

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MASSACHUSETTS REHABILITATION COMMISSION

FINAL REPORT OF 1973 TASK FORCE ON CORRECTIONS

RUSSELL E. O'CONNELL
COMMISSIONER OF REHABILITATION

APRIL 1974

MICROFICHE

42386
(Publication #8037 approved by
Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Definitions.	
1.	Public Offender.	1
2.	Behavioral Disorder.	
II	Basic Recommendations.	2
1.	MRC should provide services.	
2.	Specialist Counselors.	
3.	Fiscal autonomy.	
III	General Policy and Procedural Recommendations.	8
1.	Eligibility and Case Finding.	
a.	Sources of Referral.	
b.	Age.	
c.	Institutionalized Offenders including "lifers"	
d.	Ex-offenders.	
e.	Unofficial offenders.	
f.	Offenders with drug or alcohol addiction.	
2.	Diagnostic Evaluation.	9
a.	Mandatory Psychiatric exam.	
b.	Mandatory Psychological Evaluation.	
c.	Recommendations.	
3.	Role of the Counselor.	11
4.	Support Personnel.	12
a.	Staff of correctional institutions and agencies serviced by MRC.	
b.	Ex-offenders.	
c.	Non-offender paraprofessionals.	
d.	Junior Counselors.	
e.	Social Workers.	

NCJRS

JUL 12 1977

ACQUISITIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

5. Rehabilitation Training. _____	13
6 Job Placement and Follow up _____	13
7. Recommendations for Improved Statistical Reporting _____	14
IV. Regional Recommendations. _____	16
A Introduction	
1. Northeastern Massachusetts _____	17
a. Essex County	
b. Middlesex County	
2. Southeastern Massachusetts _____	20
3. Central Massachusetts _____	23
4. Western Massachusetts _____	25
5. Greater Boston Area _____	29
V Sources of Funding _____	33
1. Vocational Rehabilitation Act.	
a. Section 2 Funds	
b. Training Services Grants	
2. Other Sources.	
VI. Bibliography _____	36

Appendices

A. Program Recommendations by Individual Task Force Members.

1. Western Mass Region by Ray Lucas, Ed Bajgier, and Ken Sibley
2. Central Mass Region by Nelson Rahaim and Art Gillam.
3. North Shore Area (Essex County) by William Bartlett.
- 4 North Shore Area (middlesex County) by Jim Parker, Peter Slipp, and Armand Tousignant.
5. Statewide Recommendations by Thomas Allman.

FOREWARD

In January 1973, Commissioner O'Connell directed that a Correctional Task Force be established within the Commission to review the agency's policy and program of services to handicapped public offenders, and to address itself to the following specific questions:

- 1- Are we going to respond to the problems of handicapped offenders? If so, why and how are we to do so?
- 2- What should our policy be toward serving handicapped offenders?

The Commissioner also requested that the Task Force focus its attention on the development of a viable and relevant case service delivery system for handicapped offenders throughout the Commonwealth if the answer to question one above was affirmative. He specifically asked for the identification of service and staffing needs, establishment of a number of options in priority order, and a time-table for implementation.

The Task Force membership included approximately thirty-five professional staff at all levels from throughout the State. In addition to Mr. Gerard McCarthy, the Director of Client Services, the core of the Task Force consisted of Leo Long, Supervisor of Correctional Programs, who was the designated Chairman and the following staff members:

Thomas Allman	Larry Cable
Edward Bajgier	Anthony Colatrella
Joseph Fay	Arthur Gillam
Delia Johnson	Raymond Lucas
Alfred Pickett	Nelson Rahaim
Kenneth Sibley	

Other staff who participated in at least one or more of the seven (7) general and two (2) regional meetings were as follows:

William Bartlett	Roland Colella
Marthella Crawford	Paul Curry
Gary Donaldson	Brendan Fitzgerald
Larry Foster	Richard Goldberg
Shirley Miller	Brad Newman
Christine Panek	George Pappas
James Parker	Hal Paulsen
Michael Petrowicz	Randolph Picknarcik
Peter Slipp	Peter Tangalos
David Tarmey	Armand Tousignant

Summaries of each Task Force meeting were prepared by Leo Long with the assistance of Delia Johnson of the Research Unit with copies distributed to each participant.

The final report was assembled and drafted at two (2) meetings in the Natick Area Office by the following members of the Correctional Task Force: Ed Bajgier, Bill Bartlett, Larry Cable, Gary Donaldson, Art Gillam, Delia Johnson, Leo Long, Ray Lucas, Christine Panek, Ken Sibley and Peter Slipp.

The work of the Task Force was aided to a considerable degree by the participation of outside public and private agency correctional staff persons who provided the M.R.C. staff with ideas, suggestions and facts concerning offender needs at all levels of the criminal justice system. Those guests and their agency affiliation are as follows:

Mr. Stephen Blesofsky, Member of Massachusetts Parole Board
 Ms. Sally Bradt, Massachusetts Halfway Houses, Inc., Boston
 Ms. Jeanne Colbett, Counselor, Brooke House, 79 Chandler St., Boston
 Dr. Jonathan Ehrenworth, Chief Psychological Consultant, Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission.
 Mr. Joseph Foley, Deputy Commissioner of Probation, Massachusetts Probation Commission.
 Mr. Michael Hogan, Counselor, Brooke House, 79 Chandler Street, Boston
 Ms. Barbara Horowitz, Counselor, Brooke House, 79 Chandler Street, Boston
 Mr. Bruce Ledgerwood, Department of Corrections (Liasion with Mass . Rehabilitation Commission and Coordinator of Vocational Education Program
 Mr. Jerry Locchi, Industrial Relations Director, Boston Court Resource Project, 14 Somerset Street, Boston
 Mr. Fred Miller, Learning Systems Inc., 120 Boylston Street, Boston
 Mr. Angelo Musto, Deputy Commission of Probation, Massachusetts Probation Commission.
 A. E. Palchanis (Ph.D.), Clinical Psychologist, Worcester, Massachusetts
 Mr. J. Bryan Riley, Executive Director, Massachusetts Halfway Houses Incorporated, 178 Newbury Street, Boston.
 Mr. Gary Robinson, Executive Office of Human Services (On special assignment with the Department of Corrections)
 Mr. Lawrence Shoket, Counselor, Brooke House, 79 Chandler Street, Boston
 Ms. Lois Stryker, Supervisor, Law Offender Services Unit, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Charles F. Hurley Employment Security Building, Government Center, Boston.

The members of the Task Force divided the State into five (5) regions for the purpose of evaluating the current M.R.C. involvement, making recommendations, and establishing program priorities. This is reflected in those appendices relative to each of the five (5) regions which reflect the best thinking of the Correctional Task Force members actively working in those regions who spent considerable time outside the regular meetings of the Task Force to develop these regional proposals which to a great degree are the basis of the final recommendations.

A. The Task Force members who were assigned to the five (5) regions for the purpose of evaluating the current M.R.C. involvement, making recommendations, and establishing program priorities, are listed in the following table:

The Chairman would like to express his appreciation to Commissioner O'Connell and Mr. Gerard McCarthy, Director of Client Services for the opportunity to convene the Correctional Task Force and make it possible for so many Commission staff at all levels to participate. They also manifested their continuing interest in the progress of our work by frequently joining the discussions in the meetings. We are most grateful to the Regional and Area Office Directors for their cooperation, patience and understanding during the life of the Task Force which involved so many of our staff throughout the Commonwealth and Meetings in the Administration Office as well as Boston, Brockton, Lowell, and Natick Area Offices.

The Chairman also wishes to express his appreciation to each staff person who participated in any of the meetings for their manifest interest and concern for the rehabilitation needs of handicapped offenders. All displayed a great deal of insight and understanding which strongly reflected extensive knowledge of the offender which they had obtained from practical experiences.

A special note of thanks goes to Ms. Delia Johnson, Research Assistant who attended all of the Task Force meetings, performing the duties of a secretary, report writer, fact finder and completing the bibliography.

In conclusion, the Chairman wishes to thank all those clerical staff members of the Commission who were engaged in the typing, proof-reading and stenciling of the Task Force Meeting Summaries, regional recommendations and final report. Without their assistance this report could not have been completed and distributed. We are especially appreciative of the work done by the clerical staff of the Case Services Unit at the Administration Office, and Ms. Jackie Yeats in the Natick Area Office, and the staff of the Supply Room for the mimeographing of the final report, at the Administration Office.

Leo D. Long
Chairman of Correctional Task Force

April 16, 1974

1. The Public Offender

The Fifth Institute on Rehabilitation Services defines the "public offender" in the following way:

"A public offender is any juvenile or adult convicted or adjudicated by a court of competent jurisdiction whether Federal, State or Local, including persons institutionalized, probated, paroled or otherwise released." *(See below.)

2. Behavioral Disorder

A "Behavioral disorder", is not specifically defined by the Federal Vocational Rehabilitation regulations, but it is subsumed under the definition of "physical or mental disability." Clarification of the term "behavioral disorder" is provided in Chapter 16, Section 1, Part III of the Federal manual. It is suggested that the following summary be added to the MRC manual of Policies and Procedures.

1. 683a Behavioral Disorder

A. A behavioral disorder is present, when through a comprehensive evaluation, including a psychiatric or psychological evaluation, it is determined that a person's behavior significantly deviates from what is considered normal, or that his ability to carry on normal relationships with his family and community is significantly impaired. Such behavior which persists over a period of time will manifest itself in various settings such as in school, on the job, before the courts, and in the home.

Verification of the existence of a behavior disorder may be obtained through verbal or written reports from teachers, employers, social workers, policemen, judges, probation or parole officers, and family members. Such incidents and behavior as family quarrels, arrests, truancy, idiosyncracies, or mannerisms, do not in themselves constitute a behavioral disorder, but may be suggestive of the possible existence of a behavior disorder and would require further examination and evaluation.

Some examples of behavior which the vocational rehabilitation counselor should evaluate and verify in order to establish the existence of a behavior disorder are as follows:

a. A persistent pattern of unemployment or job instability, including loss of jobs due to disagreements with work supervisors or fellow workers, unreasonable

* recommend adoption of above definition to facilitate gathering of data and providing case services.

- a. (cont.)
and demanding attitudes, and inappropriate work behavior.
- b. A persistent pattern of school truancy, vagrancy, educational underachievement, dropping out of school, and inappropriate behavior within the school or home setting resulting in suspensions.
- c. A persistent pattern of arrests for crimes defined as misdemeanors, felonies, or juvenile delinquent actions in the criminal code.
- d. A persistent pattern of deviant social behavior manifested by arrests, convictions and incarcerations including probation in lieu of incarceration.
- e. Any combination of a,b,c, or d.

II. THREE BASIC RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE CORRECTIONAL TASK FORCE.

1. Should MRC provide services to the non-physically or emotionally disabled offender?

Option 1: MRC should not service the non-physically or emotionally disabled public offender.

- a. Financial reason: limited funds and therefore other disability groups should receive services. It would follow that services should be given only to those disability groups who are not taken care of by other agencies.
- b. The public offender should be the responsibility of the Department of Corrections, the counties, the courts, the probation departments, the Department of Youth Services.
- c. Philosophical reason: The public offender is not disabled per se, and MRC would only accept the physically or mentally handicapped public offender.

Option 2: MRC should provide vocational rehabilitation services to the non-physically or emotionally disabled public offender.

Reasons:

- a. Corrections agencies and departments are not equipped to provide vocational rehabilitation services.
- b. Correctional agencies and departments do not recognize the disability aspects.

- c. Other community correctional programs, including that of the DES do not have the MRC orientation, including the focus on comprehensive assessment.
- d. The main purpose of the Department of Corrections is to protect the public. Custodial care still encumbers 80 to 90 percent of their budget. The recent emphasis on rehabilitation is a minor emphasis, in terms of State money.
- e. Guidance and counseling (especially vocational) are not available at correctional institutions, except where specially funded programs have been established.
- f. The role of the courts is similarly not one of operating their own resources, nor do they have the desire to do so.
- g. Federal guidelines acknowledge the existence of a behavioral disability.
- h. The offender represents a major disability problem. His multiple disabilities must be evaluated and responded to .
- i. Besides the behavioral disability, the stigma created by the criminal history is a further handicap in finding employment.
- j. State vocational rehabilitation agencies have the skills and ability to do what the Department of Corrections is only recently trying to do: provide vocational rehabilitation.
- k. Vocational rehabilitation is a perfect vehicle for reintegration.
- l. Vocational rehabilitation is a way for the government to invest tax money in order to create a wider source of tax revenue. In the case of the offender, thousands of dollars will be saved if the client is kept from returning to prison.

