

**A Report on Community Justice Support Centers  
in FY 2026**

**Mandated by the 2025 GAA**

for Line-Item 0339-1003

to the

House Committee on Ways and Means

&

Senate Committee on Ways and Means



**Massachusetts Trial Court  
Massachusetts Probation Service  
Office of Community Corrections**

Vincent L. Lorenti, Executive Director  
Janice Neiman, Program Manager for Performance Metrics

March, 2026

**OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

John W. McCormick Building  
One Ashburton Place, Room 405  
Boston, MA 02108  
Voice: 617-788-3500  
Fax: 617-936-2428

## Introduction

The Office of Community Corrections (OCC) submits this report consistent with the provisions of Chapter 9 of the Acts of 2025, Line Item 0339-1003.

The OCC is a government organization within the Probation Service of the Massachusetts Trial Court. Pursuant to M. G. L., c. 211F, the OCC is charged with the development and implementation of community-based programs that serve as an alternative to jail and prison for those that might otherwise be incarcerated. These programs may be used at the pretrial and dispositional phase of the judicial process and as a means of support for those returning from a period of incarceration.

The OCC delivers programs and services through two main initiatives. First, the OCC contracts with social service providers and county sheriff's departments to operate a network of community-based facilities known as Community Justice Support Centers (Support Centers). There are eighteen Support Centers in Massachusetts. Support Centers deliver cognitive behavioral treatment, education, career counseling, clinical case management, and community services as an alternative to jail, house of correction, and prison. Second, the OCC operates the Massachusetts Trial Court Community Service Program to help individuals on probation supervision engage with community partners as volunteers in lieu of incarceration. Support Centers programming participants may also utilize the Community Service Program to practice skills they have learned and address a need for pro-social leisure and recreation activities caused by criminal behavior.

OCC programs are available to people at various stages of the criminal justice process and through various pathways. The "pathways" are the statutory authority by which a person accesses the Support Center. They include the following:

### **1. Intensive Supervision with Treatment (IST)**

Per M.G.L. c. 211F § 3, a court can sentence a person who has been convicted of a crime to community supervision at the Community Justice Support Center in lieu of a period of incarceration. This sentence is administered as a special condition of probation by the probation department. A person who is sentenced to Intensive Supervision with Treatment (IST) submits to a risk/needs assessment which is used to develop a treatment plan. The treatment plan includes all the programs that are necessary to reduce the likelihood that the person will engage in further conduct that may result in justice involvement. Programming can include cognitive behavioral therapy to address decision making or drug/alcohol use, education towards a GED/HiSET or other credential, career counseling, clinical case management to address physical/behavioral health, housing, cultural competency and other responsibility needs, and community service to allow clients the opportunity to practice skills. People can also come to IST as a means of graduated re-entry from parole, the Sheriff's Department, or the Department of Correction.

### **2. Pretrial Treatment**

Per M.G.L. c. 211F § 3A(b), if a person has been arraigned on an offense, they can request to participate in the programming provided via IST, in lieu of bail or as a condition of release. The Pretrial Treatment pathway allows a person to engage in programming at the Support Center while they await trial. In Pretrial Treatment the person has access to all the same programming, services, and supports they would have gotten had they been sentenced to IST. However, these interventions happen before they have been convicted of a crime. This may allow the person who does well in programming to get a favorable recommendation from the district attorney or a favorable sentence from the judge when the matter is resolved.

### **3. Pretrial Services**

Per M.G.L. c. 211F § 3A, if a person has been arraigned on an offense, the court can order them to report to the Support Center in lieu of bail or as a condition of release. The Pretrial Services pathway allows a person to remain at liberty while their case is pending. To increase the likelihood that the person will report to court, they are required to check-in at the Support Center on a periodic basis. During the check-in the Support Center staff can help the person find a place to live, get a job, get connected to a primary care or behavioral health provider, enroll in MassHealth or DTA benefits. This is different than Pretrial Treatment because the person has not consented to participate. Therefore, the Support Center only offers case management services to the person on a voluntary basis. The person does not receive rehabilitative services through the Support Center. Rather, the Support Center refers the person to community resources for any support they request.

### **4. Probation Referral (For Court-Ordered Program)**

Per M.G.L. c. 211F § 3B, people that are subject to probation supervision may be referred to the Support Center or the Community Service Program by a probation officer to resolve a condition of probation if they have had a risk, needs assessment, are at an appropriate supervision level, and have had a condition ordered by the court that can be fulfilled by a program available at the Support Center.

