

NCJRS

OCT 2 1978

ACQU... 5

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

State of New Jersey
Department of Institutions and Agencies
Division of Correction and Parole

BUREAU OF PAROLE


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

(July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977)

Nat R. Arluke, Chief
Bureau of Parole

Domenick Sparaino
Supervising Parole Officer

50928



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 the Training School for Boys/Girls, the Youth Correctional Complex, the Prison Complex, Correctional Institution for Women, the Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center, and persons paroled from similar institutions of other states to reside in New Jersey.

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 Size: Efforts continue in the development of caseload size based on the amount of work required to supervise adequately the caseload, rather than on a numerical, geographical limitation.

2. Improving Quality of Service to Clients and to the Community: (a) Expansion of specialized caseloads to include special supervision based on specific parolee problems, currently limited because of staff shortages, will be considered as soon as adequate staff becomes available. (b) Increase in parolee supervision span during other than regular business hours should expand as funds become available to charge evening meals on expense accounts. (c) Expanded use of "hot-line" emergency communication systems continues as knowledge of its availability becomes known. (d) Team supervision process is in effect in all district offices and the process should prove to be of value, particularly in the orientation of new officers.

3. Streamlining of Paper Work Processes: As procedural memorandums continue to be revised, efforts are being made to expedite this process. Efforts will continue to make this a major item as staff may become available.

4. Community Involvement: (a) Volunteers in Parole Program continues to seek further match-ups with parolees and potential parolees. (b) Efforts continue to expand the Parole Resource Orientation and Office Facility model to other areas in the State.

5. Staff Selection and Retention: (a) Efforts continue to gain support to upgrade salary levels and to expand promotional opportunities in the field-oriented positions. (b) Requests have been initiated to provide a departmental policy of professional development which will offer a reasonable incentive in this area.

6. Realignment of District Office Areas: Following a determination of possible or potential trends in the State's catchment areas, and the actual growth or decline of parolees as the result of decisions of the various paroling authorities, district office areas will be revised.

DEVELOPMENTS

Federally Funded Projects: Community Resource Specialist project is in operation with a Senior Parole Officer in each of the nine district offices. The State budget approved the funds for five of the nine with the remaining four being Federally funded.

With approval received to initiate a Manpower Vocational Service Center in three of the district offices as model programs, the Centers were inaugurated in Newark, Trenton, and Camden. Total cost was \$500,000.

Probable Cause Hearings: This hearing, mandated by the Supreme Court *Morrissey v. Brewer* decision, was initiated under urgent requirements with the assignment of Supervising Parole Officers (highest level under the Chief) to formulate operating procedures, establish policy, and to conduct the hearings. In view of the fact that this has been accomplished satisfactorily, consideration will be given to reducing the position level for hearing officer assignment to Senior Parole Officer or Assistant District Supervisor as soon as these positions may be made available.

Parole Bureau Advisory Committee: In order to increase the communication flow and, incidentally, to reduce the flood of unfounded rumors, an advisory committee was created composed of a vertical cross section of the Bureau to meet monthly and to place "on the table" those areas they would desire to discuss as reflected by each unit of the Bureau. Since there are representatives of every level from parole officer up, the communication flow is direct and expedient. Of the two meetings held this fiscal year, reaction has been, unanimously, to continue the meetings. The conclusions and results attained at each meeting are subsequently published.

PERSONNEL

At the end of the prior fiscal year, there were 304 staff members in the Bureau, 12 of which were Federally funded. On July 16, 1976, a budgetary cutback resulted in the abolishment of 43 positions. However, there were 31 positions either unfilled as a result of the "freeze" or being utilized by the Department for various commitments, which resulted in an actual lay-off of only twelve staff members (three Assistant District Parole Supervisors and nine parole officers--seven of whom were transferred to other agencies and two who elected to take the lay-off).

During the same period, one Federally funded senior parole officer (Community Reorientation Program) position was abolished and funding approved for the implementation of the Vocational Service Centers in Trenton, Camden and Newark which resulted in the establishment of three Assistant District Parole Supervisor positions (Unit Managers), nine parole officer positions (three in each center) and three senior clerk-stenographers (one in each center).