Task Force Recommendations:

The reasons are overwhelmingly in favor of correctional involvement by MRC. This involvement, however, would require a full commitment by MRC to provide continuous services of highest quality to the designated institution, court, community program and the client himself. If such a commitment cannot be made, then MRC should not service the public offender.

2. Should the MRC counselor working with offenders be a specialist or a generalist?

Option 1: A generalist counselor.

- a. A generalist has closer contacts with the general functioning of the agency.
- b. There would be less likelihood of resentment and better morale among supervisory and counselor staff if the correctional counselor did not have special status in the office.
- c. A generalist would have a broader knowledge of the physical problems so frequently encountered with the offender.
- d. A generalist with a history of successful placements of physically handicapped clients has already established good relationships with community employers, and therefore might encounter less resistance in placing offenders.

Option 2: A specialist counselor.

- a. MRC has already moved toward specialization, in mental retardation, psychiatric cases, public welfare, Social Security recipients, etc.
- b. The public offender is a specialty in the true sense of the word, with counseling needs which are different from those of other disabilities. This has been substantiated in several research projects by other states.

These studies show that a special philosophy and set of rehabilitation techniques are needed to rehabilitate public offenders.

- c. The public Offender requires more intensive counseling in order to effect changes in self-perceptions, motivation, and behavioral patterns. His problems and needs are multiple. Counseling must help to counteract society's rejection of the offender and break into the cyclic pattern of criminal act-incarceration or court record - rejection - reinforcement of poor self-esteem - criminal act (the self-fulfilling prophecy).
- d. MRC counselors share with the general population varying degrees of pre-conceptions and fears of the offender. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has described public response to crime as one of fear and stereotyping of the offender. Such attitudes are communicated subliminally to the offender. A counselor thus requires not only special skills but must also have a positively reinforcing attitude towards his offender-clients.
- e. Special resources need to be made available to the public offender. A counselor who also has a general caseload has to

- e. (cont.)
familiarize himself with two separate types of community resources. Knowledge and development of specialized community resources need to be extensive for good vocational rehabilitation planning.
- f. Job finding presents different problems for the public offender. Many employers who are willing to hire the physically or emotionally handicapped will not hire the public offender, and vice versa.
- g. There are sufficient numbers of public offenders being handled on a statewide level to warrant a system of MRC specialty counselors.

Task Force recommendations: One of the most important recommendations by the Task Force is that counselors servicing the public offenders be assigned as specialty counselors. This, however, does not imply that every counselor should serve corrections on a full-time basis. In some areas a part-time assignment would suffice until the number of cases warrants a full-time counselor. But even part-time corrections counselors must be interested in the public offender and undergo in-service training on the needs and problems of the offender.

In order to retain experienced counselors and also for the purpose of recruiting qualified correctional counselors, a career ladder for counselors should be encouraged and instituted. A counselor who is in grade 13 should be able to get a grade 15 and even 17, without having to become a supervisor if he prefers to retain his caseload. The past experience of MRC has been that, in order to get a promotion, the Counselor was required to take on supervisory duties for which he might not necessarily be qualified or interested.

3. Degree of autonomy of the correctional program

Option 1. Retain the program within the same administrative, supervisory, and fiscal structure as exists now.

- a. Under the present structure, a few MRC corrections programs have been successful, although far from adequate in terms of coverage.
- b. Success has been achieved wherever supervisors were sympathetic and supportive to the counselor and educated about the needs of offenders.
- c. A massive effort of educating the supervisory structure and a policy statement in the manual about MRC's commitment to the public offender and special policies with regards to the public offender might lead to more consistent and fair supervision. Such a policy statement should also stress the fact that the public offender has a civil and legal right for MRC service. "evaluation if he so desires".

- d. Senior Supervisor of Public Offender Program continues as Consultant Coordinator on correctional programming. Corrections part of M.R.C. annual budget would be under the direction and control of the Senior Supervisor of the Public Offender Program.

Option 2. MRC correctional program should have fiscal autonomy, with a regional corrections specialist, but under the area office supervisor. A regional corrections specialist would disburse funds, provide training to the area supervisor to help him understand the special nature of correctional vocational rehabilitation, and assure that supervision be exercised with fairness towards the offender-client.

- a. Fiscal autonomy would eliminate the problems of priority when client service funds become scarce.
- b. Reasonable rehabilitation plans will have a better chance for approval when funds do not come out of general caseload funds.
- c. The regional concept would allow for the needed community contact and base.
- d. The regional concept would also facilitate communication among the area offices to avoid duplication and to provide a cooperative use of resources.
- e. The regional concept for operations and funding is being utilized by other agencies involved in phases of corrections eg. "Committee on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice (LEAA) Department of Youth Services and Office for Children."
- f. The Senior Supervisor of the Public Offender Program continues as Consultant - Coordinator on correctional programming. The correctional part of the MRC budget would be under the direction of and control of the Senior Supervisor of the Public Offender Program.

Option 3: Establish a separate MRC correctional unit, with its own lines of supervision and fiscal autonomy.

- a. This method of supervision would circumvent the prejudice, ignorance, and bias surrounding this disability group.
- b. Supervisors are already overburdened by high caseloads. Under the present system, it takes a long time before getting cases approved. The offender, more so than other disability groups, cannot afford to wait.
- c. A separate system would make it more possible to assure smooth transition and continuity of services to transferred offender-clients.

- d. Supervisors of correctional counselors should be experienced in dealing with public offenders.
- e. A area supervisor cannot always be on top of all disability groups, Corrections is changing so fast that even a full-time correctional supervisor will have difficulties keeping up with it.
- f. DES, in their offender team program, has found that the team approach functions more efficiently on an out-station basis, and that working outside of the normal agency procedures allows more freedom of operation.
- g. A separate correctional unit would lend itself better to statistical monitoring and research of the Commission's work with offenders.
- h. All regional and area correctional staff would be responsible to the Senior Supervisor of the Public Offender Program who in turn would be responsible to the Director of Client Services and the Commissioner.

Option 4: A mixed system, depending on the needs of a particular area, with a research component comparing the effectiveness of the different structures of delivering services. This should remain under regular supervision and could depend on :

- a. Availability of qualified and experienced corrections specialists in the area, who know the area's resources.
- b. Letting the area and unit supervisor decide whether he is interested in the offender and supervision of offender specialist counselors.
- c. The number of counselors needed for the area.
- d. Availability of free office space in prisons or courts.
- e. For research purposes the decision should be made randomly.
- f. The role of the Senior Supervisor of the Public Offender Program under the regular supervisory structure would be the same as Option 1 d. Where under a separate supervisory structure his role would be as found in Option 3 h.

Task Force Recommendations

- 1. The greatest statewide need appears to be fiscal autonomy. As long as this basic requirement is fulfilled then the specialist counselors could be within the regular supervisory structure.

Task Force Recommendations (cont.)

2. In areas where correctional programs have been successfully established. The establishment of a separate regional area or unit correctional services office is strongly recommended.
3. In those areas where correctional programs have not been satisfactorily developed, recruiting staff for correctional assignment within the present structure of the area office with fiscal autonomy should be initiated as soon as possible. These areas would not warrant a separate office at this time because of inexperienced staff and the need for caseload development. As staff becomes available and gains caseload experience, the caseloads will increase and warrant a separate correctional office.
4. The ultimate goal should be a separate, autonomous correctional program.

The General Policy and Procedural Recommendations

These recommendations are based on the combined experiences of MRC Task Force Participants. This would include the MRC staff and also invited guests from other agencies.

1. Eligibility and Case Finding

From the outset, it should be stressed that neither receipt of public assistance nor status as a public offender of itself makes an individual eligible for vocational rehabilitation services.

The Rehabilitation Services Series Number 67-18, entitled "Public Offenders: Eligibility and Determination of Rehabilitation Potential," issued September 28, 1966, clearly indicated that:

"...before the State agency may provide vocational rehabilitation services the public offender must meet the three basic conditions of eligibility. The public offender, as a public offender, therefore, may not be considered categorically eligible for rehabilitation services, but must have his eligibility established on the basis of an individual evaluation as in the case of any applicant for services...Although studies have shown that public offender populations are characterized by a relatively high proportion of mental retardation, emotional disturbance, and physical disability, there is clearly a sizable group of public offenders whose disability is essentially behavioral. . . Where behavioral disorders are involved, a psychiatric or psychological evaluation must be obtained in accordance with section 401.22 (c) (2), new section 401.32 (2), of the Vocational Rehabilitations."

It is therefore clearly evident that in serving persons with behavioral disorders, the basic eligibility criteria for vocational rehabilitation services must be met.

a. Source of referral. Task force participants agree that MRC should focus on the delivery of services to offenders in community-based facilities as well as those on probation and parole and provide for continuity of services from institution to community. Persons transferred from the institution to pre-release facilities and community programs should be contacted and evaluated while still at the institution by a counselor stationed at the institution who will participate in screening and classification committees.

Other possible sources of referrals are courts, DES, self-help programs, Department of Mental Health, drug and alcohol treatment center, Department of Public Health, and police departments, and self referrals.

b. Age. Task Force participants agree that MRC should focus on juvenile, youthful and adult offenders, both male and female. It is recommended that efforts be concentrated on those offenders who are at least 15 years old, with exceptions up to the discretion of the counselor. It has been found in MRC's juvenile Delinquency Project that formulating a meaningful and realistic vocational rehabilitation plan is difficult with a person under that age.

c. Institutionalized offenders. Task Force participants agree that MRC should consider as eligible for referral those inmates who are within two years of parole eligibility. The Correctional Reform Act, Chapter 777 of the Acts of 1972 states that a person who is within 18 months of parole eligibility may be considered for work or educational release.

Men serving life sentences should be handled on an individual basis in keeping with MRC's guidelines.

d. Ex-offenders are people with criminal records who are no longer on parole probation, or institutionalized. These persons should be eligible for evaluations and serviced by MRC correction specialist counselors.

e. Drug Referrals A person has to be drug-free before MRC can provide services. Offenders referred from the community should have a drug evaluation in keeping with MRC's agreement with the Division of Drug Rehabilitation of the Department of Mental Health. If a person who is referred from within a County or State institution has been worked with in a drug program, the evaluation of the drug program should be considered sufficient to consider the client drug free. If the institution has no drug program, the counselor in consultation with other institutional staff, and on the basis of medical and psychological evaluations should make the judgement about the client's state of addiction. A similar procedure should be followed with those offenders who have indications of alcoholism.

2. EVALUATIONS

The members of the Task Force have expressed considerable concern about the policy of MRC requiring a psychiatric examination

2 Evaluation (cont.)

for the determination of eligibility on all public offender applicants which is very rigid and inflexible when compared to the Federal Regulations on Eligibility.

a. Their concern is based on the following factors:

1. The availability of qualified psychiatrists interested in corrections varies substantially throughout the state.

- a. If interested, their time available may be seriously limited because they have a private practice, or they are full time employees of another State Agency and can work for MRC only if outside their regular working hours.

2. Experience has shown that the written report received from a psychiatrist doing a one or two hour psychiatric interview with a public offender applicant often includes very little information of practical value to the counselor in rehabilitation planning.

3. The psychiatric evaluation has been required primarily to obtain a diagnosis or "diagnostic label."

4. The requirement for psychiatric evaluations has led to negative attitudes towards the state agency by offender applicants especially those incarcerated in state correctional institutions and facilities, and community correctional facilities.

- a. Inmates are concerned because exam results may delay parole.

- b. Inmates are concerned because they might be transferred to MCI Bridgewater, the state correctional institution for the "criminally insane."

- c. Inmates are concerned because of the connotation today that if you are required to see a psychiatrist "you must be crazy."

5. The requirement for a psychiatric evaluation has in many instances unduly prolonged the determination of basic eligibility for vocational rehabilitation services. The South Carolina Public Offenders Program has shown that offenders cannot withstand lengthy evaluation periods.

6. The psychiatric requirement has also prolonged unduly in many cases the initiation of vitally needed vocational rehabilitation services such as counseling and guidance, vocational training and job placement.

7. The psychiatric requirement has tended to restrict the number of public offenders who might otherwise be eligible for vocational rehabilitation services.

8. Most State and County Correctional Institutions in Massachusetts do not have psychiatrists on their institutional staff or available to them on a consultant basis.

b. During the last four years public offender program conducted by the Worcester Office at the Worcester House of Correction, has utilized a psychological evaluation for all public offenders in lieu of a psychiatric evaluation. If the necessity for a psychiatric evaluation arises or is manifested by testing results, such evaluation is provided. In the psychologist's written report to M.R.C. he is guided by the question-what does the counselor need to know about the applicant to determine eligibility? The two basic areas of M.R.C. counselor concern are basic eligibility and vocational rehabilitation planning. The psychologist sees his role as one of providing specific information to professional counselors who know what they are doing. In his opinion the diagnostic labels (shorthand) utilized by M.R.C. facilitate communication but don't yield practical information which is useful.

