

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)

(January 1, 1979 - December 30, 1979)
(Supplemented With Available Fiscal 1979 Statistics)

67820

Albert Elias
Assistant Commissioner

Fred B. Holley, Chief
Bureau of Parole

Victor R. D'Ilio
Assistant Chief

INDEX

ACQUISITIONS

Introduction Page 1
Goals Page 1
Major Objectives Page 2
Major Developments Page 2
Caseload (Calendar 1979) Page 3
Discharged Prior to Maximum Page 3
Personnel Page 3
Probable Cause Hearings Page 4
District Parole Supervisors' Decisions Page 5
Ratio of Field to Office Time Page 5
Treatment Page 6
Night Visits Page 6
Casebook Reviews Page 6
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Page 7
Furlough Work/Study Program Page 7
Institutional Parole Program Page 9
Parole Advisory Committee Page 10
Team Supervision Page 10
Parolee Earnings Page 11
Training Page 11
Parole Resource Orientation and Office Facility Page 12
SLEPA Program Page 16
Volunteers in Parole Program Page 18
Public Relations Page 19
Special Note Page 20
Caseloads (Fiscal 1979) Page 20
Returns to Institutions Page 20
Missing Cases Page 20
Supervision Page 20
Charts and Tables Follow

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 periodic 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

To establish a regional administration of parole services based upon due regard for the principles of economy, efficiency, and feasibility. It is anticipated that regionalization will provide impetus for improving the quality of investigations and the effectiveness of supervision regarding individuals paroled from the Prison Complex (Trenton, Leesburg, and Rahway), the Youth Correctional Institution Complex (Annandale, Bordentown, and Yardville), the Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center (Avenel), the Training School for Boys and Girls (Jamesburg), and from other states to a parole program in New Jersey. Bureau of Parole involvement with offenders begins while they are inmates, continues throughout the period of parole supervision, and can extend beyond the maximum expiration date of sentence on a voluntary basis for delivery of services and counselling.

To maximize community participation in the reintegration process by expanding the number of citizen volunteers and the scope of their activities. Community participation in offender reintegration is to be further assured by educating the personal and utilizing the services of as many community-based agencies as possible.

To improve the level of community protection against parolees whose recidivism potential is high by close cooperation with law

enforcement agencies, use of Bureau surveillance teams, enforcement of urine monitoring, and referrals to mental health diagnostic and treatment services.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

To increase the field staff's ability to respond appropriately to individual parolees' needs.

To facilitate preparation of inmate's release to parole supervision and serve in a liaison role between the several institutions and the Bureau of Parole field staff.

To provide an immediate and effective alternative to return as a parole violator to those parolees who cannot satisfactorily meet parole conditions, by use of community-based residential facilities which offer a variety of supportive services.

To provide U. S. Supreme Court-mandated hearings for parolees whose adjustment has deteriorated markedly in one or more serious aspects. To promptly confine serious community threats.

To provide a program for interested and qualified community residents who wish to serve as volunteers in the reintegration process, on a one-to-one basis. To maintain the program under continual refinement and expansion with a view toward opening the ranks of volunteers to individuals from all walks of life.

MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS (Calendar 1979)

As the year drew to an end, legislation was passed which will dramatically change the future of the Bureau. An Act Concerning Parole mandates that the Bureau will, among other things, supervise County Jail parolees, collect revenues from offenders, allow attorneys in Probable Cause Hearings, and various other changes in the way the Bureau presently conducts its supervision.

The team concept, along with workload classification, has been operational for over one and a half years and for the most part benefits are beginning to be realized. Team efforts are being utilized in a variety of ways while the Base Expectancy Scale has shown itself to be a useful tool in properly classifying parolees in degrees of risk.

The Bureau in its quest for accreditation spent considerable time during the course of the year in gathering and developing primary documentation in order to provide evidence of compliance to various ACA standards. All levels of Bureau personnel were involved in this herculean task and as the year drew to an end, efforts continued to accomplish the goal of Bureau accreditation.

The Bureau continues to be the largest part of the Division of Policy and Planning. Within the Division the Bureau of

Interstate Services continues to operate. Certain problems continue to remain unresolved as a result of this split from the Bureau of Parole. Statistical data no longer maintains the degree of accuracy it once boasted and field staff is placed in a position at times of "serving two masters."

A program to service the entire Hispanic community was established with the placement of a bilingual parole officer in each district. Not only do these professionals supervise a caseload of Hispanic offenders, but are also expected to perform outreach assistance to Hispanics at large through counselling, referrals and group meetings. Initial results have tended to indicate that the program has been well received.

CASELOAD (Calendar 1979)

As of December 31, 1979, a total of 8,470 cases were reported under supervision of the Bureau of Parole by its various components. This represented a total increase of 241 cases during the course of the calendar year. The Bureau could no longer claim an error limit of less than ten cases in the monthly statistical total; problems had been discovered which developed subsequent to the date that the Bureau of Interstate Services began maintaining its own count. Attempts to rectify the problems are in process. Until resolution, the Bureau case count will reflect only those figures reported to the Central Office by various Bureau components.

