James Schindler
Jeff Stiano
John Corrao
John Glennon
John Silva
Jonathan Palermo
Marianne Gonzalez
Mark Casimiro

Mark Marcinko
Mark Monteiro
Martin Cunniff
Melanie Joyner
Michael Orlandi
Michael Spellman
Michael Forcillo
Nathan Durawa
Patrick Dugan
Peter Feeley
Philip Kirdulis
Robert Doherty
Robin Ashley
Sean Duggan
Seth Creeden
Shawn Wright
Stacey Deveau
Thomas O'Neil
Thomas Rosatto
Timothy Pasquale
Tina Bongo
Tracey Pisano
Willie Powell

Acknowledgments

This report would not have been possible without the cooperation of administrators in all of the community corrections centers and collaborating agencies and the guidance and support of the Massachusetts Sentencing Commission. The Office of Community Corrections would like to acknowledge that cooperation and assistance as follows:

Barnstable County

Sheriff James M. Cummings
Terry Ryan, Program Manager, Hyannis

Berkshire County

Sheriff Thomas Bowler
Kyle Schadler, Program Manager, Pittsfield

Bristol County

Sheriff Thomas M. Hodgson
Scott Gomes, Program Manager, Taunton
Thomas Carter, Program Manager, Dartmouth

Dukes County

Sheriff Michael A. McCormack
Jeremy Norton, Program Manager, West Tisbury

Essex County

Sheriff Frank G. Cousins, Jr.
A.J. Mora, Program Manager, Lawrence
Steve Cicco, Program Manager, Lynn
Robert Levarone, Program Manager, Salisbury

Hampden County

Sheriff Michael J. Ashe, Jr.
Tyena Whitley, Program Manager, Springfield

Hampshire County

Sheriff Robert J. Garvey
John Leahy, Program Manager, Northampton

Middlesex County

Sheriff Peter J. Koutoujian
Captian Josh Bowdridge, Program Manager, Lowell

Norfolk County

Sheriff Michael Bellotti
Christopher Bell, Program Manager, Quincy

Plymouth County

Sheriff Joseph D. McDonald, Jr.
Christine Costa, Program Manager, Plymouth CCC
Filomena DaVeiga, Program Manager, Brockton CCC

Suffolk County

Sheriff Steven W. Tompkins
Maureen Kenny-Woodworth ,
Program Manager, Boston CCC

Worcester County

Sheriff Lew Evangelidis
Mark Leary, Program Manager, Fitchburg CCC
Fran Pisegna, Program Manager, Worcester CCC
Sarah Sullivan, Program Manger, Worcester JRC

Department of Correction

Carol Higgins O'Brien, Commissioner

Department of Youth Services

Peter J. Forbes, Commissioner

Massachusetts Parole Board

Paul Treseler, Chairperson

Office of the Commissioner of Probation

Edward J. Dolan, Commissioner
Michael Coelho, Deputy Commissioner-Program
Development

Department of Research and Planning

Linda K. Holt, Director
Lee M. Kavanagh, Research Manager
Kevin Riley, Research Analyst
Elizabeth Marini, Executive Assistant

Executive Summary

This report was prepared to present summary data on the utilization of community corrections centers in Massachusetts:

- This report provides statistical data on the 18 community corrections centers in operation during FY 2015;
- On average, 796 offenders were participating in the programs daily at the community corrections centers state-wide;
- All community corrections center program participants were under the supervision of a criminal justice agency:
 - 84% were supervised by Probation
 - 11.9% were supervised by a Sheriff department and
 - 4.1% were supervised by the Parole Board
- Community corrections center program participants were both male and female:
 - 77% were male; and,
 - 23% were female.
- There were 2,688 community corrections referrals :
 - 93% were Intermediate Sanction Level III; and,
 - 7% were intermediate Sanction Level IV.
- There were 665 intermediate sanction level III and IV participant transitions:
 - 4.7% made a transition from Level IV to Level III;
 - 95.3% made a transition from Level III to Level II (standard supervision).
- There were 1,864 intermediate sanction level III and IV participant terminations from community corrections:
 - 8.0% of participants were terminated from Level IV;
 - 92.0% of participants were terminated from Level III.