As of June 30, 1977, the total complement of 294 staff members was as follows:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Chief | 1 |
| Supervising Parole Officers | 7 |
| Volunteers in Parole Program - Supervisor of Volunteers and Senior Parole Officer | 2 |
| Program Development Specialist (Federally funded) | 1 |
| District Parole Supervisors | 9 |
| Assistant District Parole Supervisors (3 Federally funded) | 12 |
| Senior Parole Officers (9 Federally funded) | 30 |
| Residential Parole Officers | 7 |
| Parole Officers (9 Federally funded) | 137 |
| Clerical | 88 |
| Total | <u>294</u> |

Resignations: During the year there were 14 resignations (exactly half of the number for last year) of the professional staff for the following reasons:

Six went to better paying positions in allied service agencies.

Four moved out of state.

Two resigned for personal reasons (one of whom was doing unsatisfactory work).

One resigned for medical reasons.

One left without any reason provided.

The total number of parole officer separations for all reasons amounted to percent of the total number of professional staff (9 percent last year).

TRAINING

A. In-Service Training: Training was held on the following area basis with the senior parole officer in each district responsible for the program on a rotating basis:

Area 1, 2, 9
 " 3, 4, 5
 " 6, 7, 8

Programs included a tour and orientation of the Stokes Forest/High Point complex of the Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale; a tour and orientation of New Jersey Police Laboratory including Handwriting Analysis, Ballistics, Forensic Medicine, Evidence, Identification, Photography, Organized Crime and Narcotics; Interstate Matters; New Jersey Division of Civil Rights; Final Revocation Hearings; Problems Involved in Board of Trustees of Youth Correctional Complex in Board Decision Making and Resultant Effect on Institutions and Field Parole Staff; CETA Programs; Community Resource Specialist Project; Alcoholism; a film, "Death on Wheels"; a tour of New Jersey State Police Voice Print Analysis Laboratory, Computer Center and Teletype Rooms; Salvation Army Program; the Effect of Rehabilitation Unit on Juvenile Delinquents at Atlantic County Detention Center; the Volunteers in Probation Program.

B. Other Agency Training Programs: These included Behavior Modification, Multi-Model Behavior Therapy, Seminar on Alcoholism, Assertiveness Training for Female Correctional Staff, Interviewing Techniques, Grantsmanship and Proposal Writing, Assessing Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Narcotic and Drug Abuse Control Prevention, Alcoholism Training Workshop, Food Stamp Program, Criminal Justice System, Counselling, Management Seminars, Administration of Psychological Tests.

Training of Volunteers programs have been conducted throughout the year under the aegis of Volunteers in Parole Program Coordinator Walsh.

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

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, 1977 the 800th 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 of the Central Office in Trenton. 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 six residential Parole Officers, one Parole Officer and a clerk-transcriber.

Statistical Information: During fiscal year 1977, 3404 resident days were utilized by a total of 132 parolees and, accordingly, the facility operated at an average of 62.16% 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 27.6 days in fiscal 1976 to an average of 25.8 days in fiscal 1977. Institutional and district breakdown of the 125 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 | 3 | 1 | 2 | | 7 |
| DO#2 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 16 |
| DO#3 | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | | 11 |
| DO#4 | | 12 | 9 | 19 | 15 | | 55 |
| DO#5 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | | | 8 |
| DO#6 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| DO#7 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| DO#8 | | | | | | | 0 |
| DO#9 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 3 | | 24 |
| TOTAL | 1 | 32 | 30 | 33 | 28 | 1 | 125 |

The 123 terminations were broken down as follows: 59 were relocated in the community without need for further assistance; 5 were placed in other programs more suited to their

needs; 17 were arrested for various reasons (charges initiated prior to PROOF entry, while at PROOF, and as parole violators); 42 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 \$1150 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.

Counseling 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 counseling. 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 who 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.