DISCHARGED PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF MAXIMUM (Calendar 1979)

Seven hundred and twenty-four parolees as indicated below were discharged from parole prior to expiration of maximum sentence, upon recommendation of the Bureau.

State Prison Complex.....	71
Youth Correctional Complex - Yardville.....	153
- Bordentown.....	207
- Annandale.....	191
Training School for Boys and Girls, Jamesburg.....	69
Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton.....	33
	<u>724</u>

PERSONNEL

As of December 31, 1979, the total complement of 297 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
District Parole Supervisors	9
Assistant District Parole Supervisors (including 3 Federally funded)	13
Senior Parole Officers (Field and Institutional Parole Officers)	51
Residential Parole Officers (PROOF)	7
Parole Officers (including 9 Federally funded)	116
Clerical (including 4 Federally funded)	<u>89</u>
Total	297

The Chief of the Bureau of Parole has been on sick leave for the entire calendar year. Mr. Fred Holley has been appointed Acting Chief in the interim.

The Bureau was saddened to learn of the tragic accidental drowning of Senior Parole Officer Herbert Bernauer.

Retirements during the year included: Victor Dragon, District Parole Supervisor, DO#1; Francis Hopkins, Assistant District Parole Supervisor, DO#1; Edward Hermann, Assistant District Parole Supervisor, DO#9; David Lamborne, Senior Parole Officer, DO#7; Richard Rogers, Assistant District Parole Supervisor, DO#3; Governour Brown, Senior Parole Officer, DO#9; Joseph Camisa, District Parole Supervisor, DO#4.

The Bureau received additional funding in order to establish nine Hispanic parole officer positions so that each district could establish a program to service the Hispanic community in its jurisdiction.

PROBABLE CAUSE HEARINGS

Probable Cause Hearings (Calendar 1979): 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 were responsible for conducting all Probable Cause Hearings throughout the state.

As of September, 1979, due to vehicle and budgetary restraints, the Probable Cause Hearing Unit was disbanded and the hearings were held by the Administrative Senior assigned to each district.

In order to comply with a Supreme Court decision, the following tabulation of Probable Cause Hearings and Decisions was compiled in calendar 1979:

a. Hearing requested and hearing held	1115
b. Hearing waived and hearing held	39
c. No response from parolee and hearing held	504
d. Hearing waived and no hearing held	399
e. Probable Cause found and formal revocation hearing to follow	1806
f. Continuation on parole recommended although valid violations determined	205
g. Continuation on parole--no valid violations determined	5
h. Other	<u>41</u>
Total hearings scheduled (columns a+b+c+d)	2057
Probable Cause found (column e)	1806 (87.8 percent)

DISTRICT PAROLE SUPERVISORS' DECISIONS (Calendar 1979)

<u>DO#</u>	<u>Authorization to Continue on Parole</u>	<u>Authorization to Continue on Bail</u>
1	226	255
2	131	111
3	273	161
4	254	405
5	118	136
6	160	159
7	211	179
8	64	72
9	<u>119</u>	<u>103</u>
Totals	1556	1581

RATIO OF FIELD TO OFFICE TIME (Calendar 1979)

The following chart indicates the hours and percentage of officers' time spent in the office as compared to the field in calendar 1979:

	<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>FIELD</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Jan.	8804	9316	18,120
Feb.	7892	6792	14,684
March	8912	9346	18,258
April	7918	8247	16,165
May	8320	8827	17,147
June	8246	8087	16,333
July	7128	6645	13,773

	<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>FIELD</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Aug.	7867	7844	15,711
Sept.	7041	7258	14,299
Oct.	8634	8749	17,383
Nov.	6988	7147	14,135
Dec.	<u>7316</u>	<u>7004</u>	<u>14,320</u>
Totals	95,066	95,262	190,328
Percent	49.9%	50.1%	100%

TREATMENT (Calendar 1979)

As of December 31, 1979, the N. J. Rehabilitation Commission indicated that it was servicing a total parole caseload in Newark of 167 cases of which 129 were on Active status and 38 on Referred status. Although during the early part of the year the Specialized Rehabilitation caseload covered the entire Essex County, in the latter months only the City of Newark was serviced by a Specialized caseload.

NIGHT VISITS (Calendar 1979)

- DO#1 - Staff made total of 65 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#2 - Staff made total of 47 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#3 - Staff made no reported contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#4 - Staff made total of 24 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#5 - Staff made total of 25 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#6 - Staff made total of 80 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#7 - Staff made total of 115 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#8 - Staff made total of 274 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#9 - Staff made total of 282 contacts after normal working hours.

Bureau staff made a grand total of 912 contacts after normal working hours.

CASEBOOK REVIEWS (Calendar 1979)

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 32 reviews were completed, resulting in two (6.2 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 as a result of the great time and effort placed on Bureau accreditation efforts by all personnel while trying to manage case-loads with diminishing resources.

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 December, 1979, 2076 parolees had been accepted in one of the CETA programs. There were 26 rejections for various technical reasons.