- There were 14,135 referrals to the community service program. Among those referrals:
 - 73.5% were male;
 - 26.5% were female.And:
 - 97.3% were adults;
 - 2.7% were juveniles.
- There were 80 participants awarded their HlSet in FY 2015.
- There were 987 participants placed in jobs in FY 2015
 - 24.7% of those participants received placement into part time jobs;
 - 75.3% of those participants received placement into full time jobs.
- There were 616 participants placed in aftercare in FY 2015.
- There were 63,396 specimens screened for illicit drugs in FY 2015:
 - 83.0% reported negative results;
 - 17.0% reported positive results.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	6
Study Sample	6
Study Period	6
Data Collection	6
Data Analysis	8
Data Quality	8
FINDINGS	9
TOTAL POPULATION	9
POPULATION BY GENDER	16
NEW PARTICIPANTS	18
TRANSITIONS AND TERMINATIONS	20
GED	28
JOB PLACEMENT	30
AFTERCARE	32
DRUG TESTING	34
COMMUNITY SERVICE	37
SUMMARY	40
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS IN STUDY	42

List of Figures

Figure 1. Number of Community Corrections Centers, 1998 to 2015	4
Figure 2. Sentencing Guidelines Grid	5
Figure 3. Total Population by Month	9
Figure 4. Average Population by Center	10
Figure 5. Population by Supervising Agency	11
Figure 6. Average Population by Supervising Agency and Center	13
Figure 7. Average Population by Intermediate Sanction Level	14
Figure 8. Average Population by Intermediate Sanctions Level and Center	15
Figure 9. Average Population by Gender	16
Figure 10. Average Population by Gender and Center	17
Figure 11. Referrals by Level	18
Figure 12. Referrals by Level and Agency	19
Figure 13. Transitions and Terminations from Centers	21
Figure 14. Transitions by Month and Level	22
Figure 15. Transitions by Center and Level	23
Figure 16. Terminations by Month and Level	24
Figure 17. Terminations by Center and Level	25
Figure 18. Termination Reasons for Level III, IV	26
Figure 19. Outcomes without CJ intervention and with CJ intervention.	27
Figure 20. HiSet Performance by Center	29
Figure 21. Job Placement Performance by Center	31
Figure 22. Aftercare Placement by Center	33
Figure 23. Total Number of Drug Screens by Center.	35
Figure 24. Percentage of Positive and Negative Drug Test Results by Center	36
Figure 25. Adult Community Service Referrals by County	38
Figure 26. Juvenile Community Service Referrals by County	39

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

UTILIZATION OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS STATISTICAL REPORT, FY 2015

INTRODUCTION

The Office of Community Corrections (OCC) is authorized by Massachusetts General Law Chapter 211F. The mission of OCC is the establishment of intermediate sanctions programs which offer a continuum of sanctions and services for probation, sheriffs, parole, the Department of Youth Services (DYS), and the Department of Correction (DOC). These intermediate sanctions are delivered at community corrections centers across the state.

Community corrections centers are community based, intensive supervision sites, which deliver bundled **sanctions** and **services**, including treatment and education, to high risk offenders via Intermediate Sanction Levels.