### **5. The Ralph Gants Project (Gants Project)**

Through the Gants Project, any person released from incarceration (including, but not limited to, any probationer or parolee) can come to a Support Center for help with anything they need to stay safe in their community. The Reentry Services Coordinator at the Support Center can help a person get a state ID, engage with housing services, get a GED/HiSET, and engage with employment services and vocation training. The Public Benefits Coordinator can help a person get enrolled in MassHealth, access SNAP benefits, SSI/SSDI, or any other safety net program for which they are eligible.

Also under M.G.L. c. 211F § 3B, people can go to the Support Center on a voluntary basis to work on a criminogenic need area with a referral from their probation officer.<sup>1</sup> Because participation at the Support Center is not a court-ordered condition through this pathway, the Support Center does not report the individual's progress to the supervising agency.

---

<sup>1</sup> A criminogenic need is something that can cause or lead an individual to engage in criminal behavior. According to Evidence-Based Practice, there are eight major criminogenic need areas that show a consistent positive relationship with recidivism.

## History

The following provides a brief history of the Office of Community Corrections.

### Prison Overcrowding

In 1980, 5,441 people were committed to county houses of correction in Massachusetts. By the end of the decade the number of county commitments increased more than 150% to 13,721. At the state prisons, the number of people committed increased by more than 200% from 1,234 in 1980 to 3,794 in 1990. In 1997, county commitments peaked at 19,842.

### Boston Bar Association (BBA)/ Crime and Justice Foundation Report

In 1990, faced with a crisis affecting the criminal justice system, the Boston Bar Association and the Crime and Justice Foundation convened a task force to study the prison overcrowding problem and make policy recommendations toward its resolution.

### Recommendations

While the BBA task force made no inquiry into the underlying cause of increased prison commitments it characterized the problem as being a result of increasing incarceration rates, longer sentences and jailing of substance abusers. The task force resolved that it would not be possible to “build our way out” of the problem. Among the recommendations it made were:

1. Establish a sentencing commission to revise sentencing law, develop sentencing guidelines and serve as principal author for future sentencing amendments
2. Establish intermediate sanctions using the latest programmatic technologies

In recommending intermediate sanctions the task force referred to the lack of options between probation and incarceration as a serious gap in the criminal justice system. The task force found that “there are many offenders for whom a sanction greater than probation is appropriate and others for whom prison is not appropriate.” The task force recommended intermediate sanctions that incorporate “supervision—through urinalysis, daily schedules and a regular reporting structure; accountability—through curfews and community service; and treatment—through substance abuse counseling, employment and training.”

### Truth in Sentencing

As a result of the public debate over criminal justice policy, the Massachusetts Legislature passed a series of reforms commonly referred to as “Truth in Sentencing” laws. Among these laws were statutes that established the Massachusetts Sentencing Commission and the Office of Community Corrections (OCC). The Massachusetts Sentencing Commission was charged with promoting truth in sentencing, proposing modifications of law for sentencing, and proposing sentencing guidelines that incorporate intermediate sanctions. The Office of Community Corrections was charged with development and implementation of intermediate sanctions.

### Consistency with Massachusetts Sentencing Commission

Pursuant to G. L. c. 211F, § 2(c) the executive director of the Office of Community Corrections shall work in consultation with the [sentencing] commission...to ensure consistency between sentencing guidelines and community corrections.

### Intermediate Sanction Levels

The Office of Community Corrections adopted Intermediate Sanction Levels 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...” Community Justice Support Centers are designed to facilitate the intensive supervision of offenders, delivering integrated services and sanctions which correspond to intermediate sanction levels three and four.

In April 2018, the Sentencing Commission released revised guidelines that dispensed with the Intermediate Sanction Levels and instead referenced only the imposition of intermediate sanctions. The

law provides that programs developed by the OCC be used as intermediate sanctions for those that are justice involved.

### **2018 Criminal Justice Reform**

In 2018 Massachusetts adopted two comprehensive criminal justice reform bills that impacted the Office of Community Corrections by expanding access to Support Centers. Specifically, the reforms created statutory authority for:

1. courts to order participation in Support Center programs at the pretrial phase of a case either with or without the consent of the defendant,
2. probation officers to refer people that are subject to probation supervision to Support Centers to satisfy conditions of probation under certain circumstances, and
3. for probation officers to refer people that are subject to probation supervision to Support Centers to get any help they need on a voluntary basis.

Further statutory authority was granted through appropriations to the Office of Community Corrections to develop the Gants Reentry Services Program so that those returning to the community after a period of incarceration can access resources at the Support Center.

