

053055

53055

A N N U A L R E P O R T

State of New Jersey
Department of Corrections
Division of Policy and Planning

BUREAU OF PAROLE

Whittlesey Road, Trenton
(P.O. Box 7387)

(July 1, 1977 - June 30, 1978)

Albert Elias
Assistant Commissioner

Nat R. Arluke, Chief
Bureau of Parole

Victor R. D'Ilio
Supervising Parole Officer

INDEX

Introduction..... Page 1

Goals and Objectives..... Page 1

Developments..... Page 3

Personnel..... Page 3

Parole Advisory Committee..... Page 5

Training..... Page 5

Parole Resource Orientation and Office Facility..... Page 6

Volunteers in Parole Program..... Page 9

SLEPA Grant Projects..... Page 12

Parolee Earnings..... Page 17

Discharged Prior to Expiration of Maximum..... Page 17

Comprehensive Employment and Training Act..... Page 18

Casebook Reviews..... Page 18

Probable Cause Hearings..... Page 18

Public Relations..... Page 19

Institutional Parole Program..... Page 19

Furlough Work/Study Program..... Page 20

Caseloads..... Page 23

Returns to Institutions..... Page 23

Missing Cases..... Page 24

Supervision..... Page 24

Charts and Tables Follow

NCJRS

JUN - 4 1981

ACQUISITION

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Parole has the responsibility to conduct investigations for both parole and clemency matters, to provide orientation and planning aimed toward release to the community of persons committed to training schools and penal and correctional institutions in New Jersey and the Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center, to provide supervision and submit reports concerning persons paroled from the above institutions and persons paroled from similar institutions of other states to reside in New Jersey. In addition, the Bureau is responsible for periodical investigations and recording of activities of inmates involved in the work release and furlough programs, and as a result of the *Morrissey vs. Brewer* U. S. Supreme Court Decision, for conducting the "Probable Cause" section of the revocation process.

In order to execute its responsibilities, the Bureau maintains a headquarters office in the Department of Corrections Administrative Complex, Trenton, nine district offices located throughout the state, a parole office in each institution, and a community residential facility in Jersey City.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. Caseload/Workload Size: Experimentation has begun in the development of workloads based on the amount of effort required to adequately service cases under supervision rather than on a numerical or geographical limitation. It would appear upon initial observation that a larger field staff may be required to convert entirely to such a system.

2. Improving Quality of Service to Clients and to the Community: (a) Team supervision process is in effect in all district offices although in varying degrees of development. The process should prove valuable, particularly in the orientation of new officers and the bringing into focus on a case the thinking of various professionals. (b) Parole Manpower Vocational Service Centers have expanded the Parole Bureau's role beyond State parolees in serving all offenders in the job readiness and job placement area. Variety of clientele will continue to increase as more service agencies learn of its advantages. (c) The National Association of Businessmen's program has begun to involve Parole Bureau personnel in segments of the business world previously uncharted by service agencies in attempts to secure employment for offenders. (d) Surveillance units are planned for a wide range of uses and could become available almost immediately upon funding. Such units would not only observe parolee behavior and make arrests, but could also conduct various investigations and act as a Bureau Internal Affairs Unit. (e) PROOF II and III (residential facilities are planned to

service each region not presently housing such a residential facility. These concepts also await appropriate funding.

3. Community Involvement: (a) Volunteers in Parole Program continues to expand. Not only are volunteers now being recruited for supervision, but also recruited are those who wish to contribute a specific service. A third volunteer unit includes those individuals and organizations wishing to contribute cash and/or physical goods or services to the clientele. (b) Expanding role in the furlough/work release program has allowed the Bureau to also expand its public relations role on an individual one-to-one basis.

4. Paper Work Process: The paper work process is constantly under scrutiny. Additions, deletions and changes are made as required. Efforts are being made to streamline where possible.

5. Staff Selection and Retention: (a) In excess of twenty parole officers were upgraded to senior parole officers and are now involved in case supervision. Efforts continue to secure more upgrades, parole officers, and Assistant District Parole Supervisors. (b) Efforts continue to gain support to upgrade salary levels. (c) Efforts continue to secure departmental policy of professional development which will offer a reasonable incentive in this area.

6. Realignment of District Office Areas: Initial consideration has begun to determine possible or potential trends which may have a bearing on whether or not district office areas will have to be revised.

DEVELOPMENTS

Probable Cause Hearings: This hearing, mandated by the Supreme Court *Morrissey vs. Brewer* Decision, was initiated under urgent requirements with the assignment of supervising parole officers (highest level under Chief and Assistant Chief) to formulate operating procedures, establish policy and to conduct the hearings. Having accomplished these goals, in January, 1978 a Probable Cause Hearing Unit composed of four senior parole officers was established. Under the supervision of a supervising parole officer the senior parole officers are responsible for conducting all Probable Cause Hearings throughout the State. At their periodic meetings, problems are resolved and with the Chief's approval, Bureau policy is established and distributed to all field units by means of written minutes of the meetings.

Regionalization: Disengaged from daily involvement in Probable Cause Hearings, the supervising parole officers became free to involve themselves directly in overall administrative and policy-making duties. The State was divided into three regions--north including Districts 1, 2 and 9, central including Districts 3, 4, 5 and PROOF, and south including Districts 6, 7 and 8. A supervising parole officer was placed in administrative charge of

each region and charged with developing it according to its needs. The remaining two supervising parole officers were assigned the state-wide responsibility for such functions as training, Probable Cause Hearing Officers, institutional parole officers and a series of other similar type programs lending themselves to state-wide jurisdiction.

Team Supervision and Workload Classification: As part of the overall reorganization of the Bureau, experimentation began in earnest with the scientific classification of cases through use of the California Base expectancy scale. Three categories of supervision are now being utilized. Hard-to-manage are under the supervision of an expanded field senior parole officer staff. Orienta-tion cases are those classified as needing only a "front-loading" of services and perhaps can be discharged promptly without posing any great threat to the community. The bulk of the cases remain in a service category and are provided with that type of supervision deemed appropriate. Teams consisting of a senior parole officer and two parole officers are working together in attempts to expand horizons in supervision.

PERSONNEL

At the end of the prior fiscal year, there were 294 staff members in the Bureau, 26 of which were Federally funded positions. Thirty-three new positions were granted as of July 1, 1977 (25 parole officers and 8 clerk-typists), making a total of 327 positions at the beginning of the fiscal year.

During the fiscal year, the following positions were removed as indicated below:

- 2 Senior Parole Officers) Reassigned to the newly created Bu-
- 2 Parole Officers) reau of Interstate Services.
- 1 Clerk-typist)

- 5 Parole Officers - Federally funded Community Resource Spe-
- cialists abolished (replaced by reclassification of 5
- parole officer positions).

- 1 Senior clerk-stenographer - reassigned to Hearing Officers,
- Yardville.

- 2 Parole Officers)
- 1 Clerk-typist) Commandeered by the Department.

With the removal of the above 14 positions, the total staff of the Bureau was reduced to 313, to which was added during the year three parole officers and one senior clerk-stenographer under the Federally funded NAB project, and one principal clerk-stenographer (secretary to the Assistant Chief).

During the same period, one Supervising Parole Officer position was utilized for reclassification to Assistant Chief, and 26 Parole Officer positions were reclassified to Senior Parole Officer to provide team leaders for the newly implemented Bureau Reorganization Program.

