

**A Report on the Office of Community Corrections
in FY 2025**

Mandated by the 2024 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, Director
Janice Neiman, Program Manager for Performance Metrics

March, 2025

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 140 of the Acts of 2024, 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 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 Community Service Program to help those subject to probation supervision engage with community partners as volunteers in lieu of incarceration and allow those engaged in programming at Support Centers to practice skills they have learned.

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:

Mandatory/Supervised Pathways

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 responsivity 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.

Voluntary Pathways/Ralph Gants Project

1. Probation Referral (Upon Agreement)

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. Because participation at the Support Center is voluntary through this pathway, the Support Center does not report the individual's progress with the supervising agency.

2. Re-entry Services

The Ralph Gants Project (RGP) provides services to those that are justice involved on a voluntary basis. Through RGP, any person that has been formerly incarcerated can come to a Support Center for help with anything they need to stay safe in their community. The Re-entry Services Coordinator at the Support Center can help a person get a state ID, engage with housing services, get a GED/HiSET, 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.

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.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Office of Community Corrections is the establishment of intermediate sanctions which offer a continuum of sanctions and services for probation, parole, sheriffs, and the Department of Correction. This interagency and community collaboration supports public safety.

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. Upon the execution of appropriate agreements, 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 our partners to ensure that the interventions delivered at each Support Center are evidence-based and administered with fidelity to the underlying research. The evidence is clear that incorporating practices like Motivational Interviewing, Risk/Need/Responsivity, Treatment Matching, Contingency Management, and Manualized Cognitive Behavioral Therapy can reduce recidivism. However, 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 (RPM).

RPMs 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 2025 to date (July 2024 through January 2025). 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 recidivism 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 recidivism level upon discharge
- Job status at discharge

1. Participant Performance Data: Participant Compliance and Achievement

Site	Programming Attendance Rate ¹	Community Service Attendance Rate	Drug Testing Compliance Rate ²
Barnstable	73.0%	N/A	68.2%
Boston	75.9%	75.6%	62.8%
Brockton	80.3%	61.4%	80.1%
Dartmouth	65.7%	71.8%	67.6%
Fitchburg	71.1%	42.8%	61.2%
Framingham	83.7%	74.4%	87.2%
Greenfield	94.7%	N/A	76.1%
Haverhill	84.4%	75.1%	79.1%
Lawrence	86.3%	77.6%	79.2%
Lowell	81.5%	62.8%	85.9%
Northampton	85.2%	56.5%	81.0%
Pittsfield	84.5%	74.4%	84.8%
Plymouth	86.0%	67.2%	84.7%
Quincy	84.4%	64.4%	69.1%
Springfield	65.2%	30.5%	49.5%
Taunton	84.6%	58.5%	83.2%
Woburn	91.3%	74.7%	81.2%
Worcester	76.0%	44.4%	57.7%
TOTAL	79.6%	60.5%	73.1%

Site	HiSET	Job Placement
Barnstable	0	1
Boston	1	2
Brockton	7	15
Dartmouth	1	2
Fitchburg	0	4
Framingham	3	8
Greenfield	4	5
Haverhill	0	3
Lawrence	0	2
Lowell	6	2
Northampton	0	8
Pittsfield	6	13
Plymouth	1	8
Quincy	1	4
Springfield	1	0
Taunton	4	4
Woburn	1	0
Worcester	0	0
TOTAL	36	81

¹ The programming attendance rate is calculated by dividing the number of programming hours attended by the number of programming hours required. Only IST or Pretrial Treatment pathway participants are included in this calculation because their engagement is required.