The Psychologist may provide the rehabilitation counselor with the following practical information: A measure of intelligence, educational achievement, social maturity, interests, aptitudes, goal orientations, determination of possible brain damage, rehabilitation potential and clinical diagnosis.

As of January 1973 there is a licensing law in Massachusetts covering psychologists. Now we have a choice of diagnostician-an M.D. or psychologist. Because of this law, there would be more qualified psychologists than psychiatrists available to provide evaluations.

Recommendations: In view of these considerations the Task Force recommends that either a psychological or psychiatric evaluation be recognized by the Commission. This decision would depend on local conditions and the availability of professionals to conduct the evaluation.

We recognize the importance and necessity of a basic medical evaluation for public offenders. The South Carolina Public Offender Project has shown that a large percentage of offenders have undiagnosed medical conditions which require treatment even though they were referred as behavioral problems. Generally, if the referring agency has conducted a basic physical exam within 90 days of referral to M.R.C., such evaluation would be acceptable as meeting the MRC requirements.

3. Role of the Counselor

It should be the responsibility of all staff to develop and use the resources of public and private groups in implementing and developing the public offender programs. They should also be responsible for becoming the advocate in promoting reasonable response by agencies in fulfilling their legal commitments to clients. Experience has shown that success in the rehabilitation of the public offender increases with the development of interest and active participation of community individuals and groups, including self help groups, in pertinent phases of the program. This requires knowledgeable MRC counselors who will actively motivate such community response and work with them to make their efforts more productive and effective. A counselor should also develop a close relationship with all staff within correctional settings.

Counseling and guidance assumes greater importance with a behaviorally disordered client than with other disability groups. This has been docu-

mented by the MRC Juvenile Delinquency Project and the South Carolina Public Offender's Project. The public offender has besides a behavior disorder, a multitude of other problems, including social, educational, cultural, and personal handicaps which all mediate against adequate vocational adjustment. The prime role of the counselor should therefore be to focus on helping the offender resolve these problems.

The Counselor should also serve as coordinator of training services, medical and psychological treatment, job placement, follow up, and referral to other community resources.

Suggested case loads are any where between 50 and 125, depending on the assignment (institution v.s. community based facility), geographical scatter of clients and resources, the availability of support personnel and the degree of counselor experience.

4. SUPPORT PERSONNEL

The MRC Correctional Task Force recommends that counselors should be assisted by support personnel in such capacities as arranging for diagnostic evaluations, locating offenders in the communities, providing services to families of offenders, job placement and resource development, and follow-up. These services could be provided by a variety of personnel. The team approach has been successfully used by the DES law offender program.

a. People already employed by County or State Corrections. One way of using part-time support personnel is to utilize staff (social workers psychologists, medical doctors, etc.) who are salaried by the facility. Part-time salaries to be payed by MRC could be arranged in order to obtain regular services. This technique has been found successful by the Cooperative Program of the Maryland Department of Corrections and the Maryland Division of Vocational Rehabilitation in providing services to inmates of Maryland Correctional Institution. Staff such as classification officers, academic and vocational instructors, and clerical staff were utilized and payed by both agencies.

b. The use of Ex-Offenders. Many community programs (DES and Brooke House) have demonstrated the feasibility of using ex-offenders for working with the public offender. Glaser stresses the value of using ex-offenders in counseling public offenders, because of their familiarity with the offender's manipulative behavior and their ability to relate to the offender on his own level. The ex-offender may be used in the following ways; as suggested by the experience of the Division of Employment Security.

- Meeting the offender upon release
- Assisting in making and keeping appointments with MRC and other agencies of referral (diagnostic evals).
- Assist in case conferences.
- Assist in job placement and opportunity development.
- Work with employers.
- Assist the offender in work adjustment.
- Know community resources.
- Maintain relationships with other agencies.

The training of ex-offenders may be accomplished by means of sub-contract with a correctional agency, such as the Massachusetts Halfway Houses, Inc. which has experience through a sub-contract with the Division of Employment Security. Training could also be obtained through contract with technical assistance grants from Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

c. Non-Offender Paraprofessionals. This could include volunteers, graduate students in social work or psychology in field placement, or payed paraprofessionals. Duties would depend on availability and area of expertise. They could range from paperwork, initial interviewing, setting up appointments, testing, tutoring, to bilingual or regular counseling on the same level as junior counselors.

d. Junior Counselors. In order to establish a viable statewide correctional services program, it is recommended that junior counselors be used as needed to assist correctional counselors in providing continuity and expansion of services.

e. Social Workers. The nationwide Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Project has emphasized that services to families of offenders were an essential ingredient in rehabilitation success of offenders. The use of social workers working cooperatively with counselors to resolve social problems should therefore be encouraged. If possible we should utilize or contract with existing social work agencies and schools of social work to work as counselors aides to our specialty counselors. The commission should also consider the employment of social workers throughout the Commission.

5. TRAINING

Training needs of the offender are great and important. At the end of 1972, in the State Correctional Institutions there were 1400 unskilled residents according to Commissioner Boone of the Department of Corrections. Training in and of itself, however, is not the final answer to the employment of offenders. Along with traditional training, the use of innovative vocational prevocational personal adjustment and on the job training should be emphasized, encouraged and utilized.

6. JOB PLACEMENT AND FOLLOW-UP

With the offender, placement into suitable employment is the ultimate objective of the rehabilitation effort.

The inmate requires intensive preparation before job placement. Counselors in the MRC Juvenile Delinquency Project have demonstrated the need for much preparatory counseling. The Fifth Institute on Rehabilitation Services summarizes the problem in the following way:

The placement of a client who is known as a public offender involves considerably more than telling him where to interview for a job. Placing this particular type of client is a long-term process encompassing testing, training, counseling, public relations, and often "on-the-spot" personal assistance. The process begins when the inmate is accepted on the caseload of the institutional counselor and ends with the satisfactory employment of the client.

The authors also point out the critical nature of the transfer from a structured environment to an unstructured milieu while trying to survive. The South Carolina Project also found that goals and plans made while institutionalized are usually modified or abandoned soon after release. This problem is enhanced with increasing length of incarceration.

The client should assume the major responsibility for finding employment with the assistance of the counselor. Successful job placement also requires good public relations. As much time as possible should be devoted to contacting community resources and employers who are willing to hire public offenders and seek out firms who offer on-the-job training opportunities. These duties could be assumed by the counselor, a supervisor, or a placement specialist in the office.

The counselor's responsibility to the client does not stop when the client has been placed in employment. The counselor needs to provide follow-up to insure that the job is suitable from the client's and the employer's point of view. The offender requires special counseling when employed. A job places the offender under severe interpersonal stress. As a result he tends to act out on the job or impulsively terminates his employment. Follow-up after job placement should therefore be longer than usually required. In the Atlanta Federal Offenders Project, clients had to be employed for 6 months before closure. Many cases were followed for about a year. Counselor aides could possibly perform much of the time consuming follow-up services.

7. RECOMMENDATION FOR IMPROVED STATISTICAL REPORTING

The referral code "56" provides for incomplete and inadequate information on the extent of the Commission's work with the Offenders. Referrals come from a variety of sources, including community facilities, schools, self referral, other person, etc. It is therefore recommended that the referral source be broken down in the following manner with a new reporting form to identify specifically the offenders serviced:

1. In the left-hand column under P.O. (Public Offender), change YSB to DYS (Department of Youth Services), since latter is the correct agency title. The explanatory notes to be written should state that this designation will apply to any juvenile or youthful offender who is residing in an institution or detention center administered by the Department of Youth Services or is residing in a group home or community residential facility which has a service contract with the Department of Youth Services which covers the applicant or who is referred by a staff person in the Administrative or Regional Office of the Department of Youth Services including juvenile parole officers and educational counselors of the Department. Juveniles referred by Court, District Court, Superior Court, or court probation officers should not be placed in the Department of Youth Service categories.

2. Any juvenile or adult referred by a juvenile or adult court probation officer or judge shall be included in the item "probation". This will include applicants who previously may have been in the custody of the Department of Youth Services or the Department of Corrections.
3. Any adult referred by members of the State Parole Board, parole placement officers, or field parole officers shall be included in the item entitled "parole officer".
4. Instead of one referral source entitled "prison", it is recommended that there be separate categories as follows: "county institution" (specific-includes jails), and state institution (specific-includes diagnostic centers, pre-release and post-release facilities, or community-based treatment facilities administered by the Massachusetts Department of Corrections).
5. A sixth item should be included to cover any offender referred by one of the many public and private organizations whose programs focus on services to offenders. It could be entitled "community correctional program." It would include referrals from the following organizations: Division of Legal Medicine, Correctional Offender Teams of the Division of Employment Security, Self-Development Group, Gavin House (half-way house), Brooke House (community treatment center), Friends of Framingham (half-way house), Massachusetts Correctional Association. It would also include self-help programs, e.g., Self-Development Group (SDG), Dismas Fraternity, Libra, Inc.
6. A seventh item under the general heading of "public offender" should be entitled "self referred." We feel very strongly that a number of offenders are referring themselves to our field offices, and there is no way currently to identify them as offenders. This would apply particularly to offenders paroled or released to Massachusetts from correctional institutions outside Massachusetts and also offenders paroled or released from Massachusetts institutions which do not have MRC coverage.

IV Regional Recommendations

A. Introduction

The recommendations which follow are presented in the form of options with a time-table for their implementation. The initial options represent what the members of the Task Force agree should be the minimum commitment (staff and facility coverage), of the Commission in order to establish an integrated statewide system of service delivery to handicapped public offenders. The Task Force has divided the state into five (5) regions which do not necessarily coincide with the current MRC regional alignment.

The factual data in the tables which follow was obtained by Mrs. Delia Johnson of our Research Unit from the following sources:

1. Summary of monthly populations of county correctional institutions for October 31, 1972.
2. Weekly summary on the populations of correctional institutions and facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections for the week ending March 3, 1973.
3. Annual summary of adults and juveniles appearing in all the District, Superior, and Juvenile Courts in Massachusetts for the 1972 calendar year.
4. The geographical distribution of offenders released from Massachusetts state correctional institutions from the Department of Corrections.

IV. REGIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1-Northeastern Massachusetts Region -- Essex CountyTable I Present MRC Coverage

<u>Correctional Facilities</u>	<u>MRC Clients</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Yearly Releases 1970</u>
1. Lawrence Rehabilitation Center	32	45	30 (73' est)
2. Lawrence House of Correction	4	100	670
3. Salem House of Correction	2	130	1,424

Table II Facilities Requesting Services

	<u>1 st</u> <u>Appearance</u>	<u>2 nd/More</u> <u>Appearances</u>	<u>Juvenile</u> <u>M F</u>		<u>Juvenile</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Lawrence District Court	2,070	3,223	293	66	359	5,293
2. Salem District Court	3,388	2,551	327	45	372	5,939
3. Haverhill District Court	1,114	1,768	113	28	141	2,893
4. Amesbury District Court	991	1,213	106	19	125	2,264
5. Newburyport District Court	1,123	1,565	152	38	190	2,638
6. Peabody District Court	2,299	726	128	46	174	3,025
7. Lynn District Court	3,429	3,891	386	97	483	7,320
8. Gloucester District Court	575	1,292	197	29	226	1,867
9. Essex County Superior Court						
a. Lawrence Superior Court						
b. Salem Superior Court	0	1,132	4	2		1,132
TOTALS	14,989	17,362	1,706	370	2,070	32,411

Option I- To serve effectively the three (3) facilities already covered, make the one part time counselor full time by July 1, 1973. This counselor would also handle local referrals in Essex County and MRC cases transferred into the county. This counselor should not have general caseload responsibilities.

Option II- As of December 31, 1973 the caseload of the one (1) speciality counselor will have been developed to a point warranting the assignment of a second full time correctional counselor and one (1) full time clerk.

Option III- By June 30, 1974 if the two (2) caseloads develop as expected it is recommended a third counselor be assigned part time to assist the community based counselor and do casefinding with other community correctional programs in Essex County.