### **Sentencing to community corrections**

Pursuant to G. L. c. 211F, § 3 (a) “Any court exercising jurisdiction is authorized to sentence any eligible offender to a community corrections program...” and that sentence is imposed, “...as a condition of probation...”

### **Referral to community corrections for reentry**

Pursuant to G. L. c. 211F, §4 (c) “...the resources of community corrections programs shall be utilized by the parole board for the purpose of parole supervision.” Furthermore, statutory authority has been granted to the OCC through appropriations for the Gants Re-entry Services Program which provides support to those returning to the community after a period of incarceration on a voluntary basis.

## **Mandated Reporting Items**

### **(a) the performance standards used to assess the success of Community Justice Support Centers (Support Centers);**

Support Centers are operated via Interdepartmental Service Agreement (ISA) with county sheriff's department or contract with community-based service providers. Requests for Response/Proposal are issued for agreements required to operate Support Centers. The OCC evaluates the success of the Support Center using the following criteria:

- 1.) Contractor's fidelity to the agreement,
- 2.) Performance measures of participants (attendance, drug test results, etc.),
- 3.) Community and stakeholder considerations, and
- 4.) Outcomes of intermediate sanction (Intensive Supervision with Treatment) participants.

### **A note about evaluating the Community Justice Support Center based on participant performance.**

The OCC works with community-based partners to ensure that the interventions delivered at each Support Center are evidence-based and administered with fidelity to the underlying research. Because Support Centers constitute an interdepartmental and inter-branch collaboration, the relative "success" of a Support Center is dependent on some factors beyond the control of the OCC and its contracted vendors of service.

The data presented here are influenced not only by the rehabilitative interventions made at the Support Center, but by the supervision decisions made by the probation, parole, or corrections officer that supervises the case. Therefore, it is insufficient to rely on these data alone to evaluate performance of the Support Center; rather, the Support Center are evaluated by these data in combination with the professional oversight undertaken by OCC Regional Program Managers.

Regional Program Managers conduct weekly Support Center visits in which they attend clinical and multidisciplinary team meetings, conduct meetings with stakeholders, review case files and interact with Support Center staff, probation and parole officers, sheriff's departments, prosecution and defense bar and program participants. Through this management structure, the OCC plays an active role in monitoring contract compliance and promotes criminal justice collaboration.

---

**(b) a description of how each Community Justice Support Center rates based on performance and utilization data;**

The following data are derived from weekly utilization reports submitted to the OCC by Community Justice Support Center managers pursuant to agreements for Program Management. The data represent active participants in FY 2026 to date (July 2025 through January 2026). Weekly utilization reports include case level data regarding all Support Center participants. Data categories include:

***Intake***

- Center
- First and last name
- Unique identifier (typically Probation Central File number)
- Admission date
- Gender
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Date of birth
- Education level
- Job status at intake
- Referring agency
- Pathway to the Support Center
- Risk for re-offending level upon intake

***Programming***

- Hours of program orientation required/attended
- Number of days required/attended at the center
- Hours of cognitive behavioral treatment (CBT) required/attended
- Hours of educational groups required/attended
- Hours of job groups required/attended
- Hours of other groups required/attended
- Hours of technology education service required/attended
- Hours of community service required/attended

***Drug Testing***

- Number of positive drug tests and type
- Number of positive drug tests with a current and verified prescription and type
- Number of negative drug tests
- Number of positive and negative Breath Alcohol Tests (BAT)
- Number of times the participant failed to produce a valid drug testing sample
- Number of times the participant failed to show for required drug testing

***Employment and Education***

- Employment achieved while at the center
- HiSET/GED achieved while at the center
- Number of clinical behavioral interventions taken

***Discharge***

- Discharge date
- Reason for discharge
- Risk for re-offending level upon discharge
- Job status at discharge

**1. Participant Performance Data: Participant Compliance and Achievement**

Site	Programming Attendance Rate <sup>2</sup>	Community Service Attendance Rate <sup>2</sup>	Drug Testing Compliance Rate <sup>3</sup>
Barnstable	80.9%	72.4%	81.3%
Boston	77.2%	78.5%	72.4%
Brockton	80.3%	64.3%	78.2%
Dartmouth	70.7%	33.3%	78.3%
Fitchburg	73.9%	100.0%	65.8%
Framingham	69.9%	48.9%	69.7%
Greenfield	97.7%	N/A	87.0%
Haverhill	75.3%	72.9%	82.4%
Lawrence	69.0%	71.9%	77.3%
Lowell	71.7%	55.2%	75.1%
Northampton	87.5%	77.8%	76.6%
Pittsfield	85.0%	86.4%	81.7%
Plymouth	89.8%	75.5%	77.6%
Quincy	81.9%	61.4%	70.0%
Springfield	75.0%	53.5%	55.3%
Taunton	78.7%	87.3%	78.4%
Woburn	89.3%	67.0%	87.8%
Worcester	80.6%	N/A	70.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>64.1%</b>	<b>74.1%</b>

\*Greenfield and Worcester have not engaged any participants in Community Service in FY26 to date.