Among the **sanctions** delivered at community corrections centers are:

- community service
- day reporting
- drug & alcohol testing
- electronic monitoring
- daily Accountability

Among the **services** provided at community corrections centers are:

- communicable disease prevention education
- HlSet/ABE/ESL or comparable educational component
- job readiness training and placement
- life skills
- referral to Department of Public Health, Department of Mental Health services and other community agencies.
- substance abuse treatment
- gender specific treatment services

Community corrections centers are designed to provide a targeted criminal justice response to a specific group of offenders. That response is delivered at the Community Corrections Centers by assignment to an Intermediate Sanction Level. Intermediate Sanction Levels III and IV are intended for those offenders who possess a substantial criminal history and are chronic substance abusers. In addition, this group may be underemployed or unemployed. Finally, Intermediate Sanction Levels III and IV are reserved for those offenders who hold a strong potential for eventual incarceration or who have served a term of incarceration and are returning to the community.

Intermediate Sanction Levels are adopted from the Massachusetts Sentencing Commission's Report to the General Court, April 10, 1996:

The commission . . . adopted the notion of a continuum of four levels of intermediate sanctions, based on the constraints on personal liberty associated with the sanction . . .

Figure 2 shows the sentencing guidelines grid proposed by the Massachusetts Sentencing Commission and the manner in which intermediate sanctions are integrated into the sentencing guidelines. The intermediate sanction levels represent the practical method by which a combination of sanctions and services are assigned to offenders. Community corrections centers are designed to provide for the intensive supervision of offenders, delivering a bundled program of sanctions and services to offenders at Intermediate Sanction Level III and Level IV.

Intermediate Sanction Level IV is the most intense level of community based, criminal justice supervision. Sanctions and services required at this level of supervision represent a twenty-four hour restriction upon the liberty of the offender. Level IV participants are required to report to the community corrections center for four to six hours per day, five days per week. Additionally, offenders placed at Intermediate Sanction Level IV are monitored twenty-four hours per day via electronic device, required to submit to the highest category of random drug and alcohol testing, and typically mandated to attend two four-hour community work service shifts per week.

Intermediate Sanction Level III is an intense level of community-based, criminal justice supervision. Sanctions and services required at this level of supervision represent a daily imposition upon the liberty of the offender. Level III participants are required to report to the community corrections center for one to

four hours per day, three to five days per week. Offenders placed at Intermediate Sanction Level III may be monitored via electronic device. Level III also requires random drug and alcohol testing, and attendance and, at least one four-hour community service shift per week.

Community Service. The Community Service Program manages the implementation of community work service as an intermediate sanction for criminal justice agencies throughout the state. Offenders are referred to the Community Service Program as a condition of probation, parole, or pre-release and as a component of an intermediate sanction level at a community corrections center. The Community Service Program specifically addresses the purposes of sentencing by: ensuring public safety by providing closely monitored community work service; promoting respect for the law and the community through community restitution; and, providing opportunities for work skills training.

Drug & Alcohol Testing. Drug testing is among the graduated sanctions available at the community corrections centers. Offenders are subject to drug testing at both intermediate sanction levels III and IV. The drug testing system is modeled after the American Probation and Parole Association's Drug Testing Guidelines and Practices for Adult Probation and Parole Agencies. Upon assignment to an Intermediate Sanction Level, participants are assigned a drug testing color. The assigned color corresponds to the participant's risk level. Participants are required to call a toll free number daily in order to determine what color will be tested that day. When a participant's color is selected on a particular day, the participant is required to report for drug testing. Specimen collection is observed by staff.

Since the inception of the OCC in 1996, 27 community corrections centers have been developed across the Commonwealth. Due to budgetary constraints centers have had to close. There are currently 18 centers in operation.

Figure 1 shows the number of community corrections centers in operation at the end of each fiscal year. A list of the community corrections centers and their dates of operation can be found at the end of the report.

This report provides summary statistical data on the utilization of community corrections centers in FY 2015. It is intended to inform judges, probation and parole officers, correctional staff, policy makers, and most importantly, the public about the development of significant criminal justice policy and practices in Massachusetts.