IV. REGIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Page 10

1 B Northeastern Massachusetts Region -- Middlesex County

TABLE I Present MRC Coverage

<u>Correctional Facilities</u>	<u>MRC Clients</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Yearly Releases 1970</u>
1. Billerica House of Correction	100	250	3,600
<u>a-Institutions</u>			
1-Shirley Pre-release Center . 0 Drug Treatment-Dept of Corrections		37 (3/13/73)	(Not operational)

TABLE II b Facilities requesting Services

	<u>1 st. Appearance</u>	<u>2nd/More Appearances</u>	<u>Juvenile</u>		<u>Juvenile total</u>	<u>Total</u>
			<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>		
1. Ayer District Court	3,614	1,362	186	81	267	4,976
2. Concord District Court	3,205	2,896	308	45	353	6,101
3. Lowell District Court	4,615	5,145	489	102	591	9,760
4. Lowell Superior Court	190	1,591	67	18	85	1,781
5. Woburn District Court	3,422	5,305	470	102	572	8,727
<u>Totals:</u>	15,046	16,299	1,520	348	1,868	31,345

Presently two part time counselors serve the Billerica House of Correction a maximum of two days a week. No direct service is being provided officially to any of the courts.

OPTION 1. By July 1, 1973, in order to serve the House of Correction effectively it is recommended one (1) counselor be assigned full time and one (1) counselor part-time to assist the full-time counselor particularly for follow up of released clients in Middlesex County.

By July 1, 1973, it is recommended one (1) full time counselor be assigned to serve the Lowell District and Superior Court, Ayer District Court, Concord District Court and Woburn District Court. This counselor would also cover the Shirley Pre-release Center (Department of Corrections). He will also handle local referrals and transfers. A part-time counselor should also be assigned at this time.

OPTION 2. By December 31, 1973, it is anticipated that there will be over two hundred (200) clients of MRC at the House of Correction being serviced either in the institution or the community. It is recommended that the part-time

OPTION 2. (cont.)
counselor be made full time.

OPTION 3. By July 1, 1974, it is anticipated that one (1) full-time counselor will be needed to service juvenile and adult offenders in the Lowell District and Superior Courts, plus local referrals and transfers.

By July 1, 1974, it is also expected that the part-time counselor in Option 1 be a full-time counselor serving Ayer, Concord and Woburn District Courts as well as the Pre-release Center at Shirley (Department of Corrections),

By July 1, 1974, it is anticipated that two (2) additional full-time clerks will be needed to assist the four (4) full-time counselors mentioned above.

It is strongly recommended that there be one (1) full-time job developer or placement specialist to work with the specialty counselors in the Essex County and Northern Middlesex County areas.

IV. Regional Recommendations

2. SOUTHEASTERN MASSACHUSETTS REGION (Barnstable, Bristol, Norfolk and Plymouth Counties)

There are four area offices within Southeastern Massachusetts: Brockton, New Bedford, Fall River and Hyannis.

For the Entire Area there are presently three counselors with part-time correctional assignments.

The following table summarizes present coverage:

Table I Present Coverage

<u>CORRECTIONAL FACILITY</u>	<u>CLIENTS</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>	<u>RELEASES</u>
1. Massachusetts Correctional Institution-Bridgewater	4		17
<u>Bridgewater</u>		135	
sentence for drunkenness		6	
transfers		40	Prisoners 181
segregation unit		0	
temporary care		275	
state hospital-commitments		137	
state hospital-observations		0	
alcoholics-commitments		304	
alcoholics-voluntary		39	
drug addicts-commitments		0	
drug addicts-observations		0	
drug addicts-voluntary		123	
sex treatment center commitments		24	
sex treatment center observations		3	
sex treatment center voluntary		4	Patients 909
Females			
2. Massachusetts Correctional Institution-Plymouth	28	117	1,468
3. Bristol County House of Corrections-New Bedford	8	248	1,397
Total:	40	365	2,882

SOUTHEASTERN MASSACHUSETTS REGION
TABLE 2A FACILITIES REQUESTING SERVICE

<u>FACILITIES</u>	<u>MRC CLIENTS</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>	<u>RELEASE</u>
1. Barnstable County House of Correction (Barnstable)	2	110	654
2. Department of Youth Services Forestry Camp (Brewster)	0	57	?
3. Plymouth County House of Correction (Plymouth)	1	117	1,468
TOTALS:	3	284	2,122

Regional Recommendations (continued)

TABLE 2B--Other Facilities Requesting Services

COURTS: 1972 COURT Records	1st	2nd/more	Juveniles			Total
	Appearance	Appearance	M	F	T	
1. Brockton District Court	2,059	5,161	484	146	630	7,226
2. Stoughton District Court	3,442	1,059	213	43	256	4,501
3. Taunton District Court	1,652	2,110	295	48	343	3,762
TOTALS:	7,153	8,330	992	237	1229	15,489

Option 1. Serve the institutions presently served, making the part-time counselors full time, in the following manner by July 1, 1973.

1. Brockton Area Office

One full time counselor to cover: Plymouth House of Correction, M.C.I. Plymouth and do community follow up from the Plymouth House of Correction.

One full time counselor to cover Brockton District Court, M.C.I. Bridge-water, local referrals and transfers.

2. Fall River Area Office

As of July 1, 1973, one general counselor should be designated to handle local offender referrals and transfers.

3. Hyannis Area Office

As of July 1, 1973, one general counselor should be designated to handle local offender referrals and transfers.

4. New Bedford Area Office

One full time counselor to cover the New Bedford House of Correction and Barnstable House of Correction as well as local offender referrals and Community follow-up.

Option 2. As of July 1, 1974, projected need would necessitate:

1. Brockton Area Office

A second community counselor to expand service to Stoughton, Taunton and Attleboro District Courts.

2. Fall River Area Office

By July 1, 1974, it is expected that there will be a need for at least

Option 2 (Fall River Area Office (cont.))

2. one (1) full time specialty counselor covering the Fall River District Court, local referrals and transfers.

3. Hyannis Area Office

By July 1, 1974, it is expected that there will be a need for one (1) full time specialty counselor to cover the Barnstable County House of Correction, Barnstable and Provincetown District Courts, local referrals and transfers.

4. New Bedford Area Office

One counselor would continue to serve New Bedford House of Correction as well as local referrals and transfers.

3. Central Massachusetts - Worcester RegionTable I - Present M.R.C. Coverage

A. <u>Correction Facilities</u>		M.R.C. Clients	Capacity	Yearly Releases (1970)		
1. Worcester County House of Correction		160	225	3,607		
2. Worcester Detention Center-Department of Youth Services.		0	60	120		
B. <u>Facilities</u>	1st Appearance	2nd/More Appearance	Juvenile			Total (Ad. & Juv.)
			M	F	T	
1. Worcester Superior Court	156	1,959	28	1	29	2,115
2. Worcester District Court	8,883	9,249	-	-	-	18,132
3. Worcester Juvenile Court			1,222	410	1,632	1,632
4. Framingham District Court (Juvenile)			430	90	520	520
TOTALS:	9,039	11,208	1,680	501	2,181	22,399

Table II - Facilities Requesting Services

<u>A. Correction Facilities</u>		<u>M.R.C. Clients</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Yearly Releases (1970)</u>			
1. M.C.I. Framingham Department of Corrections		0	100	155			
<u>B. Facilities</u>		<u>1st Appearance</u>	<u>2nd/More Appearance</u>	<u>Juvenile</u>			<u>Total</u>
				<u>M</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>(Ad. & Juv.)</u>
1. Westboro District Court	4,873	1,149	145	32	177		6,022
2. Gardner District Court	1,215	2,060	177	34	211		3,275
3. Framingham District Court (Adults)	3,653	5,258					8,911
<u>TOTALS:</u>		9,741	8,467	322	66	388	18,208

OPTION I - A. By July 1st, 1973, establish a correctional services office at the Worcester House of Correction in cooperation with the Sheriff and add a second (2nd) full time counselor because of the size of current caseload plus increased capacity of new facility. One (1) fulltime clerk should be assigned to the House of Correction.

B. By July 1st, 1973, make the part-time counselor currently covering Worcester District Superior and Juvenile Courts, and Department of Youth Services Detention Center full time. He would also handle local referrals and transfers.

C. By July 1st, 1973, one counselor should be added to the Correctional Unit (total 3) at the House of Correction who would take over the existing juvenile caseload at the Framingham District Court, as well as do

case finding in the Adult Division of the court. He would also cover M.C.I. Framingham (institutionalized offenders and offenders in training and work release programs), and do case finding in the Westboro District Court. This counselor would also handle local offender referrals in the Natick-Framingham area and transfers.

D. By July 1st, 1973, if there are three or four counselors assigned to the M.R.C. Correctional Unit at the House of Correction, a Unit Supervisor should be appointed as director.

E. By July 1st, 1973, it is recommended that the one general counselor in each of the Fitchburg, Milford and Southbridge Area Offices be designated to handle local offender referrals and transfers.

OPTION II

A. By December 31, 1973, there should be one (1) full time social worker assigned to the MRC unit at the House of Correction to assist the counselors by providing more effective social services to inmates and their families.

B. There should be one (1) full time staff person at the grade 17 level who would be totally responsible for all MRC correctional programs in Central Massachusetts.

C. There should be one (1) full time staff person assigned as the job developer or placement specialist at the House of Corrections.

4. Western Massachusetts (Berkshire, Franklin, Hampden and Hampshire Counties.)

In this region there are now two full time and one part-time rehabilitation counselors servicing the public offender client. One counselor is responsible for the institutions located in Franklin and Hampshire Counties (2 state and 2 county) with a case load of 132. There is no coverage of court or community based corrections in these counties.

One full time counselor is assigned to court and community based corrections, centralized in the Springfield area of Hampden County. There is no coverage of The Hampden County House of Correction or the Westfield Detention Center (except for youth from Berkshire County). The assigned counselor has a caseload of 139.

Berkshire County has a part-time correctional assignment, covering the county institution and some of the community based facilities including the courts in the area. The caseload is 220.

Information of correction institutions in all the tables was obtained from the following sources:

1. Average daily populations of county penal institutions for 1972.
2. An M.C.I. prison count for week ending March 3, 1973.
3. A summary of court appearances in all courts, for the year 1972.
4. MRC referral and case statistical data.

TABLE I summarizes M.R.C.'s present correctional coverage.

Facilities and other Referral Sources Requesting Services

Those receiving service as mentioned in Table I and in Appendix A have requested expanded services to meet proven needs. This is not possible to do because of present caseload size and requirements e.g. the counselor covering the four institutions in Franklin and Hampshire Counties, in addition to a caseload of 132, has an average of 7 hours per week traveling time just to reach the institutions, not to mention travel and time spent in communities arranging work and educational release and other services.

Requests have been received from many of the asterisked listings in appendix A but have been complied with only on single referrals without attempts for building a regular relationship for the same reason as mentioned above.

TABLE I

Correctional Facilities	# of MRC Clients from Referral	Capacity	Average Daily Count as of 3/3/73	Yearly Releases based on 1970 Statistics
Monroe	50	50	42	25
Warwick	29	50	44	25
Franklin County House of Correction	15	82	40	503
Hampshire County House of Correction	38	88	85	740
Berkshire County House of Correction	101	108	70	785
Westfield Detention Center (only clients from Berkshire County)	5	27	42	
Juvenile Adjudication Berkshire County	14			
Juvenile Adjudication Hampden County	46			
Adult Adjudication Berkshire County	49			
Adult Adjudication Hampden County	30			
Other (includes Welfare, Mental Health, Public & Private Correctional referral services, and self-referral)	124			
*Note Hampden County House of Correction is not presently served	0	288	124	3,521

See Appendix A for other
sources and facilities not
presently being serviced
in these four counties.

Staffing Recommendations

For the Western Massachusetts Region the following phased staffing recommendations are advocated toward an ultimate goal. This goal is based on present data and experience projected over a reasonable time period and which would be modified as empirically dictated.

Phase I - Based upon services being rendered.

Berkshire County: One full time counselor to service institution and community corrections inclusively.

Franklin County: One full time counselor to service Munroe and Warwick Camps and Community Corrections inclusively.

Hampden County: One full time counselor to service Westfield Detention Center and Community Corrections inclusively.

Hampshire County: One full time counselor to service Franklin and Hampshire County Houses of Correction and Community Corrections inclusively.

Hampshire Correctional Services provides social community services in this county.

Note: This plan would provide for making the Berkshire staff members full time and the addition of one counselor in Hampshire County. The full time counselors in Franklin and Hampden are presently staffed. Clerical help would depend on district needs.

Phase II - Additional Staff

Berkshire County: 1 Social worker
1 Paraprofessional

Franklin County: 1 Junior Counselor
1 Paraprofessional
(Social workers being planned for by Corrections in State Camps.)

Hampden County: 1 Junior Counselor
1 Social worker
1 Paraprofessional
1 Clerk

Note: Paraprofessionals and Social Workers to be a part of the team but may be procured by contract rather than M.R.C. staff membership.