Site	HiSET	Job Placement
Barnstable	0	0
Boston	0	7
Brockton	7	15
Dartmouth	1	3
Fitchburg	1	10
Framingham	0	4
Greenfield	0	3
Haverhill	0	0
Lawrence	0	0
Lowell	0	2
Northampton	0	2
Pittsfield	4	5
Plymouth	7	3
Quincy	8	10
Springfield	0	1
Taunton	2	4
Woburn	0	0
Worcester	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>70</b>

<sup>2</sup> The programming and community service attendance rates are calculated by dividing the number of hours attended by the number of hours required. Only IST or Pretrial Treatment pathway participants are included in this calculation because their engagement in programming and community service is required to address specific criminogenic needs/risk factors for recidivism.

<sup>3</sup> Drug testing compliance is defined as mandatory pathway (IST, Pretrial Treatment, Pretrial Services, and Probation Referral (For Court-Ordered Program)) participants achieving a negative drug test, a negative Breath Alcohol Test, or a positive drug test with a valid prescription.

**2. Participant Performance Data: Average Number of Cognitive Behavioral Treatment (CBT) Hours<sup>4</sup> Attended per Participant, per Week**

Listed Alphabetically

Site	Average CBT Hours Attended per Week <sup>5</sup>
Barnstable	1.9
Boston	1.6
Brockton	3.3
Dartmouth	2.7
Fitchburg	3.0
Framingham	1.5
Greenfield	2.1
Haverhill	3.2
Lawrence	2.0
Lowell	1.9
Northampton	2.7
Pittsfield	3.1
Plymouth	2.9
Quincy	2.1
Springfield	2.2
Taunton	2.3
Woburn	2.4
Worcester	1.8
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.3</b>

Listed By Rank Order

Site	Average CBT Hours Attended per Week <sup>5</sup>
Brockton	3.3
Haverhill	3.2
Pittsfield	3.1
Fitchburg	3.0
Plymouth	2.9
Northampton	2.7
Dartmouth	2.7
Woburn	2.4
Taunton	2.3
Springfield	2.2
Quincy	2.1
Greenfield	2.1
Lawrence	2.0
Barnstable	1.9
Lowell	1.9
Worcester	1.8
Boston	1.6
Framingham	1.5
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.3</b>

<sup>4</sup> Cognitive Behavioral Treatment (CBT) hours are the number of hours in which evidence-based, manualized CBT curricula are delivered through programming to each participant to address specific criminogenic needs/risk factors for recidivism (e.g., substance use disorder, decision making) identified through risk/need assessment.

<sup>5</sup> Only active IST or Pretrial Treatment pathway participants are included in this calculation as those are the only pathways in which CBT programming is required.

**3. Utilization Data: Average Number of IST and Pretrial Treatment Participants Attended Each Center, per Week<sup>6</sup>**

Listed Alphabetically

<b>Site</b>	<b>Average Participants Per Week</b>
Barnstable	12.0
Boston	42.2
Brockton	28.7
Dartmouth	21.3
Fitchburg	31.6
Framingham	12.1
Greenfield	35.9
Haverhill	4.3
Lawrence	5.1
Lowell	22.8
Northampton	6.7
Pittsfield	24.3
Plymouth	19.3
Quincy	35.4
Springfield	38.1
Taunton	10.0
Woburn	10.7
Worcester	38.2
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>22.1</b>

Listed By Rank Order

<b>Site</b>	<b>Average Participants Per Week</b>
Boston	42.2
Worcester	38.2
Springfield	38.1
Greenfield	35.9
Quincy	35.4
Fitchburg	31.6
Brockton	28.7
Pittsfield	24.3
Lowell	22.8
Dartmouth	21.3
Plymouth	19.3
Framingham	12.1
Barnstable	12.0
Woburn	10.7
Taunton	10.0
Northampton	6.7
Lawrence	5.1
Haverhill	4.3
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>22.1</b>

<sup>6</sup> Only IST or Pretrial Treatment pathway participants are included in this calculation because they are the only pathways that provide an evidence-based alternative to incarceration.