² Drug testing compliance is defined as mandatory pathway 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 Therapy (CBT) Hours³
 Attended per Participant, per Week

Listed Alphabetically

Site	Average CBT Hours Attended per Week ⁴
Barnstable	2.0
Boston	2.0
Brockton	3.1
Dartmouth	2.4
Fitchburg	3.0
Framingham	2.1
Greenfield	2.3
Haverhill	3.3
Lawrence	2.3
Lowell	2.0
Northampton	2.9
Pittsfield	3.1
Plymouth	3.3
Quincy	2.5
Springfield	2.2
Taunton	2.9
Woburn	2.9
Worcester	1.3
TOTAL/AVERAGE	2.5

Listed By Rank Order

Site	Average CBT Hours Attended per Week ⁵
Plymouth	3.3
Haverhill	3.3
Pittsfield	3.1
Brockton	3.1
Fitchburg	3.0
Northampton	2.9
Taunton	2.9
Woburn	2.9
Quincy	2.5
Dartmouth	2.4
Greenfield	2.3
Lawrence	2.3
Springfield	2.2
Framingham	2.1
Boston	2.0
Lowell	2.0
Barnstable	2.0
Worcester	1.3
TOTAL/AVERAGE	2.5

³ Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (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.

⁴ 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 Attending Each Center per Week⁵

Listed Alphabetically

Site	Average Participants Per Week
Barnstable	9.8
Boston	34.1
Brockton	29.3
Dartmouth	16.7
Fitchburg	20.8
Framingham	21.8
Greenfield	40.7
Haverhill	13.7
Lawrence	11.3
Lowell	17.9
Northampton	13.1
Pittsfield	41.1
Plymouth	11.9
Quincy	29.1
Springfield	43.2
Taunton	7.9
Woburn	9.6
Worcester	21.3
TOTAL/AVERAGE	21.8

Listed By Rank Order

Site	Average Participants Per Week
Springfield	43.2
Pittsfield	41.1
Greenfield	40.7
Boston	34.1
Brockton	29.3
Quincy	29.1
Framingham	21.8
Worcester	21.3
Fitchburg	20.8
Lowell	17.9
Dartmouth	16.7
Haverhill	13.7
Northampton	13.1
Plymouth	11.9
Lawrence	11.3
Barnstable	9.8
Woburn	9.6
Taunton	7.9
TOTAL/AVERAGE	21.8

⁵ Only IST or Pretrial Treatment pathway participants are included in this calculation because they are the only pathways that provide an EBP 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	15	17	13	13	15	17	16	15.1
Boston	14	2	15	7	11	15	4	9.7
Brockton	12	11	8	1	1	4	5	6.0
Dartmouth	17	7	14	7	11	10	11	11.0
Fitchburg	16	15	16	13	7	5	9	11.6
Framingham	10	6	1	6	3	14	7	6.7
Greenfield	1	17	11	4	6	11	3	7.6
Haverhill	8	3	10	13	10	2	12	8.3
Lawrence	3	1	9	13	11	12	15	9.1
Lowell	11	10	2	2	11	16	10	8.9
Northampton	5	13	7	13	3	6	13	8.6
Pittsfield	7	5	3	2	2	3	2	3.4
Plymouth	4	8	4	7	3	1	14	5.9
Quincy	9	9	12	7	7	9	6	8.4
Springfield	18	16	18	7	16	13	1	12.7
Taunton	6	12	5	4	7	7	18	8.4
Woburn	2	4	6	7	16	8	17	8.6
Worcester	13	14	17	13	16	18	8	14.1

Composite Rating by Rank Order

Pittsfield	3.4
Plymouth	5.9
Brockton	6.0
Framingham	6.7
Greenfield	7.6
Haverhill	8.3
Quincy	8.4
Taunton	8.4
Northampton	8.6
Woburn	8.6
Lowell	8.9
Lawrence	9.1
Boston	9.7
Dartmouth	11.0
Fitchburg	11.6
Springfield	12.7
Worcester	14.1
Barnstable	15.1

(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 and 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.