FURLOUGH WORK/STUDY PROGRAM (Calendar 1979)

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 (Calendar 1979) field monitoring of furlough activity continued to be a service provided by the district parole offices. The nine district furlough coordinators completed 912 initial investigations of furlough addresses during calendar 1979, each involving at least one home visit and one police department contact. One hundred and four of these investigations resulted in disapprovals due to the discovery of some defective aspect in the furlough designation, a rejection rate of more than 11 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 1659 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 3,036 hours during the year and the traveling of 18,416 miles by the district coordinators.

Comparison with FISCAL 1978: 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.

Note: The chart represents a fiscal year comparison ending June 30, 1979, while the above narrative represented statistical data for calendar year ending December 31, 1979.

FIELD INVESTIGATIONS - BUREAU OF PAROLE

1977 - 1978	INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED				MILEAGE	HOURS
	INITIAL					
	Home & P.D.	Dis-approval	Rejection Rate	Follow-Up (Home & P.D.)		
July 1977	83	8	9.6%	66	1598	310
Aug. 1977	132	11	8.3%	104	2661	441
Sept. 1977	93	11	11.8%	111	1712	378
Oct. 1977	75	4	5.3%	91	2021	401
Nov. 1977	59	8	13.6%	138	1386	337
Dec. 1977	77	7	9.1%	112	1947	367
Jan. 1978	71	7	9.9%	125	1827	362
Feb. 1978	72	10	13.8%	146	1647	380
Mar. 1978	78	5	6.4%	204	2008	479
Apr. 1978	64	5	7.8%	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		125.1	1935.4	391.4
TOTALS	971	89	9.2%	1501	23,225	4695
COMPARISONS						
% Increase				15.1%	2.2%	
% Decrease	-3.5%	-12.4%				-24.0%
1978 - 1979						
July 1978	63	4	6.3%	97	2739	335
Aug. 1978	84	5	6.0%	183	2168	336
Sept. 1978	64	4	6.3%	148	2282	292
Oct. 1978	82	9	11.0%	120	2492	356½
Nov. 1978	78	6	7.7%	142	1997	241½
Dec. 1978	91	9	9.9%	152	1667	212
Jan. 1979	79	8	10.3%	165	1857	340
Feb. 1979	79	9	11.4%	177	1216	289
Mar. 1979	80	5	6.3%	155	1704	358
Apr. 1979	88	6	6.8%	136	2267	307
May 1979	74	4	5.4%	165	1670	268½
June 1979	75	9	12.0%	129	1679	232
Avg. Per Month	78.1	6.5		147.4	1978.2	297.3

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE PROGRAM (Calendar 1979)

Institutional parole offices located at the institutions listed on p. 10 provide necessary services between the institution and field staff

to effect a smooth scientific reentry into the community by over 4,400 parolees during the past calendar year. 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	2,560	1,860	1,286	533
YRCC	1,222	1,554	1,235	168
YCIB	1,551	1,287	729	86
YCIA	1,125	2,497	819	824
TSB/G	577	650	216	182
CIW	355	1,638	171	136
Calendar 1979				
Total	7,390	9,486	4,456	1,429

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 as required in order to resolve pertinent current issues and dispel unfounded rumors.

TEAM SUPERVISION

Team membership does not lessen a parole officer's individual caseload responsibilities. It does make his particular expertise - and that of other team members - available to the aggregate caseload. The caseload is comprised of service and hard-to-manage categories of parole supervision: no routine involvement of orientation cases. As of December 31, 1979, the district reported the following team involvement:

- DO#1 - Three teams of three, one of four, one of six
- DO#2 - Three teams of three
- DO#3 - Two teams of three, one of four, one of seven
- DO#4 - Two teams of five, one of four

DO#5 - Two teams of three
DO#6 - Three teams of four
DO#7 - Two teams of four
DO#8 - Two teams of three
DO#9 - Two teams of six

It should be noted that the number, size and makeup of teams varies not only from district to district, but within each district from time to time depending upon availability of staff. In addition to the team structure cited above, each district also maintains individual caseloads for one-on-one supervision.

PAROLEE EARNINGS (Calendar 1978)

During the calendar year 1978, 10,738 parolees under supervision earned \$25,807,920, an increase of \$4,355,166 over last year's earnings.

Fifty-five percent (5,907) 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-four percent (2,584) were "unemployed" throughout their entire period of supervision, although employable. The remaining 21 percent (2,247) were classified as "unemployable" by reason of being missing or in custody, attending school, being engaged in homemaking or being incapacitated.

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 bimonthly basis:

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

Programs included: Various programs presented by Chairman Dietz re: the Parole Bill; the Veterans Administration re: the Offender/Veteran's Benefits; an Evaluation of In-Service Training and methods of improvement; several sessions on the Penal Code presented by the staff of various prosecutors' offices; a session on Professional Burnout presented by N. J. Employees' Advisory Service; a session on Personnel Benefits presented by staff of the Bureau of Personnel; a program on Targeted Job Tax Credit presented by the staff of the Department of Labor; and a host of programs involving the Interaction of Local Agencies with the various parole districts.