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 168 hotline calls. Of these, 108 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, 215 such calls were received, recorded, and passed on to the districts.

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 and facility were visited by a group of parents whose children were TSB-Skillman inmates along with Dr. Miller, who was conducting a discussion group among them. Also visiting the facility were Mr. Richard Stuart of the New Jersey Coalition for Penal Reform, Ms. Clair McCarthy of the New Jersey Legislature County and Municipal Government Study Commission, and by Mr. Albert Axlerod, Superintendent of Highfields, who was escorting a Japanese probation officer, Toro Yomaguchi, on a tour of residential facilities in New Jersey.

PROOF residents were again recipients of special Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners through the generosity of the "Meals on Wheels" program. Residents also participated in the W.O.R. Christmas Gift program wherein wrapped presents were distributed to neighborhood children.

VOLUNTEERS IN PAROLE PROGRAM

Fiscal year 1977 proved to be an innovative one for the Volunteers in Parole Program. Not only did the Program grow in size by the entry of more volunteers, but innovative plans for the future were initiated by the staff. Again, VIPP volunteers provided substantial assistance not only to a large number of individual parolees, but became more increasingly aware of the problems inherent in the criminal justice system.

(1) Assistance to Parolees. During fiscal year 1977 the Program maintained a mean average of 303 volunteers available at any time for assignment. This figure represents a decline of approximately 24 volunteers from fiscal year 1976 as the staff of VIPP conducted an ongoing audit of all available volunteers and eliminated individuals who were no longer willing to participate in the Program. Of this group, 93 were new participants who joined during the year. As some volunteers were withdrawing on their own initiative, new volunteers were joining, so that the total number active at any one time increased only gradually. Most of the volunteers joining the Program were attorneys; however, an increasing number of non-attorneys are presently joining VIPP.

The volunteers assisted a total number of 246 parolees during the year, an increase of 16 over the number assisted in fiscal year 1976. 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.

The monthly statistics compiled during fiscal year 1977 show a steady climb in the number of volunteers participating in the Program. This climb was not as large as in previous years because of our audit; however, we had at the end of fiscal year 1977 307 "aides available" as contrasted to 291 "aides available" at the end of fiscal year 1976. The total number of "aides assigned" at the end of fiscal year 1977 was slightly lower (138) than in fiscal year 1976 (148). This was due in part to the resignation of the Staff Director, Dick Pilch, on May 6, 1977. The Parole Coordinator, C. Eamon Walsh, assumed Mr. Pilch's duties as Staff Director and the position of Parole Coordinator was left unoccupied, pending assignment. The Parole Coordinator selects the cases for participation in the Program. The total number of volunteers agreeing to supervise specific inmates ("cases pending assignment") declined slightly because of the above-mentioned developments in the Program.

| | <u>Aides Available</u> | <u>Aides Assigned</u> | <u>Cases Pending Assignment</u> |
|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| June 30, 1976 | 291 | 148 | 45 |
| June 30, 1977 | 307 | 138 | 37 |

(2) Volunteer of the Year. In fiscal year 1975 the staff of VIPP began the practice of honoring one participant in the Program each year as the "Volunteer of the Year". 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.

On November 24, 1976, Thomas Hayes Morgan, a Moorestown attorney working in the District Office #7 area, was given the honor because of his conscientious and dedicated work over a long period of time (early 1972 to present). Mr. Morgan presented intensive assistance to two different parolees, one of whom he is still working with. Both parolees' conduct improved significantly as a result of Mr. Morgan's efforts.

Mr. Morgan was given a scroll honoring him at a meeting of the Camden County Bar Association on November 4, 1976. Dick Pilch, Staff Director, and Judge Arthur J. Simpson, Jr., Acting Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Trenton, New Jersey, presented the award to Mr. Morgan. Featured articles about Mr. Morgan's activities appeared in all the local media.