Site	FY25 projected cost	FYTD 25 average participants per week ⁶	Cost per participant, per day
Barnstable	\$1,288,548.00	15.1	\$272.90
Boston	\$1,709,453.00	44.3	\$123.59
Brockton	\$1,471,385.00	53.9	\$87.44
Dartmouth	\$1,422,292.00	20.3	\$224.93
Fitchburg	\$867,130.00	32.4	\$83.63
Framingham	\$1,369,488.00	25.2	\$174.18
Greenfield	\$738,137.00	49.1	\$48.18
Haverhill	\$1,245,301.00	17.7	\$225.50
Lawrence	\$1,390,928.00	19.8	\$225.54
Lowell	\$1,325,006.00	28.0	\$151.49
Northampton	\$907,762.00	22.2	\$130.86
Pittsfield	\$1,409,190.00	52.7	\$85.65
Plymouth	\$1,486,703.00	23.5	\$203.06
Quincy	\$1,485,690.00	49.3	\$96.52
Springfield	\$1,341,977.00	96.4	\$44.60
Taunton	\$1,209,124.00	13.1	\$295.08
Woburn	\$1,396,323.00	30.7	\$145.78
Worcester	\$992,579.00	37.0	\$86.06
TOTAL/AVERAGE	\$23,057,016.00	35.0	\$150.43

⁶ Average participants per week in this table includes individuals who participated in Community Justice Support Center supervision or treatment through all pathways.

(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 FY25 include the following:

Expansion of Re-entry Services. The OCC is committed to assisting previously incarcerated individuals as they navigate re-entry services. Through the Ralph Gants Project, the OCC has assisted 909 re-entry and 124 voluntary probation referral clients and made 5,016 connections and referrals to community-based services such as housing, identification, food, clothing, substance use treatment, employment, and MassHealth.

Cultural Competency. In response to a burgeoning need, Support Centers now have a full Spanish-speaking program schedule from 9am-4pm along two evening sessions. This schedule provides culturally competent CBT programming statewide to address all criminogenic need domains via Spanish-speaking facilitators.

OCC managers continued to meet for quarterly training sessions in a series called, "What's the DEIL: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Leadership." Sessions are facilitated by field experts and topics covered topics have included equity for non-apparent disabilities, Native American history of local tribes, and identifying implicit bias in the workplace.

Training. The OCC continues to increase training opportunities for Support Center staff. Almost all OCC Program Managers are certified Motivational Interviewing (MI) trainers, and many are becoming certified ORAS trainers. Enabling OCC staff to be MI and ORAS trainers will increase the capacity for Support Center staff to be trained more quickly when hired. As part of this effort, the OCC offers monthly drug testing training to Support Center staff and four MI skill building sessions each calendar year.

In FY25, the OCC has introduced a new curriculum to its programming inventory called, "Reasoning and Rehabilitation." This interactive training addresses the Criminal Attitudes and Behavioral Patterns domain in the ORAS, which is an important supplement to the Support Centers' already robust programming to assist participants with their need areas.

Partnership with UMass Chan Medical School. In FY25, the Office of Community Corrections continued its partnership with the University of Massachusetts 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.

To further enhance Support Center's capacity to execute a Risk, Need, Responsivity model that reduces recidivism, UMass Chan is assisting the OCC to understand how its Community Service Program (CSP) can be reorganized to maintain its connection to the community while becoming more focused on building strengths in clients. In the past service projects were driven solely by demand in the community for volunteer support. While community needs are still an important part of the community service mission, aligning projects with the strengths of program participants enhances opportunities to reduce recidivism in the long run. This work requires enhanced training of community service employees including Risk, Need, Responsivity and Motivational Interviewing. This project is ongoing and has included surveys of staff, program participants, and other system stakeholders.

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 2024, 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 2025, 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, February 28, 2025, the OCC reports that all contractors are in compliance with their respective agreements with the OCC.

Appendix

1. FYTD 25 Mandatory/Supervised Pathway Admissions

Site	IST	Pretrial Treatment	Pretrial Services	Probation Referral	Total Admissions
Barnstable	14	9	0	1	24
Boston	34	8	20	1	63
Brockton	27	20	27	4	78
Dartmouth	8	1	8	0	17
Fitchburg	16	2	7	2	27
Framingham	20	6	6	0	32
Greenfield	48	3	19	5	75
Haverhill	10	1	3	2	16
Lawrence	13	8	12	0	33
Lowell	23	7	5	2	37
Northampton	12	14	10	1	37
Pittsfield	35	7	6	0	48
Plymouth	11	3	8	11	33
Quincy	22	3	19	11	55
Springfield	42	72	23	0	137
Taunton	11	3	1	3	18
Woburn	6	18	2	4	30
Worcester	24	2	13	4	43
Total Admissions	376	187	189	51	803