**4. Rating Table**

Site	Programming Attendance Rank	Community Service Attendance Rank	Drug Testing Compliance Rank	HiSET Completion Rank	Job Placement Rank	Average CBT Hours Attended Rank	Average Participants Per Week Rank	Composite Rating
Barnstable	7	8	5	8	14	14	13	<b>9.9</b>
Boston	11	4	13	8	4	17	1	<b>8.3</b>
Brockton	9	11	8	2	1	1	7	<b>5.6</b>
Dartmouth	16	16	7	6	8	7	10	<b>10.0</b>
Fitchburg	14	1	17	6	2	4	6	<b>7.1</b>
Framingham	17	15	16	8	6	18	12	<b>13.1</b>
Greenfield	1	N/A	2	8	7	12	4	<b>5.7</b>
Haverhill	12	7	3	8	14	2	18	<b>9.1</b>
Lawrence	15	9	10	8	14	13	17	<b>12.3</b>
Lowell	15	13	12	8	10	15	9	<b>11.7</b>
Northampton	4	5	11	8	10	6	16	<b>8.6</b>
Pittsfield	5	3	4	4	5	3	8	<b>4.6</b>
Plymouth	2	6	9	2	8	5	11	<b>6.1</b>
Quincy	6	12	15	1	2	11	5	<b>7.4</b>
Springfield	13	14	18	8	12	10	3	<b>11.1</b>
Taunton	10	2	6	5	6	9	15	<b>7.6</b>
Woburn	3	10	1	8	14	8	14	<b>8.3</b>
Worcester	8	N/A	14	8	12	16	2	<b>10.0</b>

\*Greenfield and Worcester have not engaged any participants in Community Service in FY26 to date.

**Composite Rating by Rank Order**

Pittsfield	4.6
Brockton	5.6
Greenfield	5.7
Plymouth	6.1
Fitchburg	7.1
Quincy	7.4
Taunton	7.6
Boston	8.3
Woburn	8.3
Northampton	8.6
Haverhill	9.1
Barnstable	9.9
Dartmouth	10.0
Worcester	10.0
Springfield	11.1
Lowell	11.7
Lawrence	12.3
Framingham	13.1

**(c) the amount of each contract awarded to Community Justice Support Centers on a per client-day basis;**

The tables below provide information about the cost of each Community Justice Support Center. The Support Center is funded either by a contract with a community-based service provider or an interdepartmental service agreement (ISA) with the county sheriff's department.

The cost per participant, per day was calculated as follows:

1. The total cost was divided by fifty-two (52) to determine a cost per week
2. The cost per week was divided by the average number of participants per week to determine an average cost per participant, per week
3. The average cost per participant, per week was divided by six (6) days per week to determine a cost per day.

PLEASE NOTE: The cost per participant per day is an approximation due to the variation in services required by each participant. Participants may engage with the Support Center for programming, pretrial check-ins, drug testing, and case management up to six days per week, depending on their individual needs. Ralph Gants Project participants typically engage with the Support Center on an ad-hoc basis to address specific needs rather than to pursue a program of rehabilitation.

<b>Site</b>	<b>FY26 projected cost</b>	<b>FYTD 26 average participants per week<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>Cost per participant, per day</b>
Barnstable	\$1,321,612.00	18.3	\$231.59
Boston	\$1,751,732.00	57.4	\$97.89
Brockton	\$1,537,589.00	46.9	\$105.14
Dartmouth	\$1,514,600.00	24.1	\$201.46
Fitchburg	\$888,471.00	74.5	\$38.25
Framingham	\$1,414,658.00	16.1	\$281.12
Greenfield	\$858,658.00	48.5	\$56.80
Haverhill	\$1,307,869.00	9.6	\$436.07
Lawrence	\$1,401,267.00	14.9	\$301.36
Lowell	\$1,371,556.00	40.1	\$109.64
Northampton	\$931,279.00	13.6	\$219.27
Pittsfield	\$1,519,163.00	39.9	\$122.12
Plymouth	\$1,533,767.00	25.9	\$190.02
Quincy	\$1,534,005.00	51.1	\$96.28
Springfield	\$1,378,210.00	56.7	\$77.89
Taunton	\$1,289,235.00	23.4	\$176.93
Woburn	\$1,462,853.00	23.9	\$196.42
Worcester	\$1,019,735.00	48.8	\$67.01
<b>TOTAL/AVERAGE</b>	<b>\$24,036,259.00</b>	<b>35.2</b>	<b>\$166.96</b>

<sup>7</sup> Average participants per week in this table includes all individuals who participated in Community Justice Support Center programming or services.