As of June 30, 1978, the total complement of 318 staff members were distributed as follows:

Chief	1
Assistant Chief	1
Supervising Parole Officers	5
Program Development Specialist	1
Volunteers in Parole Program (Supervisor of Volunteers and Senior Parole Officer)	2
Furlough Coordinator (Senior Parole Officer)	1
Statistics and Research (Senior Parole Officer)	1
Hearing Officers (Senior Parole Officers)	4
District Parole Supervisors	9
Assistant District Parole Supervisors (including 3 Federally funded)	12
Senior Parole Officers (Field and Institutional Parole Officers - including 3 Federally funded)	53
Residential Parole Officers (PROOF)	7
Parole Officers (including 12 Federally funded)	125
Clerical (including 5 Federally funded)	95
Total	316
(Federally funded Program Development Specialist -- and Senior Parole Officer positions held vacant to accumulate funds to continue 3 Community Resource Specialist positions through September 30 expiration date)	2
Total	318

Terminations: There were 15 terminations of professional staff for the following reasons:

Two moved out of state.

Three resigned for personal reasons--one admitted to mental institution, one could not adapt to the environment in Monmouth County and one as the result of a career decision.

Two resigned to accept promotional opportunities--one with Thomas Edison College and the other with the Division of Policy Planning.

Four accepted positions with the newly created Bureau of Interstate Services.

One voluntarily resigned after having failed to satisfactorily complete his probationary period.

One was terminated following an unauthorized absence.

One resigned "not in good standing"--failed to give adequate notice.

One retired after twenty-four years of service.

PAROLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Conceptualized in the early months of 1977, the Parole Advisory Committee has grown to maturity rapidly and for good reason.

The Committee is composed of representatives of every operating component in the Bureau and draws its participants from all levels of staff.

It is a forum for problem presentation and mutual exchange of ideas. Situations that do not lend themselves to ready resolution are researched for later discussion and policy development.

Anyone in the Bureau may raise issues, problems or ideas through their representatives. Through the minutes of these meetings, policy is distributed uniformly throughout the State.

Begun experimentally, meetings are still held monthly in order to resolve pertinent current issues and dispel unfounded rumors.

TRAINING

A. In-Service Training: Training was held on the following regional basis with the senior parole officer or administrative assistant supervisor in each district responsible for the program on a rotating bi-monthly basis:

Region North: Districts 1, 2 and 9
Region Central: Districts 3, 4, 5 and PROOF
Region South: Districts 6, 7, 8

Programs included a tour of the Bergen County Jail and an orientation to same; Prediction and Caseload Management; Probable Cause and Final Revocation Hearings; tour of N. J. State Prison, Rahway, and observation of the "Lifers Group" in action; Problems of Abused and Battered Spouses; presentation of a reorientation to the PROOF concept; Listening Techniques; tour of N. J. State Prison, Trenton; presentation on the problems attendant to the criminal justice system; presentation on the Newark Renaissance House; Procedures of the new Bureau of Interstate Services; Social Security Benefits; Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation; Treatment of Alcoholic Offender; and an address by the Assistant Commissioner of the Division.

B. Other Agency Training Programs: These included Final Revocation Hearing training; Assertiveness Training; Counselling the Alcoholic Client; Dealing With the Hispanic Offender; Minority Group Awareness; Guided Group Interaction; Orientation to State Parole Board Administrative Procedure; Orientation to Bureau Reorganization; General Parole Bureau Conference.

Field training of correction officers by field personnel in the districts continued as scheduled.

Training of volunteers has been conducted throughout the year under the aegis of the Volunteers in Parole Program Coordinator.

Training for Community Resource Specialists and Vocational Services Center Project personnel has been under the direction of the Project Director.

PAROLE RESOURCE OFFICE AND ORIENTATION FACILITY (PROOF)

Description: The Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility is operated solely by the Bureau of Parole. Located in a public housing project in Jersey City, it continues to provide a unique and necessary service as a community based facility which supplies total supportive services to parolees who are experiencing difficulty. For the recent institutional releasee PROOF can provide a transitional phase back into the community. As an alternative to incarceration for those who have become involved in community problems with which they cannot adequately cope, an opportunity is offered the parolee to reside at PROOF and participate in a program of social diagnosis and treatment on a 24 hour a day, 7 day a week basis. Ultimately, after a stay which is hoped will not exceed 90 days, the parolee can be returned to his home district to be continued under parole supervision. PROOF admitted its first resident on December 2, 1969 and on June 30, 1978 the 938th admission was realized.

Staffing: On-site staffing of PROOF is accomplished by eight professionals and one clerical support person. They fall under the responsibility and general supervision of a supervising parole officer (Regional Administrator - Central). The facility is staffed 24 hours a day on rotating shifts. A senior parole officer has been designated as officer-in-charge in his role as on-site supervisor. He provides the necessary accountability for both casework and facility operation. The balance of staff includes four residential parole officers, three parole officers and a clerk-transcriber.

Statistical Information: During fiscal year 1978, 3338 resident days were utilized by a total of 137 parolees and, accordingly, the facility operated at an average of 60.94% of capacity. This represents a decrease in utilization over the previous fiscal year not due significantly to the decrease in the number of new admissions to the facility, but rather because their length of stay had diminished

from an average of 25.8 days in fiscal 1977 to an average of 23.6 days in fiscal 1978. Institutional and district breakdown of the 137 new admissions of the past fiscal year are as follows:

	<u>TSB</u>	<u>YRCC</u>	<u>YCIA</u>	<u>YCIB</u>	<u>NJSP</u>	<u>O/S</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
DO#1	1	2	3	1	3		10
DO#2		5	5	3	1		14
DO#3		2	2	6	5		14
DO#4	2	11	12	10	13	1	49
DO#5		2	5	3	3		13
DO#6			2	1			4
DO#7			2		1	2	5
DO#8		1					1
DO#9		3	12	8	3	1	27
Total	3	26	43	32	29	4	137

The 138 terminations were broken down as follows: 74 were re-located in the community without need for further assistance; 11 were placed in other programs more suited to their needs; 9 were arrested for various reasons (charges initiated prior to PROOF entry, while at PROOF, and as parole violators); 44 were terminated for failing to adjust to the program (including residents who went AWOL and never returned, as well as overtly serious adjustment problems).

Casework: The ultimate goal of the PROOF program is to assist residents in developing self-sufficiency so that they can maintain themselves in the community. For most residents this means obtaining full time employment. To this end, staff has employed the services of various community resources, such as the Jersey City Vocational Counselling Service, New Jersey State Employment Service, New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission, the Urban League, the U. S. Armed Forces, Newark Services Agency and Job Bank. Almost all residents are usually successful in obtaining at least temporary employment on a daily basis through such private agencies as Labor Pool, Staff Builders and Manpower. Staff is also constantly attempting to develop contacts for direct job referrals. Most residents who sincerely want to work are successful in finding employment.

Many residents have taken advantage of various programs to further their education. Some have studied for their GED while others have enrolled in programs at Jersey City State College, Technical Careers Institute and Cashiers Training Institute.

Upon entry into the facility, most residents are almost totally without funds. Clothing, transportation, and personal items present an immediate problem. To assist in meeting these needs, the resources of Jersey City Municipal Welfare are used along with such Departmental and Bureau programs as institutional gate money, Central Office

Health Services funds, mini-grants, and purchase of service accounts provided by the Community Resource Specialist Project. Total disbursements of \$1047 were made from the various Bureau programs alone.