B. Other Agency Training Programs: 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 staff involved itself with training sponsored by the Administrative Office of the Courts; Correction Officers Training Academy; the Department of Health (A.N.D.A.T.E.C.); Civil Service; State Police Training Academy along with county and local police training academies and limited participation in national and regional conferences.

PAROLE RESOURCE OFFICE AND ORIENTATION FACILITY (PROOF) (Fiscal 1979)

I. Statement of Purpose

PROOF is a community based residential facility located in Jersey City and operated by the State Bureau of Parole. It provides a vital and unique service by offering total supportive service and intensive supervision to parolees who are experiencing difficult adjustment problems in the community. It is staffed 24 hours per day, 365 days per year by professional parole officers who are skilled in counselling and community resource development.

The agency is able to offer emergency housing and related services to up to 15 dislocated male parolees. Newly released parolees, as well as those who have been in the community for extended periods, frequently find themselves unable to maintain themselves in the community as a result of unemployment, collapse of family support, and other reasons. In such situations of stress, the field officer is able to refer his client to PROOF for intensive supervision and casework services which are designed to assist the parolee with his efforts to reorganize or reintegrate with the community.

Its 365 day per year operation also enables PROOF to function as a vital link in the institutional furlough program. All furloughees are required to notify the district parole office upon arrival at their destination. Many furloughees arrive at their destination after normal business hours or their furlough may commence on a weekend when district offices are closed. They call into PROOF in compliance with the regulations of the furlough program.

PROOF staff also mans a 24 hour hotline. All parolees and their families as well as most police agencies are informed of our telephone number. They are encouraged to call at any time when they cannot reach their parole officer for information, advice or counselling.

II. Statistical Information (Fiscal 1979)

A. History: PROOF was opened late in 1969 and admitted its first resident on December 2 of that year. Nine and one half years later it admitted its 1,093rd resident on June 26, 1979.

B. Utilization Rate: From July 1, 1978, to June 30, 1979, there were a total of 5,475 resident days available. (15 residents x 365 days.) Of this total, 3,823 resident days were utilized. Accordingly, the facility operated at an average of 69.66 percent of capacity.

For the same period last year the facility operated at 60.94 percent of capacity. This represents an 8.72 percent increase in utilization. The average occupancy rate for the past five years has been 66.81 percent.

C. Admissions: On June 30, 1978, there were nine parolees in residence at PROOF. From July 1, 1978, to June 30, 1979, there were 155 admissions. The previous year there were 138 admissions. The 155 admissions plus the 9 in residence made a total of 164 case serviced during the year. This is 17 more than the previous year's total of 147.

D. Terminations: During the year there were 159 terminations leaving 5 parolees in residence as of June 30, 1979. The 159 cases which were terminated had spent a total of 3,922 days in residence for an average length of stay of 24.7 days. This is up slightly from last year's average length of stay of 23.62 days.

Eighty of the terminations (slightly more than 50 percent) were by reason of relocation in the community. Thirty-six (22.6 percent) were AWOL and simply failed to return. Ten (6.3 percent) had been admitted on an emergency basis for one night only. Eleven (6.4 percent) had been placed in other residential programs (drug, alcohol, hospital and training) more suited to their needs. Thirteen (8 percent) were expelled for various infractions of house rules. A total of nine (6.2 percent) were terminated because of arrest and incarcerations. Six of these were arrests on new charges in the community. One was arrested by the district office for parole violations. Two were placed in custody by staff for serious violations of house rules (fighting).

E. Referrals: The breakdown of referrals according to district offices and institutions is shown in the table which appears on page 15 of this report. DO#4 continues to be the leading sending district with 47 referrals or approximately 28.7 percent of all admissions. Geographical proximity to the facility apparently has a high correlation factor to the number of referrals per district. DO's #2, 4, 5 and 9 are all within a ten mile radius of the facility. Together they accounted for 132 admissions or over 80 percent of the total. Yet, they service only about 45 percent of the total Bureau caseload. Conversely, the three most distant districts, DO's #6, 7 and 8, account for a total of only 8 admissions or about 5 percent of the total. Together they service over 27 percent of the Bureau caseload.

III. Casework

A. One of the major goals of the 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 we have employed the services of various community resources such as Vocational Counselling Services, N. J. State Employment Service, N. J. Rehabilitation Commission, the Urban League, U. S. Armed Forces, Newark Services Agency, and Job Bank. Almost all residents are usually successful in obtaining temporary employment on a daily basis through such private agencies as Labor Pool, Staff Builders and Manpower. Staff also works to the best of its abilities in developing direct employment referrals for the residents. Most residents who sincerely want to work are successful in finding employment.

B. Many residents have taken advantage of the education and training program available in the area. Some have continued their education in General Equivalency Diploma programs and at Jersey City State College. Others have gained occupational training through CETA programs and through Community Help Corporation.