**(d) standards for terminating contracts with underperforming Community Justice Support Centers;**

Pursuant to G.L. ch. 211F § 4 the Executive Director reserves the right to place any Community Justice Support Center under the administrative control of the OCC due to noncompliance with OCC program standards, or in the interest of public safety.

The OCC shall move to terminate contracts with Support Center vendors when:

1. The failure of a contractor to perform represents an immediate threat to the public safety;
2. The performance of a contractor deviates from the agreement so substantially as to defeat the purpose of the contract;
3. The contractor fails to make a good-faith effort to resolve an allegation of contract noncompliance after repeated attempts to do so by the OCC;
4. A funding appropriation is not renewed;
5. A funding appropriation to the OCC is reduced thereby rendering the contracted services inconsistent with the priority to implement intermediate sanctions in a manner that has the greatest impact on promoting the public safety;
6. Exigent circumstances render some portion of the contractor's performance impossible due to loss.

If the OCC alleges an incident of noncompliance due to the quality of performance, the OCC shall exhaust all reasonable measures to resolve contractor noncompliance before seeking to terminate the agreement.

**(e) a plan for increasing the use of Community Justice Support Centers by the courts, the department of correction, and the sheriffs;**

The core elements of the OCC's plan to increase the use of Support Centers remain unchanged:

1. Communication from the inside out. Messaging about the Support Centers begins with a focus on the core value shared across stakeholders of enhancing community safety and progresses to how and what Support Centers do to achieve positive outcomes.
  - a. *Why*- Enhance community safety.
  - b. *How*- Deploy Evidence-Based Practices that are innovative and motivational to change behavior.
  - c. *What*- Facilitate enhanced supervision for probationers, parolees and pre-release participants that are at high-risk for recidivism.
2. Engage stakeholders. Deliver the message of the Support Centers to stakeholders at every level of the criminal justice system including judges, lawyers, probation and parole officers, sheriff's departments, victim's services, and community-based treatment and service providers.
3. Create a results-oriented culture. Articulate goals, measure progress, cascade success, link success to incentives, and communicate success/challenges.

Highlights of progress in FY26 include the following:

***Expansion of Re-entry Services***

The OCC is committed to assisting previously incarcerated individuals as they navigate their return to the community. Through the Ralph Gants Project, the OCC has assisted 1,485 voluntary participants in FY26 so far and made 3,807 connections and referrals to community-based services to address housing, identification, healthcare, food, clothing, substance use treatment, employment, and education.

Beginning September 23, 2024, the OCC and the Massachusetts Probation Service (MPS) Field Services Division launched a pilot program to encourage utilization of the Community Justice Support Centers as a resource for voluntary treatment and assistance with responsibility needs. The probation pilot focused on referrals for people transitioning from custody to probation as well as people currently on risk/need probation that have assessed as moderate to very-high risk. Probation Officers have made 809 referrals for voluntary services through the Gants Project so far in FY26.

***Federal Appointment***

The Reentry Services Coordinator at the Brockton Community Justice Support Center was appointed to a two-year term as a member of the US Sentencing Commission's Sentence Impact Advisory Group. As an Advisory Group member, his duties include reviewing and revising guidelines, providing views on the Commission's "activities and work," and helping to disseminate information on federal sentencing issues. Mr. Anderson was a former participant at the Brockton CJSC.

***Cultural Competency***

OCC managers continued to meet for quarterly training sessions facilitated by field experts in a series called, "What's the DEIL: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Leadership." The most recent What's the DEIL session in January 2026 viewed ["Seeing Red: Changing the Narrative"](#) and facilitated a discussion around acknowledging and supporting Support Center clients of color who have had experiences in the juvenile justice system.

The Woburn Community Justice Support Center was a Trial Court Cultural Appreciation Week Signature Site on October 23, 2025. As a Signature Site, the Woburn CJSC hosted a celebration of the communities' cultures and diversity through art, food, and conversation. They featured two keynote speakers: María Teresa Nagel, Director of the City Somerville Office of Immigrant Affairs; and Mathematics, a motivational influencer, recovery consultant, community activist, and spiritual advisor who uses his lived with addiction, recovery, prison to inspire and uplift others.