The Jersey City Medical Center has, to a large extent, assisted in providing health care to the residents. Dr. McGovern's office has been utilized for routine medical examinations while the emergency room has provided treatment for acute illnesses. The Center's various clinics have met such resident needs as dental care and diagnosis and treatment of venereal disease. Restorative dental care and other health services have been provided through N. J. Rehabilitation Commission. New Eyes for the Needy have provided several residents with prescription eyeglasses. Community Mental Health Center, along with Patrick House Drug and Alcohol Abuse Clinic, has served to meet some of the more specific needs of residents.

Recreational facilities of the local YMCA have been made available to PROOF residents on a selective basis without cost. In-house recreation includes ping-pong, chess, checkers, cards, frisbee and basketball along with T.V. viewing.

Counselling remains one of the most basic of services which PROOF provides. The intensive intake interview enables staff to evaluate the parolee's situation and problems and to develop a program which is individually designed to meet the resident's needs. A staff member is assigned to each resident to provide for continued counselling. The assigned counsellor meets with the resident at least weekly to review progress, identify problems, suggest corrective measures and to assist the resident in planning for relocation. Because there is always an officer on duty who is completely aware of each resident's case and problems and is capable of responding to immediate problems and needs, the team approach is effectively utilized. Through staff reviews and regular discussion of all cases, staff develops a unified approach that becomes individually tailored to each resident. Occasionally group counselling is attempted, but the high rate of resident turnover precludes development of the needed bond among resident-participants.

Group sessions, discontinued a year ago, were resumed in January, 1978. Attendance at the weekly meetings is required of all residents. Sessions deal with practical problems facing the residents. The Parent Outreach Program also was developed in January and attempts to bring together the families of juveniles about to be paroled and to provide them with some insight into problems that might be expected.

Hotline: The hotline was established at PROOF on October 1, 1974. All parolees upon their release as well as most police agencies and many other community groups have been informed of the service and telephone number. In fiscal 1977 PROOF received a total of 172 hotline calls. Of these, 112 were from parolees, 41 from friends and relatives and 19 from police agencies. All calls were

dealt with appropriately on the emergency after-hour basis on which the hotline functions, and later brought to the attention of the proper district office for follow-up.

Furlough: PROOF continues to operate as one of the key contacts in the Departmental furlough program. As most furlough participation transfers occur over the weekend when district offices are closed, PROOF provides that contact which the inmate-participant must complete to report pertinent information. This information is recorded for later transmittal to the appropriate district or institution. During this past fiscal year, 636 such calls were received, recorded, and passed on to the districts. This represents three times the number of calls received a year ago.

Public Relations: Good public relations continue to be essential to the operation of the facility. PROOF is a community based treatment program which endeavors to reintegrate the offender into his environment. To achieve this the cooperation and assistance of the community is essential. The staff is in daily contact with various employment placement agencies, social service agencies, medical facilities, private citizens and, most importantly, private employers. Every effort is made to maintain good rapport which has been developed with these agencies and citizens throughout the previous years.

During the year staff addressed the Committee for Non-Institutionalization at the Friends School and reoriented parole staff of the PROOF concept at regional in-service training.

VOLUNTEERS IN PAROLE PROGRAM

Introduction: Fiscal year 1978 was a most significant one for Volunteers in Parole. Concurrent with the reorganization of the New Jersey Bureau of Parole, the operations of Volunteers in Parole was restructured to mesh more effectively with Bureau procedures. The Commissioner approved the new format of the program during May, 1978.

(1) Assistance to Parolees: During fiscal year 1978 the Program maintained a mean average of 310 volunteers available at any time for assignment. This figure represents an increase of seven more volunteers available at any given time to assist our clients. Ninety-four new volunteers joined the program during the fiscal year. Fifty-one volunteers withdrew from the program for various reasons. Again most of the volunteers joining the program were attorneys, but an ever increasing number of non-attorneys are joining our ranks.

The volunteers assisted a total number of 401 parolees during the year, an increase of 155 over the number assisted in fiscal year 1977. An increasing number of "match ups" by field offices plus the programs' use of different types of volunteers accounted for the increase. As in previous years, the clients assisted were drawn from the State Prison Complex, the Youth Correctional Complex, the Training

School for Girls/Boys, Jamesburg, and the Correctional Institution for Women. During this year a small number of cases from Avenel were also serviced.

The monthly statistics compiled during fiscal year 1978 show a steady climb in the number of volunteers participating in the program. The "Total Number of Volunteers Available" at the end of fiscal year 1978 was 331 as contrasted to 307 at the end of fiscal year 1977.

Reorganizational plans have called for larger time and duty commitments from our volunteers which may forecast a declining number of available volunteers in the next fiscal year.

	<u>Aides Available</u>	<u>Aides Assigned</u>	<u>Cases Pending Assignment</u>
June 30, 1977	307	138	37
June 30, 1978	331	152	71

A larger number of volunteers (14 more) were assigned at the end of fiscal year 1978 and a larger number (34 more) of volunteers were pending assignment.

New Structure of Volunteers in Parole: Commencing in April, 1978 the Commissioner approved the program using three types of volunteers: (1) The traditional "Supervisor Volunteer" or supervising volunteer who provides a client with direct supervisory service; (2) the Special Service Volunteer who provides a special service such as psychological counselling, tutorial service, etc., but does not engage in direct supervision and (3) the Support Volunteer who pledges a job, donates work clothes, etc. and also does not become involved in direct supervision. At the end of fiscal year 1978 there were a limited number of Special Service Volunteers (8) and Support Volunteers (3).

Assignment of cases to volunteers will now be made primarily by classification teams in the district office. Central Office Volunteers in Parole Program will continue to make a limited number of selected assignments. Cases selected will consist primarily of Orientation cases and, secondarily, Service cases. Hard-to-Manage cases will not normally be used because of their past unwillingness to cooperate. Volunteers will be used in a team approach with the parole officer, whenever possible. The team leader will prescribe a treatment plan for the client and suggest to the volunteer how the latter can assist. Central Office Volunteers in Parole Program will concentrate on recruiting and training.

Volunteer of the Year: Eleanor Mulligan, attached to District Office #1, was honored as Volunteers in Parole Program volunteer of the year at a ceremony at the Training School for Boys, Skillman, on April 19, 1978. Chief Justice Hughes, Commissioner Fauver,

Assistant Commissioner Elias, Chief Arluke and other notables attended the ceremony.

The award is presented to express appreciation to the selected volunteer and to focus public attention on the time and service the volunteer has donated. Over 100 volunteers attended this year's ceremony. In addition, Robert Lintner, Assistant District Parole Supervisor, DO#1, received the 1978 "Outstanding Staff Person" award which was awarded for the first time this year.

State Parole Board Requirement of Volunteers in Parole Program Participation as a Special Condition of Parole: As in previous fiscal years, the State Parole Board continued to use Volunteers in Parole Program participation as a pre and post condition of parole. Inmates with better chances of parole success were being referred to the program. A declining number of conditions (18) were also being made. The Board of Managers of the Reformatory Complex also suggested Volunteers in Parole Program involvement in four cases. The Board of Managers at Jamesburg, in addition, referred six cases as a "tie" or strong suggestion.

Orientation of Inmates: Volunteers in Parole Program staff continued to give weekly orientation to inmates being received at Yardville and Bordentown. A videotaping was made of the Bordentown orientation and this is used when staff cannot visit.