C. Most residents, upon entering the facility, are in a state of financial poverty. Often they arrive with only the clothing on their backs and no money in their pockets. There is, thus, an immediate need for clothing, toiletry items and cash for transportation and other minor expenses. To assist them we have utilized the resources of the Jersey City Municipal Welfare Department, Gate Money funds from the institution, Health Services funds from Central Office, and the Mini-Grant account under the Community Resources Specialist Project.

During the fiscal year we were able to provide direct financial assistance through Mini-Grants totaling \$1,809.05. A total of 183 grants were made. Most grants were for transportation expenses. Some were for toilet articles and clothing. A few were for medical prescriptions.

In addition to these forms of financial assistance, staff makes many out-of-pocket loans and grants from personal funds. Clothing is solicited and many donations of used items are received during the year for resident use.

D. Health care needs also present a problem for residents. Acute illnesses are treated through the Jersey City Medical Center Emergency Room and various clinics including the dental clinic and the Venereal Disease Clinic. Restorative dental care and other health services have also been provided through the N. J. Rehabilitation Commission. New Eyes for the Needy have provided several residents with prescription eyeglasses. Community Mental Health Center has been used for the mental health care of the residents. Problems with alcohol abuse have been referred to Patrick House Alcohol Abuse Clinic. Drug related problems are referred to the N. J. Drug Clinic.

We have utilized the services of Roche Clinical Labs for drug screen testing of urine specimens received from residents. This service has greatly enhanced our ability to detect and control drug abuse among residents.

The Health Services Fund and the Mini-Grant Fund have been utilized to purchase medical prescriptions and other related types of health care needs for residents. We maintain at the facility a supply of aspirin, antacid tablets, antiseptic and bandages for treatment of minor ailments.

E. The recreational facilities of the local YMCA have been made available to PROOF residents on a selective basis by special arrangements at no cost to the residents. In-house recreational facilities include ping-pong, chess, checkers, cards, frisbee and basketball equipment as well as television viewing.

F. Counselling remains one of the most basic of services which we provide to residents. The intensive, in-depth, intake interview enables the staff to evaluate the resident's current situation and problems. A treatment program which is individually designed to meet the resident's needs is then developed. 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 prior performance, identify problems and suggest corrective measures, and to assist the resident in planning in relocation.

G. Attendance at the weekly house meetings is required of all residents. Under the direction of RPO Serge Gremmo, the groups enter into freewheeling, open ended discussions of a wide range of topics. Meetings are not considered therapy nor just bull sessions, but deal with the practical problems facing residents, such as employment, sexual relationships, group living, etc. The rate of unexcused absences is low and resident interest and participation are quite good.

H. The Parent Orientation Program was started in Fiscal Year 1978 and continued into Fiscal Year 1979. It met twice a month on a regular basis through October and met once in November. A slack in the number of new referrals and the coming of foul weather and the holiday season caused us to discontinue the program. An extensive evaluation of the effects of the program was conducted with the finding that parents were interested in such a service, that they thought the material presented was worthwhile and that they would be willing to continue meeting regularly with a group of parents with similar problems.

The study recommended that the program be adopted and implemented in the district offices. Due, in part, to staff reductions throughout the Bureau, this has not been widely accomplished. We were pleased to note, however, that the concept had been put forth in a proposal associated with the bilingual parole officer program.

IV. Hotline and Furlough Reporting Services (Statistics Reflect Fiscal 1979)

A. The hotline was established at PROOF on October 1, 1974. All parolees upon their release as well as most police agencies are informed of our number. Over the past year we received a total of 196 calls. The number is 24 more calls than received last year and represents an average of 16.3 calls per month. Since the start of the hotline service we have received a total of 701 calls.

Of the 196 calls, 130 were from parolees, 41 were from friends or relatives and the remaining 25 were from various police agencies. All calls are serviced to the extent possible and are referred to the district offices for follow-up.

B. During the year we received 675 furlough calls. This is 39 more than last year. All calls are recorded and are held for verification by the district furlough coordinator.

Starting last February we began to record the telephone number from which furloughees were calling. We also called that number right back to verify that the call was placed from the number given. District furlough coordinators are then able to verify that the call was placed from the approved furlough address as required by furlough regulations.

Institutional and district breakdown of the 164 new admissions of Fiscal Year 1979 are as follows:

<u>DO#</u>	<u>TSB-J</u>	<u>YRCC</u>	<u>YCIA</u>	<u>YCIB</u>	<u>NJSP</u>	<u>OS</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>FY 78 TOTAL</u>
1	0	2	1	3	3	0	0	9	10
2	0	11	12	5	7	0	0	35	14
3	0	2	3	5	2	1	0	13	14
4	0	10	14	15	8	0	0	47	49
5	0	4	4	4	3	0	0	15	13
6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
7	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	5
8	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
9	0	16	7	9	3	0	0	35	27
Other Agencies	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
FY 79	0	46	45	41	29	1	2	164	X
Total FY 78	3	26	44	32	29	4	0	X	138

SLEPA PROGRAM

Parole Vocational Service Center Project (Calendar 1979):
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.