1. FYTD 25 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	Sentence Expiration	Release to Parole	Supervision Conditions Amended	Unable to Continue Due to Medical Reasons	Other	Criminal Justice Discharge	Ineligible per Policy/ Statute	
Barnstable	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	6	1	15
Boston	0	4	0	3	4	0	8	0	1	23	1	44
Brockton	5	6	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	42	2	59
Dartmouth	2	3	0	1	1	0	4	0	0	10	0	21
Fitchburg	1	6	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	12	0	22
Framingham	0	10	0	3	4	0	5	1	0	7	0	30
Greenfield	7	8	0	1	10	17	10	0	0	18	0	71
Haverhill	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	4	1	8
Lawrence	0	3	0	1	5	0	3	0	0	8	0	20
Lowell	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	0	0	3	1	11
Northampton	2	8	0	3	6	0	4	0	0	9	0	32
Pittsfield	18	10	0	0	5	0	10	0	0	21	0	64
Plymouth	1	7	0	3	2	0	4	1	0	6	0	24
Quincy	4	12	0	4	6	0	12	0	0	19	3	60
Springfield	1	3	0	2	8	0	62	0	0	41	2	119
Taunton	2	3	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	10	0	20
Woburn	3	18	1	0	2	0	5	0	0	14	2	45
Worcester	3	4	0	5	6	0	4	0	0	15	0	37
Total Discharges	49	105	1	34	67	17	144	3	1	268	13	702

Community Justice Support Center Reasons for Discharge

Reason For Discharge	Description
Achieved Goals for Transition	The participant met all supervision goals and successfully transitioned to standard supervision.
Achieved Supervision Requirements	The participant was not required to meet goals for transition, but successfully completed supervision requirements.
Administrative Discharge	The participant did not successfully complete requirements nor transition from the Support Center but instead was discharged for reasons that did not involve a criminal justice intervention. (See subcategories below.)
Criminal Justice Discharge	The participant did not successfully complete requirements due to a criminal justice intervention such as new criminal conduct or a non-criminal violation.
Completed Voluntary Program	The participant left the Support Center because they completed a program that was not court ordered.
Ineligible per Policy/ Statute	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

Reason for Discharge	Description
Deceased	The participant was deceased.
Placed in Treatment	The participant was placed in treatment.
Released to Parole	The participant's participation at the Support Center ended due to release to parole.
Sentence Expiration	The participant's criminal justice sentence expired or wrapped up.
Supervision Conditions Amended	The participant's conditions were amended or removed to terminate participation at the Support Center.
Unable to Continue Due to Medical Reasons	The participant was unable to continue due to medical issues.
Other	The participant was removed for any other non-criminal justice intervention reason(s) not previously mentioned.

3. Supervision Support Services Offered to Non-Community Justice Support Center Participants in FYTD 25

Services Provided	# People Served/ Visits Q1	# People Served/ Visits Q2
Drug Testing		
Standard supervision drug testing for probationers	10,941	10,579
Standard supervision drug testing for parolees	35	9
DNA Testing		
State police DNA testing	8	7
Group or Program		
Men's Awareness groups	13	15
IPAEP	554	477
Motherhood groups	19	41
Fatherhood groups	11	50
Nurturing Fathers	4	3
Meeting Site		
Probation Officers meetings with probationers	680	687
Parole Officers meetings with parolees	204	201
Probation Pretrial Services meeting	1	8
BHJI Initiative meeting	5	16
ADA's Office meeting (Greenfield)	3	0
ELMO meetings with probationers (Framingham)	4	3
MPS Meeting for Probation Staff (Framingham)	0	28
Probation Officer evening reporting (Brockton, Barnstable)	88	27
Other		
Transportation for PSC & IPAEP participants (Pittsfield)	21	76
Total People Served / Visits in FY25	12,591	12,227