Once Central Office Volunteers in Parole Program becomes relieved of line responsibilities, orientation will be given at the Correctional Institution for Women, the Training School for Girls/Boys, Jamesburg, and some satellite units.

Other Activities: The Volunteers in Parole Program Newsletter was first published in June, 1978. Central Office Volunteers in Parole Program staff plans to publish this letter quarterly to keep all volunteers and staff appraised of Volunteers in Parole Program developments.

On April 19, 1978, Volunteers in Parole was telecast on Channel 52 during the 7:30 p.m. News. The telecast featured an attorney volunteer visiting the Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown, to meet his client prior to the latter's parole. Plainfield Cable Television also videotaped an interview with the Staff Director of the Volunteers in Parole Program. A training cassette for Trenton State College was also completed during the fiscal year.

A comprehensive recruitment and training manual for Volunteers in Parole was published during June of 1978. This manual outlines Volunteers in Parole Program reorganization and provides recruiting, orientation and training material for both professional staff and volunteers.

Central Office Volunteers in Parole Program staff has been actively planning a National Forum of Volunteers in Criminal Justice

to be held at the Hyatt House, Cherry Hill, N. J. in the fall of 1978. Staff has assisted Assistant Commissioner Elias who is the program chairperson for the event.

Volunteers in Parole Program staff has also served as part of a planning committee for "Project Advocate." The American Bar Association, the N. J. State Bar Association, the N. J. Department of Health and the Department of Corrections Bureau of Parole is attempting to establish a sister program to Volunteers in Parole which would use a pool of attorneys state-wide to provide free civil legal services to indigent parolees. The program may get funding during the latter part of 1978 or the early part of 1979.

Future planning for Volunteers in Parole Program involves a decentralization of Central Office staff duties in "matching," training and auditing volunteers. This will provide the district office with more managerial input in the program and give them a sense of ownership.

Central Office staff will be able to concentrate on recruiting all layers of society for participation in the program in line with trends in Voluntary Action throughout the nation. Any qualified interested citizen will be able to participate in the criminal justice system in some way under the new guidelines.

SLEPA GRANT PROJECTS

Community Resource Specialist Project: This project was implemented on July 1, 1975 with a SLEPA Grant. The activities being reported on presently took place during the third year of operation (July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978). It should be noted that all Federal funding for this project expires as of September 30, 1978.

The specific goal of this project is the provision of basic emergency support such as food, shelter, clothing, medical, dental, psychiatric and psychological services to at least 2,000 of the 8,000 clients presently under parole supervision.

In addition to providing basic necessities as specified above, the project is also intended to assist the client with immediate and long-range assistance in the form of employment, educational and vocational counselling and appropriate placement. This program is not designed to displace any existing programs in this area. Rather, its intent is to give priority to the needs of the client over the convenience of the agencies that provide services for the client.

A supplemental goal is the establishment of the Community Resource Specialist as a liaison with the community and its various facets including the business, industrial, vocational and academic sectors. This area will be developed for the purpose of making agencies aware of our mission and how their cooperation will be of direct benefit by reducing crime and keeping the client from becoming a public charge either as a welfare client or an institutional inmate.

The total amount of funds made available for the issuance of mini-grants (up to a maximum of \$25) for such purposes as emergency food, shelter, clothing and transportation was \$20,000. This sum also provides for purchase of food, shelter, clothing, etc., on an extended basis where such services are not readily available from existing agencies. Neither the mini-grant nor the purchases of services account is intended to be welfare. Rather, these helping efforts are intended to meet emergency needs while the client's real problem is addressed by the Community Resource Specialist and the parole officer.

Fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) was made available to purchase vocational and educational training for parole clients. As indicated above, it is the project's intention that these funds be spent only where such training is not readily available from existing sources. It is also intended that the Community Resource Specialist and the parole officer exercise a reasonable screening process in selecting clients for training.

The State has assumed funding for the Project Director and six Community Resource Specialists.

The following is a breakdown of the total presenting problems and the total services rendered for the fiscal year:

	<u>Presenting Problems</u>	<u>Services Rendered</u>
Employment	509	159
Financial	453	397
Food	226	194
Housing	379	228
Medical	142	87
Dental	75	57
Mental Health	78	66
Educational	87	57
Vocational	59	45
Substance Abuse	129	94
Placement Cases	237	237
Other	<u>412</u>	<u>278</u>
Total	2786	1899

The following figures represent funds spent for Mini-Grants together with the actual number of grants by each district office:

<u>DO#</u>	<u># of Mini-Grants</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>
1	23	\$ 505.00
2	71	1058.00
3	28	572.96
4	59	925.88
5	49	1017.00
6	48	1108.30
7	45	943.00
8	38	837.10
9	39	535.00
PROOF	<u>27</u>	<u>240.00</u>
TOTAL	427	\$7742.24

The following represents funds spent for vocational and educational training via Form 100) together with the number of grants made by each district office:

<u>DO#</u>	<u># of Mini-Grants</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>
1	2	\$ 453.00
2	1	150.00
3	-----	-----
4	-----	-----
5	-----	-----
6	4	466.40
7	5	3169.63
8	-----	-----
9	2	30.00
PROOF	-----	-----
TOTAL	14	\$4269:03

Parole Vocational Service Center Project: This project was initiated on November 24, 1976 with the assistance of a SLEPA Grant. However, due to delays in receiving authorization to hire staff, the three Assistant District Parole Supervisor Unit Managers did not start working until February, 1977. The Vocational Specialist and clerical staff were not hired until June, 1977.

In consideration of these circumstances beyond our control, LEAA permitted us to extend the project from its termination date on June 30, 1977 until December 31, 1977. We have been advised that there are SLEPA funds available to carry this project until June 30, 1980.

The purpose of this project is to provide a meaningful long-term employment (following screening and evaluation), individual training and treatment for not only parole clients, but all persons involved with the criminal justice system subsequent to meeting their immediate needs.

The locations where this project is presently operational are DO#6, Trenton, covering Burlington, Hunterdon, and Mercer Counties, DO#7, Camden, covering Camden, Gloucester, and Salem Counties, and DO#9, Newark, covering the City of Newark. It should be noted that the funds received to implement this project had to be waived by the Boards of Freeholders in Trenton and Camden. In the City of Newark, the Council waived necessary funds.

Project activities became operational in July, 1977. The period being reported on is the first full year of operation.

The activities section of this report is broken down into categories to facilitate a clear explanation of precisely the areas being reported:

<u>Presenting Problems (By clients' identification)</u>	<u>DO#6</u>	<u>DO#7</u>	<u>DO#9</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Number of Potential clients	251	Not Available	Not Available	251 known
Number Interviewed	117	87	90	294
Number of Intakes	47	51	90	188
Number of Counselling Sessions	326	230	508	1064
Employment	37	46	511	594
Educational	20	22	33	75
Vocational	8	21	24	53
<u>TOTAL</u>	806	457	1256	2519
<u>Problems Resolved (By number of ser- vices provided)</u>	<u>DO#6</u>	<u>DO#7</u>	<u>DO#9</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Number of Potential clients	----	----	----	----
Number Interviewed	----	----	----	----
Number of Intakes	----	----	----	----
Number of Counselling Sessions	----	----	----	----
Employment	59	50	29	138
Educational	21	8	2	31
Vocational	15	6	3	24
<u>TOTAL</u>	95	64	34	193
Jobs Developed	33	43	285	361
Jobs Placed	106	68	48	222
<u>TOTAL</u>	139	111	333	583

Techniques Utilized (Job Grooming)	DO#6	DO#7	DO#9	TOTAL
Job Applications	56	51	183	290
Job Interviews	30	39	168	237
Resumes Written	4	17	44	65
Appearance Counselling	7	33	67	107
Role Playing Sessions	1	19	38	58
Phone Technique Sessions	----	----	----	----
Behavior Modification Sessions	----	7	18	25
TOTAL	98	166	518	782

National Alliance of Business/Department of Corrections Program:
In May, 1978 with the assistance of a SLEPA Grant, the Bureau of Parole initiated the NAB/Departement of Corrections liaison program.