Hampshire County: 1 Junior Counselor
1 Paraprofessional

Phase III Additional

Berkshire County: 1 Junior Counselor
1 Clerk

Franklin County: 1 Clerk

Hampden County: 1 Counselor

1 Social Worker
1 Paraprofessional
1 Clerk

Hampshire County: 1 Clerk

Phase IV - Goal: Summary and additions combined.

Berkshire County: 2 Counselors
1 Social Worker
1 Paraprofessional
2 Clerks

Franklin County: 2 Counselors
1 Social Worker
1 Paraprofessional
2 Clerks

Hampden County: 5 Counselors
3 Social Workers
4 Paraprofessionals
4 Clerks

Supervision: Regional

3 Unit Supervisors...One each in 3 of the counties for supervision development of community resources and placement.

Senior Supervisor...Generally based in one county, responsible for overall supervision, training and program development, coordination and evaluation.

Note: 2 clerks: one for fiscal matters and one for secretary to senior supervisor.

5. Greater Boston AreaA. INTRODUCTION:

Boston has been the least developed of any area of the state, and yet it appears to have the greatest need. A Department of Corrections research report has shown that in 1970, 477 of 685 M.C.I. releasees, or almost 70% are released to the greater Boston Area. One large house of corrections, Deer Island, releases over a thousand men to the streets of Boston a year. There are also half-way houses, pre-release facilities, self-help programs, court projects, and juvenile and adult courts. And yet, MRC has provided only two part-time counselors who spend a combined twelve hours a week with Boston's correctional facilities.

The following Table summarizes MRC's present correctional coverage:

TABLE I: MRC'S PRESENT COVERAGE

Correctional Institution	# of MRC Clients	Capacity or No. of Inmates	Yearly Releases (1970)
Deer Island	34	217	1,045
Brooke House	15	30	120
Boston Ct. Resources Proj.	0	0	0
Boston Pre-Release Center (Department of Corrections)	0	50	200
(Non-Metropolitan Boston)			
M.C.I. Norfolk	107	645	198
Camb. Juvenile Ct.	50	0	709

The following facilities are not presently serviced by MRC, but have requested services:

TABLE II: FACILITIES REQUESTING SERVICES

Correctional Institution	# of MRC Clients	Capacity or # of Inmates	Yearly Pop. or Releases
Blue Hills Program	0	0	0
DYS Detention Ctr. Roslindale	0		
Dedham Hse. of Corrections (Norfolk County)	3	55	1,167
Camb. District Court Adult Probation	0		12,235
Som'l. Juvenile Court	0	--	168

OPTION I: Serve the institutions presently served, make the part-time counselors full-time, in the following manner:

Stationed in Boston:

One (1) full-time counselor to cover: 3 halfway houses operated by Mass. Halfway Houses, Inc., and do community follow-up of the clients.

OPTION I (Continued)

One (1) full-time counselor to cover Deer Island House of Corrections with community follow-ups and coverage of the community Court Resources Project, and also to handle community transfers from M.C.I. Norfolk.

Stationed at M.C.I. Norfolk:

One (1) full-time counselor to handle all residents of M.C.I. Norfolk and M.C.I. Walpole.

Stationed at Somerville Area Office:

One (1) full-time counselor to handle Cambridge Juvenile and develop Cambridge Adult Court and Somerville Juvenile Courts.

Counselors would work in the regular area office. This would be minimal requirement to be instituted by July 1973. This option would not require any additional staff except the replacement of one (1) counselor who prefers not to work in corrections.

OPTION II: As of December 31, 1973, the projected caseloads should warrant the splitting of the duties to one more counselor. The new counselor who will be added will be trained by the correctional staff and counselors. Whenever possible, cases should not be transferred, but existing counselors should assist the new counselor in developing new caseloads. Also, by this time many residents of Deer Island and the halfway houses will have moved into the Boston Community. Experience has shown that many clients are lost when they return to the community because of the counselor's unfamiliarity with the communities. There is, therefore, the need of one paraprofessional, perhaps an ex-offender, (perhaps Spanish-speaking), to locate the client in the community. At this point the program warrants the establishment of a correctional unit, with one of these counselors as a unit supervisor-counselor, under the district supervisor.

OPTION III: By July, 1974, the following State Department of Corrections Facilities should be covered:

TABLE 3: High Priority State Correctional Institutions:

<u>Correctional Institutions</u>	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Yearly Releases</u>
M.C.I. Concord	405	295
Norfolk	646	198
Walpole	558	119
Framingham	20F 110M	(Not established yet)

Additional Counselors Needed:

1- Full time counselor stationed at M.C.I., Concord. Establishment of an area office in M.C.I. Norfolk to cover both Norfolk and Walpole. Add one counselor and one clerk at M.C.I. Norfolk.

1- Full time counselor in Boston office to cover releases from M.C.I. Concord and Framingham.

1- Full time counselor in Boston office to cover releases from M.C.I. Norfolk and Walpole.

With five full time counselors and one paraprofessional in the Boston office, there will be need for the following, which might be included at this stage or at a later date:

A separate area office with a full time correctional office supervisor. This person could also assume correctional programming responsibilities for the greater Boston area.

One (1) placement specialist.

Full clerical staff.

One Social Worker.

Additional paraprofessional staff as needed.

OPTION IV: Chart I summarizes the staffing needs of the Boston Area Corrections Office. Each State Institution should house at least one, preferably two MRC Counselors depending on the availability of clients.

Staffing additions from the previous option will include one counselor experienced in juvenile corrections, to develop the following resources:

TABLE 4: Juvenile facilities in the Boston Area

Boston Juvenile Court (total number of court appearances in 1972-- 2,152)
Blue Hills Program
Detention Center, Roslindale (Dept. of Youth Services)
Children in Crisis Boston State Hospital
Youth Resources Bureaus
Office for Children
Other children's services

Also add two (2) unit supervisors

2- Other Offices in the Greater Boston Area:

A- Somerville Office

OPTION 1: As of July, 1973, there should be one full time counselor to cover the Cambridge (adult and juvenile) and Somerville (juvenile) District Courts. He should also handle transfers from institutions to the Cambridge and Somerville areas and self referrals. This should not require new staff but the elimination of the Framingham caseload from the already existing counselor. (See Table 1 and 2 for statistics).

OPTION 2: By December 31, 1973, these resources should have developed sufficiently to warrant the addition of another full time counselor who would be trained by the already assigned counselor. Duties could be split either regionally or by juvenile versus adult.

B. Roxbury Office

- OPTION 1: As of July 1973 there should be one counselor designated to handle local offender referrals and transfers. This counselor should be part-time but experienced or trained in working with offenders.
- OPTION 2: The eventual goal would be a full time counselor performing the duties in option 1 as well as developing relationships with the District Courts Probation Departments in Roxbury and North Dorchester.

C. Quincy Office

- OPTION 1: As of July 1973 there should be one counselor designated to handle local offender referrals and transfers, as part of a quarrel caseload. This counselor should be trained by MRC correctional staff in the handling of offenders.
- OPTION 2: By December 31, 1973, this counselor should be able to start developing a services program at the Norfolk County House of Corrections in Dedham.

Sources of Funding

In past years the Commission has expanded its services to handicapped public offenders primarily through the use of Section 2 monies and not through third party agreements, innovation or expansion grants, or research and demonstration grants.

However, between 1969 and 1972 the Commission did utilize a Research and Demonstration Grant to initiate vocational rehabilitation services to juvenile probationers. According to Dr. Goldberg, the Project Director, and Director of our Research Unit, Federal monies from Social and Rehabilitation Services Administration for Research and Demonstration Grants have been steadily decreasing since 1966 and in his opinion would not be a suitable source of funding to us in the foreseeable future. In the summer of 1972, the Lawrence General Hospital Rehabilitation Center obtained a Training Services Grant of \$138,000.00 to provide a variety of vocational training and stipends to handicapped probationers and parolees who are client of the Commission for a period of one (1) year. This grant is renewable on a year to year basis. Currently there are about seventeen offenders in training. We are exploring the future availability of grant money to initiate Training Services Programs in other regions of the state.

The members of the Task Force recognize the fact that the above mentioned funding mechanisms will probably not be sufficient to support a major expansion effort by the Commission to serve handicapped offenders. Therefore other sources of funding must be identified and developed primarily by the Commission staff who have correctional assignments throughout the state.

The Task Force has identified the following potential sources of funding with the assistance of staff people from private and public correctional agencies, and the knowledge of individual members of the Task Force:

A. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)

1. Regional Office, J.F.K. Bldg. (Ray MacKey).
2. State Office, 120 Boylston St., Boston (Arnold Rosenfeld and George Fosque).

Purposes-Grant Proposals for client services and technical assistance grants to cover training of professionals and paraprofessionals.

B. Department of Corrections

1. Transfer of funds to M.R.C.
2. Grant from Department of Corrections to cover salaries of M.R.C. Counselors assigned to the major state correctional institutions to provide primarily casefinding, counseling, and guidance, and job placement services.
3. Mutual sharing of staff (psychologists, social workers etc.) in cooperative programs in correctional facilities.

C. Department of Youth Services.

1. Same as B1, 2, and 3.

D. Massachusetts Probation Commission

1. Grants to M.R.C.

E. Office for Children (Mass. Chapter 785 of the Acts of 1972).

1. Grants to MRC for services to handicapped juvenile offenders in Welfare families. (Each Regional Office has \$175,000.00 for services to youths in former, current, or potential Welfare families - Regions One (1) and Four (4) each have \$250,000.00 for this purpose).

F. Department of Mental Health (Division of Legal Medicine)

1. Agreements with MRC whereby the Court Clinics would provide psychiatric and psychological evaluations and treatment services to MRC clients at no cost to MRC.

G. Department of Public Health

1. Division of Alcoholism.
 - a. Transfer of funds
 - b. Special projects with offenders.
2. Division of Drug Rehabilitation.
 - a. Special projects with offenders (Federal Funds)
3. Integration of MRC services programs with the Prison Health Project. (Department of Corrections)

H. Technical Development Corporation (TDC)

1. Technical assistance grants.
2. Development of correctional project proposals.

I. Massachusetts Parole Board

1. Transfer of funds to MRC.
2. Grants to MRC
3. Sharing of office space.

J. Department of Labor

1. Division of Employment Security.
 - a. Manpower Development Training Act. (MDTA)
 1. Pre-vocational, and personal adjustment training.
 2. Work evaluations-skill centers.
 - b. National Alliance of Businessmen. (NABS)
 1. On-the-job training.
 2. Selective job placement.
 3. Job placement services including job banks.

K. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

1. Office of Education (federal)
 - a. Funding for special offender projects.

L. Department of Education (State)

1. Division of Occupational Education.
 - a. Grants for vocational training.

2. Division of Special Education.
 - a. Funding for services to handicapped persons.
 - b. Funding for services to the disadvantaged.

M. County Commissioners (County Gov.)

1. Transfer of funds to MRC.
2. Grants to MRC.
3. Agreements with the Sheriffs of all Houses of Correction whereby they will provide (at no cost to MRC) basic medical and dental exams including dental x-rays to all inmate applicants of the Commission and will share the results.

N. Non-Profit fraternal and service clubs. (Kiwanis, Exchange, Jaycees, Lions etc.)

1. Funding of selective training programs for individual offender clients.
2. Job development for offenders.

It is recommended that when the above potential sources of funding are explored, MRC should seek written working agreements or contracts delineating case service responsibilities to provide for a clear and consistent case service delivery system.