Figure 1. Number of Community Corrections Centers, 1998 to 2015







Figure 2. Sentencing Guidelines Grid

Level	Illustrative Offense	Sentence Range				
9	Murder	Life	Life	Life	Life	Life
8	Rape of Child with Force Aggravated Rape Armed Burglary	96 - 144 Mos.	108 - 162 Mos.	120 - 180 Mos.	144 - 216 Mos.	204 - 306 Mos.
7	Armed Robbery (Gun) Rape Mayhem	60 - 90 Mos.	68 - 102 Mos.	84 - 126 Mos.	108 - 162 Mos.	160 - 240 Mos.
6	Manslaughter (Invol) Armed Robbery (No gun) A&B DW (Sign. injury)	40 - 60 Mos.	45 - 67 Mos.	50 - 75 Mos.	60 - 90 Mos.	80 - 120 Mos.
5	Unarmed Robbery Stalking (Viol. of Order) Unarmed Burglary Larceny (\$50,000+)	12 - 36 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II	24 - 36 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II	36 - 54 Mos.	48 - 72 Mos.	60 - 90 Mos.
4	Larceny From a Person A&B DW (Mod. injury) B&E (Dwelling) Larceny (\$10,000-\$50,000)	0 - 24 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II	3 - 30 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II	6 - 30 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II	20 - 30 Mos.	24 - 36 Mos.
3	A&B DW (No/minor injury) B&E (Not dwelling) Larceny (\$250 to \$10,000)	0 - 12 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II IS-I	0 - 15 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II IS-I	0 - 18 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II IS-I	0 - 24 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II	6 - 24 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II
2	Assault Larceny Under \$250		0 - 6 Mos. IS-III IS-II IS-I	0 - 6 Mos. IS-III IS-II IS-I	0 - 9 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II IS-I	0 - 12 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II IS-I
1	Operate After Suspension Disorderly Conduct Vandalism				0 - 3 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II IS-I	0 - 6 Mos. IS-IV IS-III IS-II IS-I
	Criminal History Scale	A No/Minor Record	B Moderate Record	C Serious Record	D Violent or Repetitive	E Serious Violent

Sentencing Zone

	Incarceration Zone
	Discretionary Zone (Incarceration/Intermediate Sanctions)
	Intermediate Sanction Zone

Intermediate Sanction Level

IS-IV	24-Hour Restriction
IS-III	Daily Accountability
IS-II	Standard Supervision
IS-I	Financial Accountability

The numbers in each cell represent the range from which the judge selects the maximum sentence (Not More Than); The minimum sentence (Not Less Than) is 2/3rds of the maximum sentence and constitutes the initial parole eligibility date.

METHOD

Study Sample. All community corrections centers operating during at least part of and/or the entirety of FY 2015 were included in the sample. A list of the community corrections centers included in this report and their dates of operation is located at the end of the report. In the tables, each of the community corrections centers is referred to by the city or town in which it is located. Some of the centers specialize services for select groups of offenders. The following abbreviations have been adopted:

- CCC community corrections center (adult males and females)
- JRC juvenile resource center (juvenile males and females)

Study Period. The study period covers FY 2015, or July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

Data Collection. Data was collected from monthly utilization reports and community service log reports submitted by each community corrections center and the Community Service Program to the OCC.

Monthly utilization reports formed one basis of the data collection for this report. Several variables of data were collected. These included variables related to the population flow through the center, and those related to the status of participants within the center. For each category of data that was collected the data was separated by intermediate sanction level (III or IV), the gender of the offender, and the supervising agency (probation, parole, sheriff, DYS, or DOC). Data was generally reported in the form of numbers of offenders participating in the program at the end of each month in a particular category, or the number served during each month. The categories of data are as follows:

New Participants. The monthly utilization reports provided the number of new participants by intermediate sanction level, gender and supervising agency for the reporting period.

Transitions. The monthly utilization reports provided data regarding offender progression from one level of supervision to another. This category was called *transition*. This includes the movement of a participant from Intermediate Sanction Level IV to Intermediate Sanction Level III, indicated as a Level IV transition or from Intermediate Sanction Level III to

Intermediate Sanction Level II (standard supervision), indicated as Level III transition.