Briefly, the National Alliance of Business was established in 1968 by President Johnson and Henry Ford II to help target groups such as the economically disadvantaged, veterans, ex-offenders, and youths and to help them break the poverty cycle and become incorporated into the mainstream of society. Put into simpler terms, NAB's goal is to turn tax users into taxpayers.

The purpose of the NAB/Department of Corrections Program is to enable the Parole Bureau to work through the National Alliance of Business to help develop relations with upper-level management in the New Jersey business community for the purpose of informing them of the problems, skills, and capabilities of the ex-offender.

The NAB/Department of Corrections Program places three parole officers from Trenton, Camden, and Newark in local NAB offices to serve as Ex-Offender Program Managers. They work directly with the Metro Director of the NAB office.

This program would be a more effective means of having the Parole Bureau's NAB liaison staff working through NAB, a means of placing ex-offenders in better jobs with higher salaries than those currently acquired by the Parole Vocational Service Center.

The NAB Program Managers are supplied lists of NAB members. Managers and personnel officers from these important firms are contacted by the Parole Bureau's Ex-Offender Program Managers. Jobs developed are turned over to the Parole Vocational Service Center.

It is important to note that NAB is not a placement service. Their placements are done through transistional agencies. The importance of this private/job sector inititative is that, according to NAB, four out of five jobs are in the private sector.

The following is a list of activities in which the Ex-Offender Program Managers are presently engaged:

1. NAB/Department of Corrections Press Conference in Newark (for the purpose of explaining our function to the Public).
2. NAB/Department of Corrections prison visit (so that the NAB members can have a better understanding of the Ex-Offender employment problems, needs and skills).
3. A job clearing house (so that the efforts of persons seeking jobs for ex-offenders can be coordinated).
4. Visits to NAB members to educate them re: the ex-offender's problems, needs and capabilities.
5. Talks to civic groups (for the same purpose as stated in #4).

PAROLEE EARNINGS

During the calendar year 1977, 10,488 parolees under supervision earned \$21,452,754, an increase of \$3,526,252 over last year's earnings.

Fifty-one percent (5,322) of those under supervision during the year were classified as "employed," i.e. worked all or part of a period under supervision, which period of supervision could be from one week to the full year. Twenty-seven percent (2,827) were "unemployed" throughout their entire period of supervision, although employable. The remaining 22 percent (2,339) were classified as "unemployable" by reason of being missing or in custody, attending school, being engaged in homemaking or being incapacitated.

DISCHARGED PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF MAXIMUM

The following number of parolees were discharged from parole prior to the expiration of their maximum sentences as the result of recommendations by the Bureau of Parole to the various paroling authorities:

State Prison Complex.....	42
Youth Correctional Complex - Yardville.....	134
Bordentown.....	183
Annandale.....	150
Training School for Boys and Girls, Jamesburg.....	46
Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton.....	27
Total.....	582

There was approximately a 49 percent increase in the number discharged from parole this year in comparison to last year. The 582

discharged from further supervision would have required approximately eleven parole officers to supervise this number at an average cost in salaries of about \$132,000. The dramatic rise in discharges may be attributed to the Bureau's orientation caseload during the last quarter of the fiscal year.

COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT (CETA)

As the result of referrals to various agencies including the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Manpower Development and Training, etc., it was determined that at the end of June, 1978, 2455 parolees had been accepted in one of the CETA programs. This represents a decrease in acceptance of 736 (23 percent) cases over last year.

CASEBOOK REVIEWS

Casebook reviews are considered a management tool of the district supervisor in that it permits a check of actual recorded contacts on each case assigned against the recorded activities of any specific day. Ideally, a spot-check by a supervisor of contacts recorded against a return visit to the contactee in the community would confirm the entries in the casebook. The check should be completed by a member of the supervisory staff together with the parole officer who made the entries.

During the year 63 reviews were completed, resulting in 4 (6.3 percent) unsatisfactory ratings. An unsatisfactory rating is to be followed for a 30 day period during which the opportunity will be provided to remedy the deficiencies with the ultimate resolution of termination of employment if the deficiencies are not corrected.

Compared to last year, less reviews were made. Perhaps this was a result of the great time and effort placed in Bureau reorganization by all personnel.

PROBABLE CAUSE HEARINGS

In order to comply with a Supreme Court decision, the following tabulation of Probable Cause Hearings and Decisions was compiled:

a. Hearing requested and hearing held	<u>1035</u>
b. Hearing waived and hearing held	<u>99</u>
c. No response from parolee and hearing held	<u>537</u>
d. Hearing waived and no hearing held	<u>186</u>
e. Probable Cause found and formal revocation hearing to follow	<u>1534</u>
f. Continuation on parole recommended although valid violations determined	<u>274</u>
g. Continuation on parole--no valid violations determined	<u>13</u>
h. Other	<u>36</u>
Total hearings scheduled (columns a+b+c+d)	<u>1857</u>
Probable Cause found (column e)	<u>1534</u> (82.6 percent)

Compared to last year, there were 302 less hearing scheduled and 78 less cases of Probable Cause found.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public relations are merging as an ever increasing necessary and important function of the Bureau in view of the fact that parole failures are well publicized and parole successes are usually noted only by the Bureau and the clients involved (most of whom are, understandably, not desirous of publicizing their specific situations). However, in view of recent budgetary cutbacks in face of an increasingly complex range of responsibilities, emphasis must be placed on educating the public as to the role that the Bureau of Parole plays in New Jersey today.

A random sampling of some of the direct contacts with the community where impact is notable indicates the following specific persons or agencies as recipients:

Rutgers University
Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Association
Volunteers of America
Gloucester County Investigators Association
Tri-State Criminal Investigators Association
South Jersey Investigators Association
South Jersey Health Systems Agency
Comprehensive Employment Training Act representing various college and high school classes and career development programs
National Alliance of Business

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE PROGRAM

Institutional parole offices located at the institutions listed below provide necessary services between the institution and field staffs to effect a smooth scientific reentry into the community by over 4,200 parolees during the past fiscal year. The current figures reveal a sharp increase in all categories as compared to the previous years and indications are that this upward trend will continue in the future. Other services not included in the statistics listed below have overtaxed the current staff members and a need for expansion in personnel in some offices is evident.