We have now completed our second full year of program operation. Data for this second year far surpasses data from the first year of operation. State objectives for this year have been met or surpassed in almost every category. It may safely be inferred that the Parole Vocational Service Centers are operating with a high degree of efficacy.

In the SLEPA evaluation report regarding the Vocational Service Centers published in April of this year, it was suggested in the conclusion of the narrative portion that innovation should be encouraged. Recent efforts by Vocational Service Center staff to assume a leadership role in advocating client services and to utilize the Targeted Job Tax Credit as a tool to encourage more private sector employment for offenders are signs that innovation is very much an ongoing part of the Parole Vocational Service Centers. It is encouraging to note that after two years, services and staff continue to reflect a sense of vitality and an excitement for new directions. These signs suggest that we can anticipate even further positive accomplishments in the coming year.

During calendar 1979 the Vocational Service Centers' involvement in initiating services was as follows:

	<u>Screened</u>	<u>Intake</u>
DO#6	208	98

Referral sources included:

Bureau of Parole, Mercer County Probation, Mercer County Workhouse, Mercer County Correction Center, Mental Health, self, CIW, Federal Probation, Hunterdon County P.T.I., Mercer County P.T.I. and X-max.

	<u>Screened</u>	<u>Intake</u>
DO#7	129	75

Referral sources included:

Bureau of Parole, Turning Point, CIW, Federal Probation, Volunteers of America, Camden County Probation, and Gloucester County Work Release Program.

	<u>Screened</u>	<u>Intake</u>
DO#9	306	301

Referral sources included:

Bureau of Parole, Second Chance, Essex County Probation, self, Federal Probation, Integrity House, X-max, DO#2, Joint Connection, Salvation Army, American Friends, and Newark House.

VOLUNTEERS IN PAROLE PROGRAM (Calendar 1979)

Introduction: Calendar year 1979 continued to be a significant one for Volunteers in Parole. The program has been decentralized concurrent with a program audit to determine available interested volunteers. Each district parole office is recruiting, orienting and training new volunteers along with having the responsibility of matching and monitoring each parolee-volunteer assignment. Central Office Volunteers in Parole Program continues to recruit, train and select cases as well as matching in Special Condition situations dictated by the various paroling authorities. Substantial advances have been made at the Central Office level in the recruitment and matching of special service volunteers, i.e. civil-legal problem resolution, psychological services, etc., as well as the influx of group volunteers in the program.

Assistance to Parolees: During the calendar year the program maintained a mean average of 268 volunteers available for assignment at any time. This represents a 13% decrease from last year, accounted for by decentralization and the audit. Ninety-six new volunteers joined the program during the calendar year. One hundred twelve volunteers were either deleted or resigned from the program as a result of the audit and for sundry other reasons.

Most of the volunteers (63%) joining the program were non-attorneys. This is in line with predictions made last year and in keeping with the large influx of other professionals and groups into the program.

The volunteers assisted a total number of 338 parolees. Of this number 18 clients had civil-legal problems resolved, 4 received psychological services, 2 received translational services and 18 received other kinds of specialized services. Eight groups joined the program during the year. These groups assisted 9 clients.

Total activities for the program included:

854 Recruitment Contacts
 227 Training Contacts
 568 Institutional Contacts
 1,284 Volunteer Contacts
 312 Parole Officer Contacts

One of the Volunteers in Parole Program's attorney-volunteers received the distinguished V.C.C.N.J.'s Volunteer of the Year Award. This honor is given to the outstanding Criminal Justice volunteer selected from the numerous programs throughout the state. Albert Rylak of Clinton, N.J. received the award on November 3, 1979.

PUBLIC RELATIONS (Calendar 1979)

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 the 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
 National Alliance of Business
 New Jersey Corrections Association
 Frontiers International
 Urban League
 PROCEED (An agency dedicated to assisting the Hispanic)
 American Red Cross
 Atlantic County Homemaker - Home Health Aide Service
 Various Rotary, Lions and other service organizations

SPECIAL NOTE

The charts presented and all discussion concerning the material presented within does not reflect information concerning those N.J. cases paroled out-of-state. The figures presented under headings "Under supervision 7/1/78" on the various charts may show a slight variation from those figures presented in the previous Annual Report. Problems have been discovered which developed subsequent to the date that the Bureau of Interstate Services began maintaining its own count. The figures presented herein represent only those submitted by the Bureau of Parole's various components. As a further result of the same dilemma, no 5 year comparisons can be made.

CASELOADS (Fiscal 1979) (See Table #1)

On June 30, 1979, the Bureau of Parole was responsible for the supervision of 8,042 cases in New Jersey and 99 cases in the Central Office Special File with a grand total of 8,141 cases. We note that by the end of the calendar year the total caseload had increased to 8,470 cases.

RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS (See Tables 2 and 2A)

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during the 1978-79 fiscal year totaled 11.2 percent of the Bureau's entire caseload. The court commitment/recommitment equaled 3.3 percent while the technical violation rate equaled 7.9 percent of the total rate cited above.