Terminations. The monthly utilization report also provided data regarding offender discharge from the community corrections center which was labeled *termination*. Such data was separated by level, gender and supervising agency and was further classified regarding the reason for offender termination. The reasons for termination from intermediate sanction level III and IV were codified on the form and included the following: warrant issued, violation of probation pending, incarcerated, returned to higher custody, sentence expired or paroled, placed in residential or inpatient treatment, transferred to another community corrections center, unable to continue due to medical issues, Removed by Supervising Agency. Community corrections centers also reported data corresponding to categories of program services or sanctions. These categories include HISet, job placement, aftercare status, and drug testing.

HISet. The monthly utilization reports provided the number of participants that took the HISet examination, the number of participants that passed a portion of the examination, and the number of participants that passed the examination and received their HISet.

Job Placement. The monthly utilization reports provided the number of participants that were placed in a part time job and the number of participants that were placed in a full time job.

Aftercare. The monthly utilization report provided the number of participants that made a successful transition to Intermediate Sanction Level II (standard supervision) and were placed in an aftercare program of low restriction or voluntary nature.

Drug Testing. The monthly utilization report provided the number of participants for which a negative drug test result was reported, the number of participants for which one or more positive results were reported on a particular specimen, and the number of participants that tested positive for a particular substance such as, cocaine, opiate, THC, etc.

Community Service Logs provided the second source of data collection and provided aggregate monthly information on the number of referrals to the program for each court site. Because community service is provided at court sites as well

as community corrections center sites, these logs were maintained on a county level rather than a community corrections center level.

Data Analysis. The 12 monthly utilization reports for each center along with the community service logs formed the basis of the analysis. Some of the analysis displays aggregated data across all community corrections centers for each week. Other data analysis shows the average reported utilization by center across the entire study period.

Data Quality. Monthly utilization reports were received from all of the community corrections centers for the entire study period.

FINDINGS

TOTAL POPULATION

Figure 3 shows the total population in the 18 community corrections centers for each reporting month in the study. In December 2014, community corrections centers reported a high total of 801 Intermediate Sanction Level III and IV participants. In March 2015, community corrections centers reported a low total of 676 intermediate sanction level participants.

Figure 4 shows the average population in each of the community corrections centers for the study period. The community corrections centers ranged from an average of 9.7 participants at the West Tisbury CCC to an average of 73.6 participants at the Lynn CCC. The state wide cumulative average attendance across all centers was 796 participants.

Figure 3. Total Population by Month





Figure 4. Average Population by Center



POPULATION BY SUPERVISING AGENCY

Figure 5 shows the supervising agency of participants in community corrections centers. During the study period, participants in the community corrections centers were under the supervision of one of three different agencies. On average, 84% of the participants were under the supervision of probation; 11.9% were under the supervision of a sheriff's department; 4.1% were under the supervision of the Parole Board.

Figure 5. Population by Supervising Agency





Figure 6 shows the supervising agency of the participants at each of the community corrections centers during FY 2015. There were large differences in the population at each of the centers. Plymouth CCC had the highest average proportion of probation supervised participants (98.8%). Pittsfield CCC had the highest average proportion of parole supervised participants (31.9%); Northampton CCC had the highest average proportion of sheriff's supervised participants (57.5%).

* Regarding the Worcester JRC, the 0.2 average "Sheriff participants" represents an average of DYS not sheriff participants. Due to the need for uniform reporting, submission of DYS participants for juvenile centers falls under the code of sheriff participant.

Figure 6. Average Population by Supervising Agency and Center



POPULATION BY LEVEL

Figure 7 shows the distribution of the population in community corrections centers by intermediate sanction level in FY 2015. On average, 95.6% of the participants were supervised at Intermediate Sanction Level III and 4.4% were supervised at Intermediate Sanction Level IV.