	<u>Pre-Parole Interviews</u>	<u>Inmate Requested Interviews</u>	<u>Released On Parole</u>	<u>Parole Classes</u>
NJSP	3,302	2,307	1,545	560
YRCC	1,529	2,481	630	118
YCIB	1,246	733	838	198
YCIA	1,331	1,334	878	302
TSB/G	371	297	157	38
CIW	261	1,145	198	186
Fiscal 1978				
TOTAL	8,040	8,297	4,246	1,402
Fiscal 1977				
TOTAL	7,746	7,556	3,500	688
Comparison	+294 (3.7%)	+741 (9.8%)	+746 (21.3%)	+714 (103%)

FURLOUGH WORK/STUDY PROGRAM

On January 12, 1976 the furlough program employed by the various Youth Correctional Institutions and the Prison Complex of the State of New Jersey was suspended due to serious difficulties in the administration of the program. The foremost criticisms addressed themselves to such areas as a lack of uniformity and consistency in operating procedures, a need for the verification of furlough destinations, and an absence of appropriate supervision for the inmates in the community.

Following an extensive investigation conducted by the Governor's office, it was recommended that explicit provisions be made to involve the Bureau of Parole in a revised program geared to correct the deficiencies of the past. In addition, the Bureau of Parole was called upon to assume greater responsibilities in the area of other community release programs, namely, work/study release.

The furlough work/study release component within the Bureau functions to insure uniformity and consistency in the operating procedures of the various district offices per Departmental Standards and to provide for the protection of the community by conducting field investigations of furlough destinations and work release sites, to notify local law enforcement authorities regarding the particulars of proposed furloughs, to provide feedback to the Institutional Classification Committees, to assist them in making appropriate decisions with regard to inmate participants, to monitor the activities of inmates participating in study release and to provide general assistance and supervision to all inmates involved in community release programs.

During the past year (Fiscal 1977-78) field monitoring of furlough activity continued to be a service provided by the District Parole Offices. The nine district furlough coordinators completed

971 initial investigations of furlough addresses during fiscal 1978, each involving at least one home visit and one police department contact. Eighty-nine of these investigations resulted in disapprovals due to the discovery of some defective aspect in the furlough destination, a rejection rate of more than 9 percent. Other information uncovered during the course of these investigations assisted the institutional classification committees in making final decisions regarding the granting of furloughs.

The district furlough coordinators also initiated a total of 1501 follow-up investigations during the year at furlough addresses or with community agencies. This follow-up effort occurred during the course of the furloughs or shortly afterwards. The field coordinators continued to fulfill the Department's legal responsibility of notifying the affected local law enforcement agency each time an inmate was in the community on furlough; and supplemented by the "hotline" at PROOF, the Bureau's residential facility, the nine district offices accepted the "check-in" telephone calls from inmates on the first day of each three day furlough.

All of these furlough responsibilities required an expenditure of 4,695 hours during the year and the traveling of 23,225 miles by the district coordinators.

Comparison With Fiscal 1977: Consistent with the overall increase in furlough program activity during the past year as compared to fiscal 1977, there were increases in every category of Parole Bureau involvement. Completions of initial investigations were up by 30 percent; the follow-up effort increased by 65 percent; 21 percent more time was required to complete the additional work; and 13 percent more miles were driven in carrying out the investigations. The actual number of furlough address disapprovals also increased by 18 percent, although the rejection rate itself decreased somewhat, from slightly under 11 percent in fiscal 1977 to slightly more than 9 percent during the past twelve month period.

The chart on the following page presents a numerical summary of investigations, mileage, and hours and includes a comparison of the past fiscal year with fiscal 1977.

FIELD INVESTIGATIONS - BUREAU OF PAROLE

	Investigations Completed				Mileage	Hours
	Initial			Follow-up (Home or P.D.)		
	Home & P.D.	Disap- provals	Rejec- tion Rate			
1976 - 1977						
July 1976	45	5	11%	22	1569	354
Aug. 1976	41	8	20%	24	2023	306
Sept. 1976	47	2	4%	54	1887	343
Oct. 1976	47	6	13%	47	1418	295
Nov. 1976	49	9	18%	30	1435	282
Dec. 1976	53	12	23%	47	1929	333
Jan. 1977	52	6	12%	46	1930	269
Feb. 1977	49	3	6%	45	1342	240
Mar. 1977	59	6	10%	52	1595	306
Apr. 1977	48	6	13%	25	1472	317
May 1977	77	2	3%	62	1434	309
June 1977	111	8	7%	71	2214	362
(Avg. Per Month)	(56.5)	(6.1)	(10.7%)	(43.8)	(1687.3)	(309.7)
TOTALS	678	73	10.8%	525	20248	3712
<u>COMPARISONS</u>						
% Increase	+30.2%	+18.0%	-1.6%	+65.0%	+12.8%	+20.9%
1977 - 1978						
July 1977	83	8	10%	66	1598	310
Aug. 1977	132	11	8%	104	2661	441
Sept. 1977	93	11	12%	111	1712	378
Oct. 1977	75	4	5%	91	2021	401
Nov. 1977	59	8	14%	138	1386	337
Dec. 1977	77	7	9%	112	1947	367
Jan. 1978	71	7	10%	125	1827	362
Feb. 1978	72	10	14%	146	1647	380
Mar. 1978	78	5	6%	204	2008	479
Apr. 1978	64	5	8%	126	2334	446
May 1978	86	8	9.3%	141	2143	420
June 1978	81	5	6.2%	137	1941	374
(Avg. Per Month)	(80.9)	(7.4)	(9.1%)	(125.1)	(1935.4)	(391.3)
TOTALS	971	89	9.2%	1501	23225	4695

CASELOADS (See tables #1 and #1A attached)

On June 30, 1978 the Bureau of Parole was responsible for the supervision of 8,067 cases in New Jersey, 633 cases in other states and 141 cases in the Central Office Special File for a grand total of 8,841 cases (an increase of 534 cases or 6.0 percent more than the previous year).

The total number of parolees supervised during the fiscal year 1978 increased from 12,330 (last year) to 13,197 for a gain of 867 cases or 6.5 percent of the total caseload. This dramatic increase has reversed a downward trend begun in 1974-75 and is the largest margin of difference in the last five years.

Cases Under Supervision in New Jersey: The unbroken trend of increasing caseloads in New Jersey was abruptly reversed in 1974. The largest reduction in caseload, ever, occurred in 1975. Since then, there has been a gradual increase in the total caseload from 7,464 to 7,562 in 1976 to 7,655 in fiscal 1977 and finally, the larger increase to 8,067 in 1978. During 1977-78, 4,493 cases were added, making a total of 12,148 supervised throughout the year.

New Jersey Cases Being Supervised in Other States: In the fiscal year 1977-78, 353 cases were added to and 240 cases removed from the 520 cases being supervised in other states, resulting in a net gain of 113 cases. At the close of the year there were 633 parolees from New Jersey under supervision in other states, or 21.7 percent more than a year ago.

Central Office Special File: This category is composed of cases not the responsibility of any New Jersey district office or any other state. The responsibility, therefore, is assumed by the Central Parole Office. It includes cases paroled to other states who have subsequently absconded, persons paroled to out-of-state warrants, cases incarcerated in out-of-state and Federal institutions with no parole plan in New Jersey, and deportation cases. There were 132 cases in the Central Office Special File at the beginning of the fiscal year 1977-78. An additional 44 cases were handled throughout the year and 35 were removed, resulting in a total increase of 6.8 percent from the previous year. As of June 30, 1978 there were 141 cases included in this category of which 60 (42.5 percent) were missing cases.

RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS (See tables #2, #2A and #2B)

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during 1977-78 fiscal year decreased by 1.4 percent in relation to the total caseload (10.4 percent) as compared to 11.8 percent in 1976-77).