MISSING CASES (See Tables 3 and 3A)

The percentage of missing cases in relation to the total Bureau caseload totaled 10.5 percent. Parolees from the Correctional Institution for Women had the largest percentage of Missing cases (14.9 percent); however, the caseload from Bordentown was close behind with 14.3 percent. The N.J. institution boasting the lowest percentage of parolees missing from its caseload was the Training School for Boys and Girls with 2.5 percent.

SUPERVISION

In the course of supervising the Bureau's caseload during fiscal 1979, Bureau field staff made a grand total of 431,571 contacts. An additional 14,863 investigation contacts were made. State vehicles were driven a total of 771,887 miles, in spite of difficulties encountered in many instances with service, repair and gasoline shortages.

TABLE #1

TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - FISCAL YEAR 1978-79 (BY INSTITUTIONS)

	IN NEW JERSEY				CENTRAL OFFICE SPECIAL FILE				Total Under Supervision 6/30/79
	Under Supervision 7/1/78	Total Cases Added	Total No. Supervised 1978-79	Under Supervision 6/30/79	Under Supervision 7/1/78	Total Cases Added	Total No. Supervised 1978-79	Under Supervision 6/30/79	
Training School for Girls	17	20	37	25	0	0	0	0	25
Correctional Institution for Women	295	156	451	305	8	0	8	4	309
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	218	165	383	200	0	0	0	0	200
Youth Correctional Complex:									
Annandale	1620	784	2404	1475	5	0	5	4	1479
Bordentown	1749	660	2409	1577	26	0	26	10	1587
Youth Reception & Correction Center	1348	583	1931	1199	35	0	35	24	1223
State Prison	2314	1340	3654	2739	67	21	88	57	2796
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	36	28	64	50	0	0	0	0	50
Out-of-State Cases in New Jersey									
Female	24	14	38	21	0	0	0	0	21
Male	433	289	722	451	0	0	0	0	451
TOTAL	8054	4039	12093	8042	141	21	162	99	8141
Under Supervision 7/1/78	8054				141				8195
Total Cases Added		4039				21			4060
Total No. Supervised 1978-79			12093				162		12255
Under Supervision 6/30/79				8042				99	8141

*As differentiated from other charts.

No inter-office transfer of cases is included in this raw data.

TABLE #2

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF VIOLATORS
BY DISTRICT AND SEX
BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
- FISCAL 1978-1979 -

MALE							
District Office	Total Number Supervised During Year*	Number and Percent of Violators				TOTALS	
		Committed or Recommitted		Returned as Technical Violators		Number	Percent
1. Clifton	1,643	91	5.5%	77	4.7%	168	10.2%
2. East Orange	1,418	39	2.8%	96	6.8%	135	9.5%
3. Red Bank	1,765	47	2.7%	116	6.6%	163	9.2%
4. Jersey City	1,325	45	3.4%	155	11.7%	200	15.1%
5. Elizabeth	1,098	30	2.7%	117	10.7%	147	13.4%
6. Trenton	1,185	20	1.7%	144	12.2%	164	13.8%
7. Camden	1,220	35	2.9%	156	12.8%	191	15.7%
8. Atlantic City	938	28	3.0%	61	6.5%	89	9.5%
9. Newark	1,331	64	4.8%	42	3.2%	106	8.0%
10. Central Office (Special File)	156	0	0	10	6.4%	10	6.4%
TOTAL MALE	12,079	399	3.3%	974	8.1%	1,373	11.4%
FEMALE							
1. Clifton	85	3	3.5%	4	4.7%	7	8.2%
2. East Orange	67	1	1.5%	5	7.5%	6	9.0%
3. Red Bank	95	2	2.1%	3	3.2%	5	5.3%
4. Jersey City	39	2	5.1%	2	5.1%	4	10.3%
5. Elizabeth	55	1	1.8%	7	12.7%	8	14.5%
6. Trenton	65	1	1.5%	4	6.2%	5	7.7%
7. Camden	37	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Atlantic City	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Newark	79	2	2.5%	2	2.5%	4	5.1%
10. Central Office (Special File)	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FEMALE	560	12	2.1%	27	4.8%	39	7.0%
GRAND TOTAL	12,639	411	3.3%	1,001	7.9%	1,412	11.2%

* Figures include inter-office transfer of cases.

Accurate figures of New Jersey cases paroled out-of-state and subsequently became violators were not provided by Bureau of Interstate Services.

TABLE #2A
 PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
 BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
 BY DISTRICT
 Fiscal 1978-1979

	Total Number Supervised	Committed or Recommitted	Technical Violators	Total
1. Clifton	1,728	5.4%	4.7%	10.1%
2. East Orange	1,485	2.7%	6.8%	9.5%
3. Red Bank	1,860	2.6%	6.4%	9.0%
4. Jersey City	1,364	3.4%	11.5%	14.9%
5. Elizabeth	1,153	2.7%	10.8%	13.5%
6. Trenton	1,250	1.7%	11.8%	13.5%
7. Camden	1,257	2.8%	12.4%	15.2%
8. Atlantic City	968	2.9%	6.3%	9.2%
9. Newark	1,410	4.7%	3.1%	7.8%
10. Central Office (Special File)	164	0	6.1%	
TOTAL	12,639	3.3%	7.9%	11.2%

Figures include inter-office transfer of cases.