Figure 8 shows the distribution of the population by intermediate sanction level for each of the 18 community corrections centers. The Lawrence CCC had the highest proportion of participants at Intermediate Sanction Level IV, an average of 8.5 participants (12.1%). The Lynn CCC had the highest segment of intermediate level III participants with an average of 66.2 (89.9%).

Figure 7. Average Population by Intermediate Sanction Level





Figure 8. Average Population by Intermediate Sanctions Level and Center



POPULATION BY GENDER

The community corrections centers provided services to both male and female participants. As shown in Figure 9 on average, 23% of the participants in the community corrections centers were female and 77% were male. Figure 10 shows the distribution of population by gender for each of the 18 community corrections centers. Among the centers providing services to both male and female participants, Lynn CCC had the highest average proportion of males (90.4%) and Salisbury CCC had the highest average proportion of females (56.6%).

Figure 9. Average Population by Gender





Figure 10. Average Population by Gender and Center



NEW PARTICIPANTS

Participants can be referred to the community corrections centers at any point during the year. Participants were referred to community corrections centers by the court (in the case of probation supervised participants), by the Parole Board, by a Sheriff's Department, by the Department of Correction or by the Department of Youth Services. Participants were referred at two intermediate sanction levels. Intermediate Sanction Level III represents daily accountability consisting of structured program services such as substance abuse treatment and sanctions such as drug testing and community service at the center. Intermediate Sanction Level IV represents 24-hour restriction and includes electronic monitoring along with structured program services and sanctions.

Figure 11 shows the proportion of participants referred to community corrections centers at intermediate sanction level III, and IV. In FY 2015 the majority of participants were referred to IS Level III (95.6%).

Figure 11. Referrals by Level




Figure 12. Referrals by Level and Agency

Figure 12 shows new referrals by level and supervising agent. During FY 2015 there were 2,528 referrals to IS Levels III and 160 referrals made to IS Level IV.

	Probation		Parole		Sheriff		DOC		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Level 4	67	3%	13	7%	80	15%	0	0%	160	6%
Level 3	1914	97%	167	93%	447	85%	0	0%	2528	94%
Total	1981	100%	180	100%	527	100%	0	0%	2688	100%

TRANSITIONS AND TERMINATIONS

The terms transition and termination are used to describe the flow of participants through the community corrections center. Data reported here indicates participants whose status changed during FY 2015. Generally speaking a transition describes a participant that is progressing through intermediate sanction levels within the community corrections center, while a termination describes a participant that has been discharged from the community corrections center.

There were 659 intermediate sanction level III and IV transitions and 1,864 intermediate sanction level III and IV terminations from community corrections centers during FY 2015. Transitions included all participants that moved from a higher to a lower intermediate sanction level during the reporting period. Terminations included participants that were discharged from community corrections centers for the following reasons: warrant issued, violation of probation pending, incarcerated, returned to higher custody, sentence expired/paroled, placed in residential or inpatient treatment, transferred to another community corrections center, unable to continue for medical reasons, removal from programming by supervising agency.

As shown in Figure 13:

- 1.0% of participants moved from Level IV to Level III;
- 25.0% of participants moved from Level III to Level II or standard supervision;
- 6.0% of participants were terminated from Level IV ;
- 68.0% of participants were terminated from Level III.

Figure 14 shows the number of transitions by month and level. Figure 15 shows the number of transitions by center and level. Figure 16 shows the number of terminations by month and level. Figure 17 shows the number of terminations by center and level.

The reasons for intermediate sanction level III and IV terminations are featured in Figure 18. Among Level IV terminations the most prominent reason reported was *Sentence Expired* at 46.7%. For Level III terminations the most frequent reason reported was *warrant issued* at 27.7%.