The amount returned by court commitments in 1977-78 decreased by 0.8 percent from 4.3 percent in 1976-77 to 3.5 percent in 1977-78.

Concurrently the percentage returned by the paroling authority decreased by 0.6 percent from 7.5 percent to 6.9 percent during the same time period.

During the last five years court commitments ranged from a high of 5.9 percent in 1974 to a low of 3.5 percent in the past year while return of technical violators ranged from a high of 8.4 percent in 1976 to a low of 6.9 percent during 1977-78. As a result, the combined total returns decreased from a high of 13.5 percent in 1975 to 10.4 percent during the past year for the lowest consolidated rate of return on record. (See table 2B)

MISSING CASES (See tables #3, #3A and #3B)

The percentage of missing cases in relation to the total Bureau caseload decreased to 10.3 percent continuing the downward trend begun last year after peaking at an historical high of 11.4 percent in 1975-76. Numerically, there was an increase of 12 cases that became missing (whereabouts unknown) at the close of the fiscal year (912 in 1978 vs. 900 in 1977). However, these figures must be compared to the larger caseload of June 30, 1978 (8,841) vs. caseload on June 30, 1977 (8,307), an increase of 534 and to the total number supervised in 1978 (13,197) compared to the total supervised in 1977 (12,330).

Parolees from the Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown, accounted for the largest percentage of missing cases (14.2 percent) in relation to respective caseloads. In descending order, the other institutions show the following: Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton (13.0 percent); Youth Reception and Correction Center (11.8 percent); State Prison (10.1 percent); Psychiatric Hospitals-sex offenders (9.0 percent); Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale (7.3 percent); Training School for Boys, Jamesburg (5.4 percent). For the second consecutive year there were no missing parolees from the Training School for Girls.

SUPERVISION (See table #4)

In the performance of their assignments in 1977-78 parole officers made 187,721 supervisory contacts and 16,782 investigatory contacts. These figures cannot be accurately compared to previous years considering that statistics are no longer kept as before on the number of telephone contacts made, but rather, as of February, 1978 statistics are now being recorded on numbers of Probable Cause Hearings and Final Revocation Hearings attended. Similarly, an average number of contacts made by each field officer cannot be meaningfully compiled for this year since, as of April 1, 1978, the majority of senior parole officers began making field contacts for the first time in the Bureau's history. The first nine months of this year found them in an administrative capacity, but with the advent of Bureau reorganization, they, too, began to make field contacts. However, the 172 field officers (42 seniors and 130 parole

officers) made a total of 204,503 contacts excluding telephone calls for what would have been an average of 1,189 contacts had there been that many field positions operative throughout the year.

Included in the total figure of contacts from 1977-78, there were 50,806 home visits (compared to 52,201 last year); 62,210 community contacts other than employment or school (74,246 last year); 2,841 employment visits (3,747 last year) and 338 school visits (471 last year).

Although overall it would appear that community contacts are down, the 531 Probable Cause Hearings and 211 Final Revocation Hearings attended by field staff since March, 1978, if projected for the entire year would number nearly 2,000 Probable Cause Hearings and 700 Final Revocation Hearings, a process which is time-consuming in investigation, preparation and attendance.

The efforts of the parole officers resulted in the submission of 47,388 written reports, including 39,966 supervision reports and 7,422 investigation reports as contrasted to 55,400 total reports, 46,569 supervision reports and 7,831 investigation reports in 1976-77.

The districts reported traveling 689,320 miles in the performance of their duties as compared to 739,220 miles in 1976-77.

TABLE #1

TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - 1977-1978 (By Institutions)

	IN NEW JERSEY				IN OTHER STATES				CENTRAL OFFICE SPECIAL FILE				TOTAL UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/78
	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/77	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1977 - 1978	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/78	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/77	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1977 - 1978	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/78	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/77	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1977 - 1978	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/78	
Training School for Girls	12	11	23	17	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	18
Correctional Institution for Women	281	177	458	295	15	13	28	18	7	3	10	8	321
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	206	157	363	218	5	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	220
Youth Correctional Institution Complex													
Annandale	1,668	932	2,600	1,620	55	41	96	65	9	4	13	5	1,690
Bordentown	1,836	809	2,645	1,755	127	68	195	141	27	9	36	26	1,922
Youth Reception & Correction Ctr.	1,345	676	2,021	1,347	109	44	153	115	30	8	38	35	1,497
State Prison	1,831	1,423	3,254	2,317	203	184	387	285	59	20	79	67	2,669
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	30	12	42	38	5	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	44
Out-Of-State Cases in New Jersey													
Female	18	17	35	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Male	428	279	707	435	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
TOTAL	7,655	4,493	12,148	8,067	520	353	873	633	132	44	176	141	8,841
Under Supervision 7/1/77	7,655				520				132				8,307
Total Cases Added		4,493				353				44			4,890
Total No. Supervised 1977-1978			12,148				873				176		13,197
Under Supervision 6/30/78				8,067				633				141	8,841

TABLE #1A

NUMBER OF PAROLEES SUPERVISED
5 Year Comparison - (1974 - 1978)

1973 - 1974	1974 - 1975	1975 - 1976	1976 - 1977	1977 - 1978
13,609	13,061	12,421	12,330	13,197
+ 5.8%	- 4.0%	- 4.9%	- 0.7%	+ 6.5%
- 3.0%				

TABLE #2

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS
BY DISTRICT AND SEX
Based on Total Number Supervised
1977 - 1978

Male

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED DURING YEAR*	NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS				TOTALS	
		COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED		RETURNED AS TECHNICAL VIOLATOR		NUMBER	PER CENT
1. Clifton	1,596	119	7.4%	58	3.6%	177	11.0%
2. East Orange	1,370	63	4.5%	58	4.2%	121	8.8%
3. Red Bank	1,685	60	3.5%	130	7.7%	190	11.2%
4. Jersey City	1,374	33	2.4%	163	11.8%	196	14.2%
5. Elizabeth	1,094	44	4.0%	96	8.7%	140	12.7%
6. Trenton	1,115	29	2.6%	117	10.4%	146	13.0%
7. Camden	1,222	48	3.9%	127	10.4%	175	14.3%
8. Atlantic City	901	24	2.6%	76	8.4%	100	11.0%
9. Newark	1,298	45	3.4%	45	3.4%	90	6.8%
10. In Other States	845	2	.2%	17	2.0%	19	2.2%
11. Central Office (Special File)	166	0	0	7	4.2%	7	4.2%
TOTAL MALE	12,666	467	3.6%	894	7.0%	1,361	10.7%

Female

1. Clifton	73	2	2.7%	2	2.7%	4	5.4%
2. East Orange	74	0	0	4	5.4%	4	5.4%
3. Red Bank	77	2	2.6%	4	5.1%	6	7.7%
4. Jersey City	29	0	0	3	10.3%	3	10.3%
5. Elizabeth	62	0	0	3	4.8%	3	4.8%
6. Trenton	62	0	0	3	4.8%	3	4.8%
7. Camden	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Atlantic City	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Newark	73	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. In Other States	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Central Office (Special File)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FEMALE	554	4	.7%	19	3.4%	23	4.1%
GRAND TOTAL	13,220	471	3.5%	913	6.9%	1,384	10.4%

*Figures include inter-office transfers of cases.