Within the Commission itself there should be developed a well coordinated relationship between the correctional services staff and the staff of the Social Security Unit and the Public Welfare Unit to insure that any eligible offenders are screened regarding their qualification for paid services under the special Social Security Program or the Public Welfare Project.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Adams, I.R. Texas Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Project, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Texas Education Agency, Austin, 1969.
- Ayers, G.E., ed. The Use of Support Personnel in Social and Rehabilitation Service Programs, Mankato, Minnesota, 1969.
- Bourgeois, P. and Miller, C.T. The Geographical Distribution of Offenders Released from the Massachusetts Correctional Institutions: A Study of First Residence After Release, Mass. Department of Correction, Boston 1972.
- Chandler, C.S. and Sandick, B.A. Rehabilitating Public Offenders, South Carolina Vocational Rehabilitation Department, Columbia, South Carolina, 1968.
- Coordinating Council for Occupational Education, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, A future for Correctional Rehabilitation? Olympia, Washington, 1969.
- Department of Corrections, The. Statistical Reports of the Commissioner of Correction, for the Year Ending December 31, 1970. Boston, 1971
- Ericson, R.C. and Moberg, D.O. The Rehabilitation of Parolees, The Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and Minnesota Department of Corrections, Minneapolis, 1968.
- Fifth Institute on Rehabilitation Services, Rehabilitation of the Public Offender, Madison, Wisconsin, 1967
- Fulton, W.S. Atlanta Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Project, Atlanta Georgia, 1969
- Glaser, D. "The Public Offender as Client". In R. J. Margolin, K. Larson, R. Vernile, Jr. Eds. Effective Approaches to the Rehabilitation of the Disabled Public Offender, Boston, May 1966, pp. 17-20
- Goldberg, R.T. and Johnson, B.D. Vocational and Social Rehabilitation of Juvenile Delinquents, Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission, Boston, 1972
- Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections, Washington, D.C., 1968
- Massachusetts Vocational Rehabilitation Planning Commission, Helping All the Handicapped, Boston, 1968, pp. 124-133
- Oklahoma Vocational Rehabilitation Service, The, and the Oklahoma State Reformatory, Final Report: Rehabilitation of the Young Offender, Oklahoma City, April, 1967.
- Presidents's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D. C., 1967

Bibliography (con't.)

Seventh Institute on Rehabilitation Services. Issues Relating to Rehabilitation of Individuals with Behavioral Disorders, Lincoln Nebraska, 1969.

Thomason, B. and Barrett, A. M., Eds. The Placement Process in Vocational Rehabilitation Counseling, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, GTP Bulletin No. 2 -- Rehabilitation Service Series No. 545, September 1960.

Recommendations:

A proposed regional approach for the development of rehabilitation services to the public offender by MRC in the in four counties:

Principles, Program and Organization:

1. An effective rehabilitation program would have a preventive effect as well as being a means of modifying an individual's limiting disabilities add their concurrent problems to society. By identifying and responding to the youthful offender, as a part of the program, hopefully the recidivism rate would be significantly lessened with fewer graduates to more sophisticated crime patterns.
2. Evaluations and plans should be done on an individual basis. Group programs are not effective unless they are evolved through individual planning and placement for a given time and situation.
3. With emphasis toward community based corrections, it is questionable that this Commission should become involved within State correctional facilities. Such programs might tend to postpone needed reorganization and change in corrections as well as continue work in an area in which success has been reportedly minimal.

It is considered to be far more productive to recommend transfer of inmates from such institutions within 18 months of their probable discharge date to camps, county correctional facilities, and/or half-way houses to begin and maintain intensive vocational rehabilitation programs. Such work would effectively be tied into preceding correctional efforts done within the institution.

4. Rehabilitation of the public offender is a process that involves the total individual. As such it includes the complete spectrum of disabilities as well as other agencies involved in human services in its broadest definition. It is, therefore, pertinent for MRC to include working agreements and contracts to provide consistency, correlation, and total service necessary to give reasonable assurance for success in the vocational rehabilitation plan e.g. family and children service, civil legal service, employment service

5. Experience has shown that success in the rehabilitation of the public offender increases with the development of interest and active participation of community individuals and groups in pertinent phases of the program. This requires knowledgeable MRC counselors who will actively motivate such community response and work with them to make their efforts more productive and effective. Such counselors need to work as community based.
6. Counselor work in Houses of Correction, Camps and community based units should include advisory and, as needed, active role with the administration and staff of these units to develop the facets of the program such as educational and work release. Understanding of their problems is pertinent as is active interest which can be demonstrated by participation in staff training projects and team approaches to correctional and rehabilitative services, as they affect the success of MRC efforts.
7. A part of the development of community and institutional programs should be the promotion and operation direction of self-help, area ex-offender, and community one-on-one help projects to give the continuing, knowledgeable support and development of self direction that experience shows as highly productive during transitional and regressive phases faced by the client and for his required social re-adjustment.
8. Active participation with industrial, business and governmental employer groups to promote employment opportunities.
9. Work with the juvenile and youthful offender is a part of the total program. Community interest and participation in one area has developed support in the other techniques and premises are the same even if emphasis differ in the process. Many clients are being referred to the Commission in the transitional age from juvenile to "adult". The earlier and more coordinated the effort the more positive seem the results.

Appendix AI - Final Report

BACKGROUND DATA BERKSHIRE FRANKLIN, HAMPDEN, AND HAMPSHIRE COUNTIES

Note: * indicates facilities and referral sources not presently being serviced

Institutions

Berkshire County

Berkshire County House of Correction

Franklin County

Franklin County House of Correction
Monroe MCI
Warwick MCI

Hampshire County

Hampshire County House of Correction

Hampden County

Hampden County House of Correction
Westfield Detention Center

Half-Way Houses and Residential Centers

Berkshire County

South Forty (juvenile and young adult)
Downeside - boys (juvenile and young adult)
Downeside - girls (juvenile and young adult)

NOTE: Adult (Male) half-way house
project presently in planning stage.

Franklin County

Beacon House

Hampshire County

Crescent House

Hampden County

Downeside - boys (juvenile and young adult)
Downeside - girls (juvenile and young adult)
Marathon House
Group Homes, Inc.,
Youth Service Foster Placement Homes

Courts - Probation, Public Defender

Berkshire County

Berkshire County District Courts -- Juvenile Probation
Berkshire Superior Court
Central Berkshire District Court
Williamstown District Court
North Adams District Court
*Adams District Court
*Lee District Court
Great Barrington District Court

Hampshire County

* Hampshire Superior Court
* Northampton District Court
* Eastern Hampshire District Court
8 Ware District Court

Franklin County

*Franklin Superior Court
*Franklin County District Court

Hampden County

*Hampden Superior Court
*Springfield District Court
*Chicopee District Court
*Holyoke District Court
*Palmer District Court
*Westfield District Court
Springfield Juvenile Court

Parole

Berkshire County State Parole Officer
*Hampshire- Franklin County State Parole Officer
Hampden County State Parole Officer
State Parole Juvenile Agents (Not serviced in Franklin & Hampshire)

Special Referral Sources by County

Berkshire County

EPIC (drug)
Berkshire Alcoholic Clinic
*Youth Resource Bureau
*Emergency Trips
One-On-One Ex-Offender Organization
*Great Barrington Drug Center

Franklin County

Correctional Services
Beacon Clinic
OVDCH
YMCA

Hampshire County

Correctional Services
Providence Hospital
OVDCH

Hampden County

Massachusetts Correctional Association
Providence Hospital
Springfield Court Resources Project.

Other General Referral Sources for the Four Counties

*Police Departments
*District Attorney's Office
Youth Service Board (Not serviced in Franklin & Hampshire)
School, College and University
Welfare Department
Physicians and Psychiatrists
Mental Health Clinics and Centers -- Public and Private
Division of Employment Security
Division of Employment Security -- Ex-Offender Counselor
Other Out-of -State Rehabilitation Agencies
Out-Of-State Correctional Facilities
Division of Drug Rehabilitation
Private and Public Alcoholic Treatment Centers
Transfers from other MRC District Offices
Religious Organizations
Families of Public Offenders
Division of Child Guardianship
Self Referrals
Out-Of-State Federal and State Parole Officers
and
Pre-Release Program Personnel

Notes on Total Referrals and Services:

Many of the referral sources are not being used or used to a reasonable potential level, and there is variability in the four counties as to the use and degree of use and service due to:

- 1- The seeming lack of desire of certain correctional agencies and institutions in MRC programs.
- 2- The lack of personnel in MRC to contact, no less service, a comprehensive rehabilitation program.
- 3- The attitude, interest, and practices reported to exist with certain MRC personnel.
- 4- The present lack of overall implemented philosophy, organization and training needed for effective promotion and operation of a rehabilitation program for the public offender.

Presently the main focus of attention in Franklin and Hampshire County is almost exclusively to incarcerate inmates; in Hampden County, efforts are exclusively involved with court and other general referral sources (community based). The work in Berkshire County has been in the institution and with the Pittsfield Court sector as much as possible. Other sources that presented referrals were serviced as possible but not sought.

Information on Public Offenders available for possible services of Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission.

Worcester County House of Correction - New Jail - Estimated number of inmates:

300 Male Inmates
40 Female Inmates
80 Work Release Inmates

Worcester Superior Court Probation Office)
Worcester District Court Probation Office) 6,000
Worcester Juvenile Court Probation Office)

Detention Center for Juveniles 60

There are 11 other District Courts in Worcester County that are not serviced at this time.

Faith House - Home for female alcoholics 20
2 Half Way Houses planned for the Worcester Area

Presently a full time Counselor covers the Jail.

Another Counselor covers the Probation Offices 1 day a week.

REFERRAL SOURCES AND SERVICES

Worcester County House of Correction
Massachusetts Parole Department at Worcester County House of Correction
Worcester Superior Court Probation Department
Worcester District Court Probation Department
Worcester Juvenile Court Probation Department
Detention Center, Worcester
Faith House, Worcester
D.E.S. Public Offender Counselors
Worcester Police Department, especially Juvenile Division
Area Police Departments
11 Area District Courts
District Attorney's Office
Youth Service Boards - Y.O.U.
Schools, Colleges
Welfare Departments - Mental Health Clinics
Division of Drug Rehabilitation
Private and Public Alcoholic Treatment Centers and Organizations
Families of Public Offenders
Self Referrals

Due to lack of personnel we cannot contact all the above, but we can do so with more personnel to implement suggested programs.

Recommendations for Worcester County-

A separate unit be established for the Public Offender Programs:

List Principles, Programs and Organizations

1. An effective rehabilitation program should have a preventative effect as well as being a means of modifying an individual's limiting disabilities and their concurrent problems to society.
2. With emphasis toward community based corrections, it is questionable that Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission should become involved with State Correctional Institutions. However, involvements on the community facilities should be considered.
3. Rehabilitation of the public offender is a process that involves the total individual. It is, therefore, pertinent for Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission to establish working agreements and contracts with other agencies to provide supportive services e.g. employment service, legal service, family and children service.
4. With emphasis on community based corrections, development of interest and active participation of community individuals and groups becomes pertinent phases of any correctional program.
5. Counselor work in Houses of Corrections, Camps and community base units should include advisory and, as needed, active roles with the Administration and Staff of these units to develop facets of the program.
6. Active participation with industrial, business, and governmental employer groups to promote employment opportunities.
7. As a means of preventative effort, work with the juvenile and youthful offender should be a part of the total program.

Specific Organizational Recommendations

1. Recommend that staffing for Worcester County be on a very selective basis. Only individuals who are interested and enjoys working with Public Offenders should be involved.
2. Training be instituted on an on going basis to develop understanding.
3. The supervision and budget of the public offender program be separated from the general district office organization.
4. The central office be located at the Worcester County House of Correction.
5. That at least one social worker be on the staff.
6. That a Senior Supervisor in Corrections head the program responsible to a Director of Public Offender Programs.

7. Organizational Chart

<u>Director of Case Service</u>		
<u>Grade 19</u>	Director of Public Offenders Program	
<u>Grade 17</u>	Senior Supervisor in Corrections	
<u>Grade 15</u>	Supervisor in Corrections	
<u>Grade 11</u>	<u>Grade 13,15</u>	<u>Grade 12</u>
Jr. Counselor	Counselor	Social Worker

Recommended Staff Need to Start Program

- 1 Senior Supervisor in Correction
- 2 Supervisors in Correction
- 4 Assistant Supervisors in Correction
- 1 Junior Counselor
- 1 Social Worker
- 2 Clerks
- 1 Fiscal Clerk

Minimum needed at this time to cover new jail and present program

- 1 Senior Supervisor
- 1 Supervisor
- 3 Assistant Supervisors
- 1 Social Worker
- 1 Clerk

Eventually we will expand and contact other district courts in the county as staff and money becomes available.

Submitted by;

Nelson T. Rahaim

Arthur J. Gillam, Jr.

Essex County

On Monday, March 5, 1973, at a meeting held in Lowell, you requested Counselors from the various counties to write a brief summary of the needs of each county concerning correctional data.