Accurate figures of New Jersey cases paroled out-of-state and subsequently became violators were not provided by Bureau of Interstate Services.

TABLE #3
 RECORD OF MISSING CASES
 BY INSTITUTION
 Fiscal 1978-1979

Institution	Total on Parole 6/30/79	Missing As Of 6/30/78	Became Missing Between 7/1/78 and 6/30/79	Total Missing	Accounted For Between 7/1/78 and 6/30/79	Total Missing on 6/30/79	Net Difference	Percent of Missing in Relation to Caseload on 6/30/79
Training School for Girls	25	0	1	1	0	1	+ 1	4.0%
Correctional Institution for Women	309	36	32	68	24	44	+ 8	14.9%
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	200	10	18	28	23	5	- 5	2.5%
Youth Correction Institution Complex:								
Annandale	1,479	141	135	276	132	144	+ 3	9.7%
Bordentown	1,587	260	157	417	191	226	-34	14.3%
Youth Reception & Correction Center	1,223	178	111	289	139	150	-28	12.2%
State Prison	2,796	276	178	454	180	274	- 2	9.8%
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	50	4	0	4	2	2	- 2	4.0%
Out-of-State:								
Female	21	0	2	2	2	0	0	0
Male	451	2	27	29	22	7	+ 5	1.1%
TOTAL	8,141	907	661	1,568	715	853	-54	10.5%

TABLE #3A

RECORD OF MISSING CASES

BY DISTRICT

Fiscal 1978-1979

District	Caseload on 6/30/79	Missing As Of 6/30/78	Became Missing Between 7/1/78 and 6/30/79	Total Missing	Accounted For Between 7/1/78 and 6/30/79	Total Missing on 6/30/79	Net Difference	Percent of Missing in Relation to Caseload on 6/30/79
1. Clifton	1,107	129	130	259	135	124	- 5	11.2%
2. East Orange	985	86	112	198	100	98	+12	9.9%
3. Red Bank	1,202	99	53	152	64	88	-11	7.3%
4. Jersey City	885	109	124	233	124	109	0	12.3%
5. Elizabeth	692	72	50	122	45	77	+ 5	11.1%
6. Trenton	792	100	73	173	75	98	- 2	12.4%
7. Camden	813	66	42	108	38	70	+ 4	8.6%
8. Atlantic City	608	53	17	70	28	42	-11	6.9%
9. Newark	958	140	60	200	75	125	-15	13.0%
10. Central Office (Special File)	99	53	0	53	31	22	-31	22.2%
TOTAL	8,141	907	661	1,568	715	853	-54	10.5%

STATE OF NEW JERSEY - BUREAU OF PAROLE
TABLE # 4
SUMMARY DAILY RECORD OF ACTIVITIES
FISCAL YEAR 1978-1979

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	PER-SONAL
	C	E	H	N	O	S	PCII	RH	P	PO	R	P	N	F-19	F-21	AR	PP	SR	DR	OA	TR	TS						
D01	6,014	272	7688	2206	6231	10	35	48	9802	12433	1344	1126	430	2439	3272		731	117	133	117	159	12447	13737	87425	3403			
D02	5095	186	3118	1418	5753			8492	5311	780	671	343	2421	2494		435	56	74	3	88	148	11571	81304	85325	332			
D03	11961	478	7431	1915	12098	22	98	70	12578	17125	2536	1744	533	2176	1976	4	809	286	124	10	200	1688	10252	15746	153108	5326		
D04	11597	268	4242	1723	6827	10	148	80	11272	16552	2588	1968	349	1529	2195		606	344	45	8	113	125	10002	11459	60115	1967		
D05	4591	302	4336	1628	4778	50	118	73	6826	9796	881	994	646	1456	2020		426	337	76	13	87	99	9146	9407	63973	624		
D06	7257	561	6314	1758	6311	83	277	126	8010	10577	1965	896	205	1812	2143		495	151	84	33	123	111	9636	10489	100899			
D07	16332	94	3371	1489	9261	17	457	121	7129	18237	3020	1343	522	1431	3238	1	570	356	70	70	103	137	12559	8524	78909			
D08	5204	456	3246	1105	6622	77	125	56	6421	7795	1383	1199	252	955	1255	18	391	252	44	46	82	104	7858	9967	148762			
D09	6165	361	8509	766	8210	113	128	31	10234	13883	1015	923	219	2116	2038		473	71	57	5	127	116	8761	12587	25529	3850		
TOTAL	67234	3178	43874	14002	64091	382	528	673	87235	116202	15577	12064	3499	16235	20931	23	4886	1970	709	188	1042	1187	26332	174870	278325	5562		
GRAND TOTAL	201,693						229,878					14,863		38,266		6,879			3,124				269,102		771,887			

Legend:

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

END