### ***Training***

The OCC continues to increase training opportunities for Support Center staff. Almost all OCC Program Managers are certified Motivational Interviewing (MI) trainers and seven are certified ORAS trainers. Enabling OCC staff to be MI and ORAS trainers improves the capacity for Support Center staff to be trained more quickly when hired. As part of this effort, the OCC offers monthly drug testing trainings, four basic MI training, four intermediate MI trainings, four MI skill building sessions, at least three Treatment Planning and Goals for Transition trainings, at least two Promoting Awareness of Motivational Incentives (PAMI) trainings, and regular ORAS education sessions to Support Center staff each calendar year.

### ***Partnership with UMass Chan Medical School***

In FY26, the Office of Community Corrections continued its partnership with the University of Massachusetts (UMass) Chan Medical School, Implementation Science & Practice Advances Research Center. UMass Chan works with community justice support centers to ensure fidelity to evidence-based practice in the following key areas:

1. **Risk/Need assessment.** Tracking interrater reliability of the administration of a fourth-generation Risk/Need Assessment (ORAS-CST);
2. **Treatment matching.** Monitoring the reliability with which Support Center staff are engaging participants in the type of programming that addresses their needs based on the risk/need assessment; and
3. **Cognitive-behavioral treatment.** Monitoring and informing the use of best practices in delivery of CBT in a group session.

Between July 2025 and January 2026, UMass Chan worked with ten Community Justice Support Centers across the Commonwealth. The first year of targeted Implementation Support began at three of the ten sites in July 2025 and a second year of implementation support was carried out at the other seven sites, with one wrapping up in November 2025. Currently, UMass Chan is tracking 156 participants at Support Centers through Intensive Supervision with Treatment and Pretrial with Treatment pathways.

In September 2025, 58 Support Center staff completed a survey on readiness to implement Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) as well as three RNR-related practices, the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS), ORAS-informed treatment planning, and cognitive-behavioral groups. Twenty-one staff also completed a training on the Foundations of Risk-Need-Responsivity. Between October and December 2025, 15 staff completed an interview on ORAS administration, treatment planning, and CBT groups at their Support Centers. Since August 2025, 26 total supports have been deployed across Support Centers in their second year of implementation support. Observations of cognitive behavioral therapy groups began in late-January 2026.

### ***Community Advisory Board (CAB)***

UMass Chan also facilitates a Community Advisory Board (CAB) for the Community Justice Support Centers. The CAB comprises eight members all of whom have previous experience in the criminal justice system. The CAB has been meeting since August 2024 and conducts monthly meetings wherein CAB members review Support Center policies, procedures, and initiatives. CAB members have helped revise

Support Center Participant Handbooks, reviewed new curricula, and discussed other policy initiatives at Support Centers. Engaging the voices of those affected by the system is a best practice to ensure that policies, procedures, and initiatives at the Support Center have the desired impact on program participants.

### ***Community Outreach***

From September to November 2025, all 18 Support Centers held Open Houses for members of the community, current partners, and potential partners. Open Houses are opportunities for people to engage with the Support Center's community-based providers to network and learn more about the services offered at center.

### ***Participant Recognition***

In the Spring of 2026, all Support Centers across the state will conduct recognition ceremonies featuring the accomplishments of participants and the time and commitment of community-based partner agencies and volunteers. In addition to the recognized participants, these ceremonies are attended by their families, local judges, probation officers, community-based partner agencies, and Support Center staff.

### **Conclusion**

As of this date, March 3, 2026, the OCC reports that all contractors are in compliance with their respective agreements with the OCC.

## Appendices

### Appendix A. FYTD 26 Mandatory/Supervised Pathway Admissions

Site	IST	Pretrial Treatment	Pretrial Services	Probation Referral	Total Admissions
Barnstable	10	4	6	3	23
Boston	33	8	15	1	57
Brockton	27	8	18	4	57
Dartmouth	18	0	0	0	18
Fitchburg	23	2	13	2	40
Framingham	10	7	11	2	30
Greenfield	52	5	14	10	81
Haverhill	5	0	1	3	9
Lawrence	6	2	2	0	10
Lowell	26	4	3	8	41
Northampton	6	7	9	2	24
Pittsfield	27	2	17	0	46
Plymouth	14	2	3	0	19
Quincy	27	3	18	7	55
Springfield	50	12	13	0	75
Taunton	13	0	2	2	17
Woburn	5	8	5	3	21
Worcester	28	7	16	0	51
<b>Total Admissions</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>674</b>