Figure 13. Transitions and Terminations from Centers




Figure 14. Transitions by Month and Level




Figure 15. Transitions by Center and Level




Figure 16. Terminations by Month and Level




Figure 17. Terminations by Center and Level





Figure 18. Termination Reasons for Level III, IV




Total Outcomes: Transition and Termination

A termination or discharge can be with criminal justice intervention or without criminal justice intervention. A termination without criminal justice intervention is not necessarily due to non compliance. Such terminations include: sentence expired/paroled, placed in residential treatment, unable to continue due to medical/mental illness, transferred to another OCC/jurisdiction, or removal by supervising agency. Terminations with criminal justice intervention would include: warrant issued, violation of probation pending, or returned to higher custody.

Combining the transitions (a participant that is progressing through intermediate sanction levels) and the terminations without criminal justice intervention, portrays a more accurate picture of participant outcomes unrelated to noncompliance. In FY 2015 57.1% of the outcomes were without criminal justice intervention, while only 42.9% of the participants were terminated due to criminal justice intervention.

Figure 19. Outcome without criminal justice intervention and with criminal justice intervention




HiSet

Education is among the service components offered at community corrections centers. Data was collected regarding High school equivalency test (HiSet) preparation in FY 2015. Across the state 80 intermediate sanction level participants were awarded their HiSET in FY 2015. As indicated in Figure 20, Quincy CCC had the greatest number of participants receive a HiSET.

*All juvenile participants are required to be full time students, therefore do not require HiSet services.


Figure 20. HlSet Performance by Center



JOB PLACEMENT

Job placement is another among the service components of community corrections centers. Figure 21 indicates the number of participants that were placed in full or part time jobs by job developers at the centers and the percentage of full time and part time job placements. There were a total of 987 job placements made across the state in FY 2015, of which 743 were full time and 244 were part time. The Plymouth CCC had the greatest success in facilitating full time employment, placing 74 participants. The Barnstable CCC had the greatest success accessing part time employment, placing 35 participants.

Figure 21. Job Placement Performance by Center




AFTERCARE

A final service component that was tracked on monthly reports was aftercare placements. Aftercare placements consist of referrals made to community based agencies in order to obtain the support services necessary to help a participant maintain success at a lower level of supervision.

Figure 22 shows the number of aftercare placements at each center in FY 2015. There were a total of 728 aftercare placements made across the state in FY 2015. The Plymouth and Salisbury CCC's had the greatest number of aftercare placements with 68 each.

Figure 22. Aftercare Placement by Center



DRUG TESTING

Drug testing is among the most prominent sanctions administered by community corrections centers. Participants are tested randomly by virtue of a color code system in which the color assigned to a participant corresponds to risk level. There was variation in drug testing administration at different centers. Centers screened for different types or numbers of drugs and screened for different types or numbers of adulterants. However, all centers were contracted to screen in accordance with the standards for drug testing set forth in the American Probation and Parole Association's *Drug Testing Guidelines and Practices for Adult Probation and Parole Agencies*.

Figure 23 shows the total number of urine specimens screened for illicit drugs by each center in FY 2015. The table indicates the total number of positive and negative results. The Lynn CCC performed the greatest number of drug tests with 8,855.

Figure 24 shows the percentage of positive and negative drug test results at centers in FY 2015. The average across all centers was 83.0% negative; 17.0% positive. The Plymouth CCC had the greatest percentage of negative results at 91.6%. The Lowell CCC had the greatest percentage of positive results at 39.7%.

Figure 23. Total Number of Drug Screens by Center





Figure 24. Percentage of Positive and Negative Drug Test Results by Center



COMMUNITY SERVICE

There were 14,135 referrals to the community service program in FY 2015. All participants at community corrections centers were referred to community service. In addition, referrals were made by the following court departments: Superior, District, Juvenile, and Probate.

Of the 14,135 adult and juvenile referrals:

- 3,647 (26.5%) were adult females;
- 10,111 (73.5%) were adult males;
- 13,758 (97.3%) were adults;
- 377 (2.7%) were juveniles.