Essex County is the third largest county in Massachusetts. It has a population of over 600,000. Geographically speaking, it runs from Lynn along the coast to Newburyport, and inward to Methuen. As this county pertains to M.R.C. it is split in two districts, one under Lynn which comprises the largest city in the county plus the cities of Peabody, Salem, Danvers, Gloucester, and seven small towns. This district is under the Lynn office. The Lawrence area, which is a sub-office, but should be a district office, covers the grand cities of Lawrence, Haverhill, Newburyport, and Amesbury plus eleven small towns. The districts, the two aforementioned, are under one sheriff. Speaking in a county matter, there is a superior court in the city of Lawrence and a superior court in the city of Salem. Cases can be held in either court no matter where you live in the county, and as you know, if an appeal has been made in the decision of the lower court. The lower courts (or district courts) in the Lynn area are in Salem, Lynn, Peabody, Gloucester, and Danvers. The district courts in the Lawrence area are in Lawrence, Haverhill, Amesbury, Newburyport, and Salisbury. There are two separate county correctional institutions; one in Lawrence, and one in Salem, both were built in the 1840's. The Lawrence institution has inhabitants from 85 or 90. The Salem institution can run from 95-100. There are no facilities for vocational training because of the antequate conditions of these two vile institutions. The sheriff, Mr. Wells, is quite progressive, and Mr. Corcoran in Lawrence has been more than cooperative with this counselor trying to formulate rehabilitation plans. In fact, Mr. Corcoran has used his own time and money without notoriety to try and help the inmates. Physically speaking, the institutions couldn't be used for any real or realistic program. As you know, they cannot serve over two years in a county correctional institution. From statistics most fall in these categories: seventh grade education, broken homes, poor work habits, alcoholism, which is a strong factor in their criminal behavior. They verify the statement that "liquor is the curse of the poor".

Fortunately, we in the Lawrence area have a detoxification unit, a hospital workshop, a day care center, good job placement services available when needed. The only aspect lacking is a half-way house. Most of all, the money, time, and professional help given these people are to no avail, as they return to their room in the rooming house and count the roses on the wallpaper, a bleak factor indeed, co-habiting with other rejects of society. There is a detention home known as the Essex County Training School. The institution will close at long last on the 30th of June and it is rumored the Division of Youth Service may use it as a half-way house.

In addition Mr. Long, Lawrence and Lynn, (and to a degree, Salem) has a large Spanish-speaking population. These people are the forgotten

Appendix B 3 (continued)

minority when it comes to rendering services. They are not aware of services available, therefore they move around like the Armenian gypsies trying to find roots. It would be of great service if we hire para-professionals to work with these people. I suggest that two counselors be placed immediately to cover this vast geographic and populated area under a backup counselor and a clerk to handle the work. The counselor could have as his area the Lawrence or a Salem office or use both, and he should be familiar with the job (political and economical). He should have the empathy to be able to try and understand their predicament, be firm in his resolutions to help their needs, because these people have failed before and a certain percentage will fail again. The courts, I estimate, handle 10,000 cases a year. Even if we start now, build up good public relations, we can only be successful in initiating and saving the taxpayers money that is being wasted in incarcerating this group of people.

INTRODUCTION

In preparing a report for recommendations for M.R.C. participation in correctional rehabilitation, it is important to note that each service region has its own unique needs and characteristics. If M.R.C. is to expand its correctional program it will be vital to utilize existing or projected programs of other agencies to assist in the total rehabilitation of the offender, and to avoid duplication of services.

In this report, recommendations will be submitted for the greater Lowell area only, since sufficient information is not available to formulate recommendations for other areas in the Northeast region.

We will present two alternatives:

- 1) Immediate short term correctional needs;
 - a) for those incarcerated,
 - b) for non-incarcerated offenders.
- 2) Long range goals for correctional rehabilitation.

In submitting this report it is important to note that Middlesex County is the largest county in the Commonwealth as well as the most populous. Therefore, our long range goals will reflect this fact in recommendations for facilities and staffing.

PRESENT NEEDS

A) Incarcerated public offenders--Billerica House of Correction.

- 1) One full time counselor assigned as needed to the House of Correction.

An optimum allocation of time would be two days per week at the House of Correction--to take part in staff meetings and interview clients. Two days should be allotted at the Lowell office of M.R.C. for follow up of Lowell area residents and for administrative duties. One day per week could be allotted at the Malden area office for follow up of released offenders.

2) A part time junior counselor should be assigned as needed to the program. This assignment would be at the discretion of the counselor and the amount of time allocated should be increased as the caseload warrants. The junior counselor's remaining time would be assigned to the Community based public offender counselor. A "50-50" time allotment to each category would be an optimum arrangement.

B) Non-incarcerated public offenders:

1) One community based public offender counselor. This counselor's area should include the Lowell District Court two days per week; the Woburn District Court one day per week; Ayer District Court, Concord District Court, and the pre-release center in Shirley would in combination constitute one day per week. The remaining day of the week should be spent in the District Office for administrative duties.

This counselor should work with the probation departments of each court; he should help to create an inter-agency board within the courts at which weekly planning, meetings and staffing of applicants can be made. The court psychiatrist should also be consulted as part of this counselor's duties, and also he should work closely with the judges in their respective courts in order to keep them abreast of services at this inter-agency conference.

2) The above-mentioned junior counselor would spend the remainder of his time on assignments at the discretion of the Community based public offender counselor.

LONG RANGE GOALS

Keeping in mind that this phase of the report is merely a projection, it is quite reasonable to assume that future necessities may vary considerably from this initial proposal.

PROPOSED TABLE OF ORGANIZATION

- 1) Director
- 2) Assistant director
- 3) Regional supervisors
- 4) Northeast region only
 - 4a) Billerica House of Correction
 - 1) Two full time counselors
 - 4b) Lowell District Court
 - 1) One full time counselor
 - 4c) Woburn, Ayer, Concord District Court plus Pre-Release Center in Shirley
 - 1) One full time counselor
 - 4d) A placement specialist available to all above
 - 4e) Two clerks

DRUG OFFENDERS

Whereas the problem of drug involvement is so closely related to the public offenders anti-social behavior, it is the opinion of this committee that the present system of referrals through a mental health coordinator, is inadequate, unrealistic, and a definite detriment in initiating rehabilitation services. Because of the delay necessitated by the above procedure, many public offenders become disenchanted with the proposed rehabilitation services.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) Case should be opened and processed in regular fashion.
- 2) Client should actively participate in a drug rehabilitation program if he is presently drug dependent.
- 3) Continued counseling and guidance, and planning toward a suitable vocational goal should be pursued simultaneously with his treatment.
- 4) Periodic review by inter-agency group, on the issue of client's drug dependency, should assist the counselor in determining whether or not the client is drug free.

- 5) Vocational planning should be initiated as soon as possible after drug free certification.

FUNDING

Due to the multiplicity of services being offered by M.R.C., it is strongly recommended by this committee:

- 1) Specific funds be allocated to the "Public Offender Program."
- 2) The director of the program should disburse these funds through the regional supervisor of the "Public Offender Program."

CONCLUSION

The need for a "Public Offender Program" has been demonstrated, and the staff to operate such a program will have to be reviewed periodically, in order to meet all the needs of the public offender.

This committee strongly recommends areas of special funding and revised drug referral procedures. It is our hope that the implementation of the above-mentioned areas, will result in rendering comprehensive and successful rehabilitative services to the public offender.

Submitted by:
Armand R. Tousignant
James T. Parker
Peter T. Slipp

This paper will be in basically outline form, covering the areas of eligibility, staff assignments, client services, counselor's selection and training and some general statements. This is in no way is meant to be a final proposal for this program, but merely some broad rough ideas, that need to be expanded upon, and refined.

A- Eligibility:

1. Should be streamlined.
2. Evaluations should be done in the institution and eligibility determined there.
3. When the above is not done, the process should be as quick as possible on the outside.
 - a) The MRC counselor should have a working relationship with 2-3 psychiatrists or psychologists, and appointment time slots should be reserved at specific times for his clients.
 - b) Counselor should have met the client in the institution, and have the above referred to evaluation appointment set up before the client leaves the institution. Of course if the counselor was able to work with the man in the institution and with him when he leaves he would not have to meet the client.
4. Should be evaluated according to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1968 Law 90-391, to determine if the disability can be substantiated by a background of crime and delinquency in itself.
5. From #4 whatever may be the ruling, the following are suggested.
 - a) Physical or mental disability should be expanded to include civil disability, and this should be substantiated by one or more of the following, preferably one. Note others may be used to help the counselor understand and help the client better.
 - 1-A record of crime and delinquency, with a report from a correctional social worker or other professional.
 - 2- A psychiatric evaluation.
 - 3- A psychological evaluation.*Basic medical exam should be optional, this option will save time for the client, and money for MRC.
 - b) Handicap to employment should be viewed in two ways.
 - 1- The disability per se, inability to maintain self in employment or secure employment, due to i.e. behavioral problems.
 - 2- Because of being an ex-offender the resulting stigma and discrimination by employers.
 - c) A reasonable expectation for employment.

B- Staff Assignments (Two Options)

1-Speciality counselors housed in regular District Office.

- a) Would be able to have authority to authorize proposals.
- b) Would be directly responsible to the coordinator of public offender services, who in turn would be responsible to the Director of Case Services, who in turn be responsible to the Commissioner.
- c) This proposal would alleviate delays and misconceptions.

2- Second option, which I feel is the better of two would be to have two special offices to serve this population. One in Boston, and the other in the Springfield Area.

a) Boston Office would have a staff of fifteen (15) to include:

- (1) A supervisor who has an expertise and knowledge of the population, as well as concern and dedication for it.
- (2) One job placement specialist - included because this is the most important phase of the process, to do job development and help the counselors with job placement.
 - (a) This person would work very closely with the DES Law Offender Program.
 - (b) He would also do public relations work, and attempt to break down barriers to employment for the ex-offender.

3-Three secretaries, including one fiscal clerk.

4- Thress paraprofessionals, could be ex-offenders.

- a) Research has shown that they are more effective often in getting through to other ex-offenders than regular staff.

5- Seven Counselors:

- a) One to serve Concord and the Shirley re-Release Center.
- b) One to serve Mass. Half-Way Houses, Inc.,
- c) One to serve Deer Island and the Charles St., Jail.
- d) One to serve Framingham (preferably a woman).
- e) One to serve Norfolk and Walpole.
- f) One to serve the Billerica House of Correction.
- g) One to serve the Plymouth Prison Camp and M.C.I. Bridgewater.

b-Springfield Office:

- 1. One Supervisor
- 2. One job placement specialist
- 3. Two secretaries, including one fiscal clerk.
- 4. Two paraprofessionals
- 5. Thress Counselors.
 - a. One to serve Monroe and Warwick Prison Camps.
 - b. One to serve Worcester House of Correction, and Hampden House of Correction.
 - c. One to serve Berkshire House of Correction.

- c-Both supervisors would be directly responsible to the coordinator of public offender services, in turn to the Director of Case Services, and to the Commissioner.

- d. Each office would be assigned either a psychiatric or psychological consultant who would be chosen for:
 1. Expertise and knowledge of the population.
 2. Dedication, concern, and special interest in the population.
- 3- Both ex-offenders and minority group members should be recruited for all staff positions, not just because they are one of the above but for their special skills, and knowledges in the human relations field.
- 4- All staff will serve as advocates for the expoffender.
 - a). Will do public relations work.
 - b). Will attend and speak at conferences and universities when asked.

C- Counselors -- Selection and Training:

1. Selection

- a) Should be selected both from within and outside of the agency from that group who are truly dedicated and concerned with the population.
- b) Should be action orientated:
 1. Should get from behind the desk and into the field.
 2. Should not be an 8:45 to 5:00 PM counselor, but be able to work a flexible schedule regarding the needs of the client, that probably will include evenings and at least Saturdays. Of course compensatory time will be given regarding this.
- c) Should be experienced in working with the offender or delinquent population.
- d) A counselor should NEVER be assigned to an ex-offender or offender caseload, but should apply for it.

2. Training:

- a) Should be at least two to four weeks in service training.
- b) Community Resources:
 1. During the training the counselor will spend time visiting major public and private agencies and programs, in person, that serve the population.
 2. At the MRC Central Office, and other facilities, counselors will participate in seminars and hear lectures with and from those with expertise in this field
 3. Experimental Learning in the Correctional Institutions (Mandatory)
 - a. For three days to one week.
 - b. Counselors will tour correctional institutions throughout the state, to in some small way get a feeling what an institution is like.
 - c. The counselor will be based in one institution, staying there overnight and eating most of his meals.
 - d. During the days the counselor would tour other institutions, participate and observe the programs, eat lunch there, and talk formally and informally to staff and inmates.

D.) CLIENT SERVICES:

1. Testing and Evaluations;

(a) Counselor should establish a working relationship with D.E.S.

- 1- D.S.E. should test men on the GATB in the institutions.
- 2- When testing is not done in the institution, the counselor should have five to six slots reserved in the local D.E.S. Office for his clients so they can be promptly referred.

(b) All other evaluations should be set up as soon as possible to reduce delays.

(c) Counselor should have Kuder Preference Record Tests on hand, to give to the client himself.