TABLE #2A

PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
 BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
 By District
 1977 - 1978

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED	COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED	TECHNICAL VIOLATORS	TOTAL
1. Clifton	1,669	7.2%	3.6%	10.8%
2. East Orange	1,444	4.3%	4.3%	8.6%
3. Red Bank	1,762	3.5%	7.6%	11.1%
4. Jersey City	1,403	2.3%	11.8%	14.1%
5. Elizabeth	1,156	3.8%	8.5%	12.3%
6. Trenton	1,177	2.4%	10.1%	12.6%
7. Camden	1,258	3.8%	10.1%	13.9%
8. Atlantic City	931	2.5%	8.1%	10.6%
9. Newark	1,371	3.2%	3.2%	6.4%
10. In Other States	873	.2%	1.9%	2.1%
11. Central Office (Special File)	176	0	3.9%	3.9%
TOTAL	13,220	3.5%	6.9%	10.4%

TABLE #2B

PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
 BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
 5 Year Comparison
 1974 - 1978

COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED					TECHNICAL VIOLATORS					TOTAL				
1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
5.9	5.0	4.2	4.3	3.5	7.3	8.5	8.4	7.5	6.9	13.2	13.5	12.6	11.8	10.4

TABLE #3
 RECORD OF MISSING CASES
 By Institution
 1977 - 1978

INSTITUTION	TOTAL ON PAROLE ON 6/30/78	MISSING AS OF 6/30/77	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/77 AND 6/30/78	TOTAL MISSING	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/77 AND 6/30/78	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/78	NET DIFFERENCE	PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/78
Training School for Girls	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Institution for Women	321	40	27	67	25	42	+ 2	13.0%
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	220	16	13	29	17	12	- 4	5.4%
Youth Correctional Institution Complex								
Annandale	1,690	146	159	305	180	125	- 21	7.3%
Bordentown	1,922	284	201	485	211	274	- 10	14.2%
Youth Reception & Correction Center	1,497	160	173	333	155	178	+ 18	11.8%
State Prison	2,669	244	126	370	98	272	+ 28	10.1%
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	44	5	0	5	1	4	- 1	9.0%
Out-of-State								
Female	25	0	3	3	0	3	+ 3	12.0%
Male	435	5	15	20	18	2	- 3	.4%
TOTAL	8,841	900	717	1,617	705	912	+ 12	10.3%

TABLE #3A
RECORD OF MISSING CASES
By District
1977 - 1978

DISTRICT	CASELOAD ON 6/30/77	MISSING AS OF 6/30/77	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/77 AND 6/30/78	TOTAL MISSING	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/77 AND 6/30/78	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/78	NET DIFFERENCE	PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/78
1. Clifton	1,085	128	140	268	132	136	+ 8	12.5%
2. East Orange	999	79	85	164	78	86	+ 7	8.6%
3. Red Bank	1,169	71	79	150	51	99	+ 28	8.4%
4. Jersey City	875	120	138	258	149	109	-11	12.4%
5. Elizabeth	697	70	37	107	34	73	+ 3	10.4%
6. Trenton	786	75	83	158	58	100	+ 25	12.7%
7. Camden	832	82	31	113	47	66	-16	7.9%
8. Atlantic City	633	65	33	98	45	53	-12	8.3%
9. Newark	987	149	79	228	98	130	-19	13.1%
10. Central Office (Special File)	141	61	12	73	13	60	-1	42.5%
11. Central Office (N.J. Cases Out-of-State)	637	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,841	900	717	1,617	705	912	+ 12	10.3%

TABLE #3B
PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO TOTAL CASELOAD
5 Year Comparison

1973 - 1974	1974 - 1975	1975 - 1976	1976 - 1977	1977 - 1978
10.8%	11.3%	11.4%	10.8%	10.3%

STATE OF NEW JERSEY - BUREAU OF PAROLE
TABLE # 4
SUMMARY DAILY RECORD OF ACTIVITIES
 Fiscal Year 1977 - 1978

DISTRICT NUMBER	FIELD AND OFFICE CONTACTS												REPORTS SUBMITTED						SUMMARIES SUBMITTED				HOURS		MILEAGE	
	TYPE OF CONTACT (1)									SUPERVISION (2)			INVESTIGATION (3)		SUPERVISION (4)		INVESTIGATION (5)		SUMMARIES SUBMITTED (6)				OFFICE	FIELD	STATE	PERSONAL
	C	E	H	N	O	S	* PCH	* RH	P	PO	N	P	N	F-19	F-21	AR	PP	SR	DR	OA	TR	TS				
DO 1	5,882	221	6,315	1,733	6,173	7	23	13	10,210	12,544	1,395	1,270	357	2,465	3,147	-	753	168	120	1	109	171	12,472	13,581	89,515	2,610
DO 2	5,399	179	5,270	2,051	5,256	6	44	11	10,313	11,362	1,036	1,191	334	2,658	2,373	1	590	184	75	11	92	125	10,574	11,172	42,181	1,375
DO 3	8,703	362	7,330	1,897	8,797	35	34	16	13,974	16,581	1,801	2,729	609	2,504	2,097	36	796	275	77	3	142	165	14,309	13,236	138,515	703
DO 4	9,392	220	4,365	2,100	6,256	8	140	60	11,915	17,579	1,831	1,354	550	1,843	2,757	2	617	215	22	5	92	146	9,967	11,512	51,259	1,287
DO 5	5,330	254	4,320	1,399	4,679	18	49	19	7,967	10,978	824	1,386	646	1,498	2,085	3	508	170	48	6	92	91	8,577	8,799	50,907	138
DO 6	6,822	415	5,711	1,444	4,775	50	68	43	9,315	15,028	1,370	942	254	1,737	1,962	-	474	295	24	17	109	127	8,195	9,219	88,505	209
DO 7	9,846	226	4,597	1,374	6,825	21	74	27	8,546	21,125	3,473	1,375	340	1,365	3,642	2	597	248	24	6	90	129	9,325	8,468	69,576	60
DO 8	4,441	622	3,362	798	7,078	74	37	11	6,938	7,954	1,965	1,475	265	1,011	1,534	2	537	237	31	74	53	71	6,520	9,022	120,238	29
DO 9	6,395	342	9,536	604	7,545	119	62	11	9,578	16,435	1,076	1,201	504	2,810	2,478	2	587	123	27	4	85	123	8,151	13,516	29,224	2,989
TOTAL	62,210	2,841	50,806	13,406	57,384	338	531	211	88,756	129,586	14,771	12,923	3,859	17,891	22,075	48	5,459	1,915	448	127	864	1,148	88,090	98,525	679,920	9,400
GRAND TOTAL	187,721								233,113			16,782		39,966		7,422			2,587				186,615		689,320	

Legend:

- | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| (1) C - Community Contact other than E H or S | (2) P - Positive Contact with Parolee | (3) P - Positive Contact
N - Negative Contact | (4) F-19 - Chronological Report
F-21 - Special Report | (5) AR - Admission Report Supplemental
PP - Pre-Parole Report
SR - Special Report | (6) DR - Discharge Summary
OA - Other Agency Summary
TR - Transfer Summary
TS - Termination Summary |
| E - Employment Contact | H - Home Contact | N - Visit Made - No Contact | O - Office Contact | S - School Contact | |
| PCH - Probable Cause Hearings | RH - Revocation Hearings | PO - Positive Contact other than Parolee | R - Case Review with or without Parolee | | |
- * Statistics compiled commencing 3-1-78