Figure 25 depicts the total number of adult referrals for community service by county and gender.

Figure 26 depicts the total number of juvenile referrals for community service by county and gender.

Figure 25. Adult Community Service Referrals by County and Gender





Figure 26. Juvenile Community Service Referrals by County and Gender



SUMMARY

A main purpose of this report has been to provide data on the utilization of community corrections centers. Among the highlights are:

- the community corrections centers provided services to a large number of participants;
- the community corrections centers provided services in diverse locations across the Commonwealth;
- the community corrections centers delivered intermediate sanctions to participants from different components of the criminal justice system witnessing strong collaboration; however,
- the ratio of participants from different agencies remained disparate from center to center;
- of the 1,864 outcomes (transitions and terminations), 57.1% were for non-criminal justice intervention reasons.

The project developed a reliable measure of the utilization of community corrections centers.

Based on the utility of the community corrections centers, a consistent application of intermediate sanctions across the commonwealth in 17 diverse communities and various offender populations has been observed.

The project demonstrated the utility and feasibility of conducting research across all of the community corrections centers.

This research project was the result of a collaborative effort among 18 different community corrections centers which were able to provide a consistent set of data on program utilization enabling cross center comparisons.

The electronic submission of data from the community corrections centers to the OCC was vital to the efficiency and integrity of the report.

Due to the volume of cases serviced by the community corrections centers, electronic submission of data has allowed efficient use of OCC staff resources and greater data integrity. Since FY 2008 all data collection, aggregate and case level utilization reports, from each community corrections center have been electronically submitted. This has allowed for greater depth of analysis and more sophisticated data integrity measurements.

Case level data on CCC participants.

This analysis is based on aggregate statistics provided by the community corrections centers. Since FY 2008 the OCC has developed methods for case level analysis. Full compliance with electronic submission has made this progress possible. In past and present years OCC staff have begun addressing the following questions through case level analysis.

- What is the new arraignment rate for clients cross sectioned with their reason for discharge from a community correction center ?
- Substance abuse trends, which drugs are abused in different geographic areas?
- What is the three year new arraignment rate for clients referred to a community corrections center, state-wide average and per each center?

Community Corrections Centers Included in Study Sample

City and Center Type	Short Form Name	County and Community Corrections Center	Date of Opening
Barnstable CCC	BARN-CCC	Barnstable Community Corrections Center	Sep-98
Boston CCC	BOST-CCC	Suffolk Community Corrections Center	Dec-98
Brockton CCC	BROC-CCC	Plymouth Community Corrections Center	Jun-06
Dartmouth CCC	DRTM-CCC	Bristol Community Corrections Center	Aug-08
Fitchburg CCC	FITC-CCC	Worcester Community Corrections Center	Jun-98
Lawrence CCC	LAWR-CCC	Essex Community Corrections Center	Mar-99
Lowell CCC	LOWL-CCC	Middlesex Community Corrections Center	Mar-02
Lynn CCC	LYNN-CCC	Essex Community Corrections Center	Mar-01
Northampton CCC	NOTH-CCC	Hampshire Community Corrections Center	Jan-99
Plymouth CCC	PLYM-CCC	Plymouth Resource Center	Apr-07
Pittsfield CCC	PITT-CCC	Berkshire Community Corrections Center	Nov-00
Quincy CCC	QUIN-CCC	Norfolk Community Corrections Center	Apr-99
Salisbury CCC	SALI-CCC	Essex Community Corrections Center	Mar-05
Springfield CCC	SPFL-CCC	Hampden Community Corrections Center	Jun-98
Taunton CCC	TAUN-CCC	Bristol Community Corrections Center	Apr-00
West Tisbury CCC	WEST-CCC	Dukes Community Corrections Center	Oct-00
Worcester CCC	WORC-CCC	Worcester Community Corrections Center	Sep-01
Worcester-JRC	WORC-JRC	Worcester Juvenile Resource Center	Mar-09