**Appendix B. FYTD 26 Mandatory/Supervised Pathway Discharges by Support Center and Reason**

Site	Achieved Goals for Transition	Achieved Supervision Requirements	Administrative Discharge							Total Discharges
			Deceased	Placed in Treatment	Released to Parole	Sentence Expiration	Supervision Conditions Amended	Unable to Continue Due to Medical Reasons	Criminal Justice Discharge	
Barnstable	1	5	0	1	0	2	2	0	5	4
Boston	2	10	0	0	0	4	12	0	16	21
Brockton	8	11	0	0	0	4	7	1	12	32
Dartmouth	1	1	0	1	0	5	5	0	11	16
Fitchburg	3	14	0	0	0	4	7	0	11	16
Framingham	2	10	0	2	0	4	4	0	10	11
Greenfield	3	14	1	0	16	7	4	0	28	14
Haverhill	0	3	0	0	0	4	4	0	8	3
Lawrence	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	8
Lowell	0	5	0	0	0	9	10	0	19	13
Northampton	3	11	0	0	0	2	4	0	6	10
Pittsfield	6	2	0	7	0	5	4	0	16	23
Plymouth	4	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	11
Quincy	3	12	1	5	0	4	11	0	21	30
Springfield	7	22	0	0	0	9	21	0	30	32
Taunton	2	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	6	7
Woburn	2	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	11
Worcester	0	9	0	0	0	11	5	0	16	18
<b>Total Discharges</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>280</b>

### ***Community Justice Support Center Reasons for Discharge***

<b>Reason For Discharge</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Achieved Goals for Transition</b>	The participant met all supervision goals and successfully transitioned to standard supervision.
<b>Achieved Supervision Requirements</b>	The participant completed court-ordered requirements.  <i>Note:</i> Pretrial Services and Pretrial Treatment referrals may have successfully ended when there was a disposition if they appeared at their hearings without a criminal justice intervention. This includes when the case is dismissed, the participant is ordered to IST or another type of probation supervision, or the participant is sentenced to incarceration.
<b>Administrative Discharge</b>	The participant did not successfully complete requirements nor transition from the Center but instead was discharged for reasons that did not involve a criminal justice intervention. (See subcategories below.)
<b>Criminal Justice Discharge</b>	The participant did not successfully complete requirements due to a criminal justice intervention such as new criminal conduct or incarceration.
<b>Ineligible per Policy/ Statute</b>	The participant is not eligible for participation at the Support Center. Ineligibility may be due to an exclusionary offense (per MGL 211F Section 3) or a low score on a risk/needs assessment.

### ***Administrative Discharge Subcategories***

<b>Reason for Discharge</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Deceased</b>	The participant was deceased.
<b>Placed in Treatment</b>	The participant was placed in treatment.
<b>Released to Parole</b>	The participant's participation at the Support Center ended due to release to parole.
<b>Sentence Expiration</b>	The participant's criminal justice sentence expired or wrapped up.
<b>Supervision Conditions Amended</b>	The participant's conditions were amended or removed to terminate participation at the Support Center.
<b>Unable to Continue Due to Medical Reasons</b>	The participant was unable to continue due to medical issues.

**Appendix C. Supervision Support Services Offered to Non-Community Justice Support Center Participants in FYTD 26**

<b>Services Provided</b>	<b># People Served/ Visits Q1</b>	<b># People Served/ Visits Q2</b>
<b>Drug Testing</b>		
Standard supervision drug testing for probationers	10,970	11,879
Standard supervision drug testing for parolees	1	3
<b>DNA Testing</b>		
State police DNA testing	2	0
<b>Group or Program</b>		
Men's Awareness groups	17	12
IPAEP	469	352
Fatherhood groups	6	36
Nurturing Fathers	5	6
Changing Lives Through Literature	29	0
<b>Meeting Site</b>		
Probation Officers meetings with probationers	569	547
Parole Officers meetings with parolees	65	52
BHJI Initiative meeting	5	6
ELMO meetings with probationers	1	0
Advocates evaluations for probationers (Woburn)	8	4
Quarterly Working Group (Springfield)	0	5
Pretrial Services Staff Meeting (Springfield)	0	6
Regional Probation Chief's Meeting (Springfield)	25	0
MassAbility meeting with probationers and parolees	19	16
Probation Chief's Meeting (Northampton)	0	11
Department of Corrections staff meeting	10	0
<b>Other</b>		
Transportation for PSC & IPAEP participants (Pittsfield)	4	11
Industrial Readiness Training	0	3
Addiction Fundamentals Training for probation staff	34	0
Wardrobe on Wheels (Worcester)	56	0
<b>Total People Served / Visits in FY26</b>	<b>12,295</b>	<b>12,949</b>