- 1- Any counselor can easily learn to give it and interpret it.
- 2- It would be more expedient for the counselor to give it.
- 3- It would save MRC money
- 4- It would actively get the client involved, and put responsibility on him.

2. Counselor's Caseload;

(a) Should not exceed fifty five (55) cases.

(b) This group needs intensive work, and studies have shown that large caseloads dictate against intensive services.

3. Counselor's Role;

(a) Must become involved with the total person, medical psychological social, and vocational aspects and issues. Counselor must be a "total counselor" not just a vocational counselor.

(b) Counselor must become actively involved with all public and private agencies who work with the ex-offender, and should not wait for the other agencies to contact him, but often must make the first move.

(c) Counselor's approach should be one of out-reach approach.

1. Many clients will be defensive and suspicious at first and counselor must reach out to them, not close the case if at first person is uncooperative but rather try to deal with this in counseling and actively go out in the field and try to reach the client when he doesn't come in for appointments. Of course there is a limit obviously to this, but if a case is closed for uncooperativeness after all efforts have been made by the counselor the door should always be open to the client for help in the future and this should be verbalized to the clients.

4. Group Counseling and Psychotherapy;

(a) Counselor should be able to do group counseling when needed.

(b) Counselor should be able to purchase the service of group psychotherapy, from psychiatrists, psychologists, and other trained people.

5. There should be monthly formal staff meetings between the major agencies concerned, as well as periodic conferences sponsored by them for those interested in the rehabilitation of the public offender.

Agencies and people involved would be Leo Long, MRC Walt Williams Deputy Commissioner Community Treatment for the Department of Corrections, Larry Solomon Deputy Commissioner for Treatment Institutional Phase for Department of Corrections, Martin Davis, Director of Parole Services, Bryan Riley, Director of Mass. Half-Way Houses Inc., Lois Stryker D.E.S. Law Offender Program, and Richard Finnegan, Department of Public Welfare.

- (a) These meetings would provide a chance to share ideas, problems and successes in working with offenders.
 - (b) It would assure that communications between agencies never break down, which has happened before.
 - (c) In addition the idea of a newsletter, a special one regarding work with the offenders by each agency, be started by each agency and distributed to all staff of other agencies.
6. The Mass. Half-Way Houses Inc., -- MRC agreement should be strengthened and serve as a model for MRC establishing similar relationships with similar programs in the future.
 7. The fact that a client may be employed in a job not in line with his capacities, interests, or aptitudes should not in any way preclude his being considered for any MRC services. This should be emphasized because when an ex-offender comes out of the institution he needs some sort of a job to have any chance at all at making it.

Related to this after a man gets out of an institution, and gets a job, it is hard for him to take time off to see the counselor and for evaluations. The employer will grow suspicious, and this will put a lot of stress on the client. For this reason it is really crucial that the evaluations be done in the institutions, and that the counselor have a flexible work schedule, one that permits him to work evenings and weekends when necessary, with compensatory time of course.

8. One important point throughout the whole process is to get the client as actively involved in the process and planning as much as possible. In an institution a man can feel he is programmed and feel like an object, thus giving him responsibility for his own rehabilitation is vital.
9. Clients who fail at training programs should have a second chance, when they are ready rather than just closing the case as a failure.
10. All communications between agencies should be prompt, complete, and courteous.
11. There should be flexibility in the use of non-traditional services proven successful for this group such as Outward Bound Programs, Karate and Judo Schools.

E.) Conclusions and Final Statements;

1. Research is needed, and should be done to help evaluate how the job can be better done, rather than to justify why MRC should do the job. By the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1968, any public offender is entitled a diagnostic evaluation for eligibility.
2. MRC should actively pursue LEAA funds, other funds to be able to expand services, however, if funds like this can not be gotten MRC still has an obligation to work with the offender population.
 - (a) MRC has not do right by this group, i.e. the juvenile delinquency project, and the relationship with Mass. Half-Way Houses Inc.,
3. Old logic and rationale that offenders and delinquents are not the responsibility of MRC is a cop-out in the purest sense. By that same rationale why aren't the mentally handicapped the sole responsibility of the Department of Mental Health? The fact is that the offender population is a tough problem, and that all agencies must work together to have a real good chance of providing this group with good services, rather than passing the buck back to one another which has gone on for too long.
4. Services to offenders, and delinquents should be a special part of the regular MRC services as these clients have special needs, but it should not be another pilot project which goes down the drain in three years, but one of on-going services.
5. Time has come for Action not Talk and more promises. For facing reality and not deluding ourselves, for follow through rather than delays, to get involved rather than passing the buck, to speak and care rather than hiding behind pseudo-professional roles, and to care for rather than neglect this group which we should have long ago been servicing well.

Post-Script: These are just a few of my ideas, I know many needed to be elaborated on, and refined, as well as implementation planned, but I feel they can serve as a start for such concrete planning, Finally, I tried to state the facts and problems as I have seen them, without pulling any punches.

Appendix A Section 5b

Statewide Recommendations for Juvenile Offender Program by Thomas Allman.

Option One:

a) Counselor serving Cambridge - Somerville Area

1) Referrals:

- a) from Cambridge and Somerville Juvenile probation departments - Youth from Cambridge, Somerville and Arlington
- b) from local high schools of acting out youth - as a preventive measure;
- c) from Dare Incorporated - a half-way house in Cambridge;
- d) from Cambridge Youth Resource Bureau - an agency staffed with street workers who work with delinquent youth
- e) Juvenile Police Officers

2) Housing - 3 options

- a) Somerville Court
- b) Cambridge Court
- c) Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission - Somerville Office

3) Relationship with other agencies

- a) Neighborhood Youth Corps - fund youth in jobs
- b) Juvenile Probation Departments - Assist in Counseling
- c) Court Clinics - Could do psychiatric evaluations
- d) Youth Resource Bureau - provide day to day contact with youth
- e) Office For Children - Region III office has \$175,000.00 to fund youth from Welfare Families;

b) One counselor serving Framingham - Mayland - Ashland - Holliston - Sudbury Area.

1) Referrals from:

- a) Framingham Juvenile Probation Department.
- b) from local high schools
- c) from Wayside Union - a half-way house in Framingham serving youth who can't live at home and who have been known to the court;
- d) from Juvenile Police Officers

2) Housing - 3 Options:

- a) Framingham Court
- b) Wayside Union
- c) Natick Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission Office

3)

- a) Neighborhood Youth Corps
- b) Juvenile Probation Department
- c) Court Clinic
- d) Office for children - Region V Office

Appendix 5b (cont.)

c) One counselor serving Greater Boston Area

1) Referrals from:

- a) Boston Juvenile Court
- b) Boston Court Resource Project
- c) Boston Youth Activities Commission
- d) Dare, Incorporated - a half-way house located in Jamaica Plain
- e) Juvenile Police Officers
- f) Division of Youth Services - Detention center and Andros Program. located in Roslindale

2) Housing - Options:

- a) Boston Regular Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission Office
- b) Special Offender team Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission Office
- c) Boston Juvenile Court
- d) Division of Youth Services detention center - with part-time location in Boston, Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission office.

3) Relationships with other agencies:

- a) Juvenile Court Probation Department
- b) Boston Youth Activities Commission
- c) Court Clinic
- d) Neighborhood Youth Corps
- e) Office For Children - Region VI Office

Option Two: Same as Option One except for Addition of para-professionals be they ex-offenders or junior counselors in 3 areas to be serviced.

Option Three:

Keep counselor serving Framingham and Cambridge Juvenile Courts but add a para-professional or junior counselor to assist him. No expansion into areas suggested in option one.

Option Four:

Do nothing, just retain counselor serving Cambridge and Framingham Courts, as he does at present.

Recommendation:

Option one, seems the minimal in order to do the job well.

November 1, 1973 - Expansion:

- a) One counselor serving Brockton - Stoughton area - (Brockton a high crime area - as noted by LEA's Crime Rate Statistics)

Appendix B 5 (cont.)

November 1, 1973 - Expansion: (cont.)

1) Referrals from :

- a) Brockton District Court - Juvenile Probation
- b) Stoughton District Court - Juvenile Probation Department
- c) local high School
- d) juvenile police officers
- e) Brockton Youth Resource Project
- f) Division of Youth Services Brockton Y.M.C.A. Project.

2) Housing-2 Options:

- a) Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission - Brockton Office
- b) Brockton District Court $\frac{1}{2}$ time, Stoughton District Court $\frac{1}{2}$ with records kept in Brockton Court:

3) Relationships with Key agencies:

- a) Juvenile Probation Departments
- b) Court Clinics
- c) Neighborhood Youth Corps
- d) Brockton Division of Youth Services Y.M.C.A. Project
- e) Youth Resource Bureau
- f) Office For Children Regional Office

- b) One counselor serving Lynn - Marblehead - Nahant (this included because of 1969 LEAA Crime Rate Statistics indication Lynn had one of higher crime rates).

1) Referrals:

- a) from juvenile probation department
- b) from local high schools
- c) juvenile police officers

2) Housing - 2 Options:

- a) Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission Lynn Office
- b) Lynn District Court

3) Relationships with other agencies:

- a) Court Clinics
- b) Juvenile probation departments
- c) Neighborhood Youth Corps
- d) Lynn Youth Activities Commission
- e) Office For Children Regional Office

Option Two: Same as one but add a para-professional or junior counselor in each area to be serviced.

Option Three: NO EXPANSION:

Appendix B 5 (cont.)

Recommendation: OPTION ONE; Both these areas Lynn and Brockton have high crime rates demonstrating a need for services. One counselor in each area would be the minimal in order to do the job well.

JULY 1974

Option One

a) One counselor serving Quincy Area (Quincy had 12th highest crime rate in 1969 according to LEAA Statistics).

1) Referrals from same sources mentioned before

2) Housing - 3 Options:

- a) Quincy Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission office
- b) Quincy District Court
- c) Quincy Community Action Program

3) Relationships with other agencies:

a) Same as mentioned before in addition include Quincy Community Action Program

b) One counselor serving Lowell-Lawrence Area (these towns had a high crime rate in 1969).

1) Referrals from same sources mentioned before:

2) Housing - 3 Options:

- a) Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission Lowell office
- b) Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission Lawrence office
- c) $\frac{1}{2}$ time Lowell District Court $\frac{1}{2}$ time Lawrence District Court - with records kept in one of them.

3) Relationships with other agencies - Same as stated before;

Option Two:

Same as one but add a para-professional or junior counselor for each area;

Option Three:

No expansion at this time;

Recommendation: Option one:

July 1975

Option One

By this time counselors serving juveniles in Cambridge-Somerville Area, Framingham Area, Boston Area, Brockton Area, Lynn Area, Quincy Area,

July 1975-Option One (cont.)

Lowell-Lawrence Area. Each counselor with a para-professional or junior counselor assisting him.

Option Two:

Same as one but add a counselor to serve the New Bedford Area; add a counselor to serve the Fall River Area and one to serve the Brookline Area;

Option Three:

Same as two but add para-professional or junior counselors in each new area.

Option Four:

Same as two but only add a para-professional or junior counselor, preferably spanish speaking, in the New Bedford Area.

Recommendation: OPTION TWO:

By July, 1975 would thus have:

Counselors serving 10 areas; Assistant Coordinator for Juvenile Delinquent Programs would:

- a) coordinate services in all areas between Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission, Office For Children, Division of Youth Services, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Probation Departments and Court Clinics.
- b) Stimulate Interest and concern for delinquent youth in the Community by working with local city government officials, Chambers of Commerce, Kiwonis and Rotary and other such clubs:
- c) Assist in training and selection of staff:
 - a) Promote educational seminars and conferences at local universities regarding vocational rehabilitation of delinquents
 - b) Hold monthly meetings of all Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission juvenile workers, so that workers may learn from one another.
- d) Provide general overall supervision to all staff serving delinquents: in-turn himself being responsible to the Coordinator for all public offender programs and in turn to the Director of Client Services and the Commissioner.

Assist the Coordinator of Public Offender Programs as he may request.

Sources of Funds

1) OFFICE FOR CHILDREN:

- a) Each Regional Office has a director whose job it is to coordinate

Appendix B 5 (cont.)

Sources of Funds

a. (cont). services among the human service agencies serving youth. The purpose is to expediate quality services, without duplication at the smallest possible cost.

b) In addition each regional director has \$175,000.00 for services for youth from Welfare Families, or former or potential Welfare Families. Regions I and IV have \$250,000.00 each.

c) Court Clinics -- could do psychiatric evaluations at the saving of \$30.00 per client to Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission over one year for 100 cases, this could mean a savings of \$3,000.00 for Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission.

d) LEAA

END