(3) State Parole Board Requirements of VIPP Participants as a Special Condition of Parole. During fiscal year 1977 the State Parole Board, as in the previous years, required certain inmates to agree to participation in VIPP as a special condition of parole. The concept of the Program as being "a court

of last resort" still prevailed and the number of clients referred to us were for the most part individuals having little chance of success on parole. Referrals during the latter part of fiscal year 1977 included inmates with better chances of success, we are happy to report. The VIPP staff continues to adopt a cooperative approach to the cases referred. The majority of these "condition cases" not only report regularly to a State Parole Officer, but to a volunteer ("dual supervision"). This policy was deemed necessary to provide adequate supervision for the more difficult cases selected.

The VIPP staff has been monitoring these match-ups and finds that the success rate of the "condition cases" is not significantly smaller than the success rate of cases selected by VIPP staff. There seems to be some merit in forcing certain kinds of clients to enter the Program as a special condition of their parole. The staff of VIPP is continuing to open the lines of communication between VIPP staff and the State Parole Board to better facilitate these referrals.

(4) Orientation of Inmates. During fiscal year 1977 the Parole Coordinator continued to conduct weekly orientation programs for inmates being admitted to Yardville and Bordentown. The program is presented to the new inmates and the procedure of entering the program is outlined by the Coordinator. The staff of the Education Department at Bordentown videotaped the presentation by the Coordinator so that the need to present this orientation at Bordentown has been largely eliminated. This videotaping proved extremely valuable after Dick Pilch resigned as Staff Director of the Program and Mr. Walsh assumed total responsibilities. The Staff Director continues to present orientation at Yardville as his time allows.

(5) Other Activities. The staff of VIPP has designed a Newsletter which will be published during the latter part of 1977. The need for this Newsletter was apparent after a questionnaire was distributed in June of 1977 to all volunteers in the Program. Many volunteers expressed a feeling of isolation and were anxious to know of developments in the Program and the activities of volunteers in other parts of the State.

The Staff Director continues his activities in the areas of recruitment, training, matching, and evaluating the Program. Mr. Theodore VanWinkle, a judge from Rutherford, New Jersey, routinely visits local Lions Club chapters throughout the State and presents specific cases anonymously to the local chapters. As a result, 22 different assignments have been made to various Lions Club members throughout the State. The Staff Director assists Judge VanWinkle in his presentations to the Lions Club.

Because of Mr. Pilch's resignation from the Program, the time devoted to selection of appropriate cases at the various institutions by the Staff Director has declined. This has not resulted, however, in less cases being offered to our volunteers as with the increasing popularity of the Program throughout the State, more time is being spent screening the various inmate-applicants attempting to join the Program. In addition to this, the professional staff at Yardville, Bordentown, Wharton Tract, and the Bordentown Unit at Skillman has been referring individual cases of merit to the Staff Director. A recent study conducted by staff shows that these referrals by institution staff prove to be highly successful match-ups.

The Staff Director has been paying special attention during fiscal year 1977 to the members of the PIE Group at Yardville and PIE II Group at Jamesburg. Other studies recently completed show that members of these two groups also contributed most of the successful candidates in VIPP.

Plans are also being made to employ volunteers living in "suburbia" in the Program. In that most of the parolees leaving institutions reside in the large metropolitan cities throughout N. J., very few referrals have been given to volunteers in the suburbs. The Staff Director has conferred with the Chief of the Bureau about the feasibility of using these suburban volunteers to perform specific tasks for individual clients. A questionnaire was distributed again to all volunteers throughout the State asking if they would be willing to provide a service, i.e., a job, personal bankruptcy, etc., rather than engage in one-to-one supervision. The results of this survey show that many suburban volunteers, lacking engagement in one-to-one supervision of a case, would be willing to perform a specific service. The staff of Community Resource Specialists and Parole Vocational Service Centers would be employed to screen clients needing specific services and would also be used to transfer the client from the city to the suburban offices of the volunteer.

S.L.E.P.A. GRANT PROJECTS

Community Resources Specialist Project. The project was implemented on July 1, 1975 with a SLEPA grant. The activities being reported presently took place during the second year of operation (July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977).

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 in the previous paragraph, the project is also intended to assist the client with immediate and long-range assistance in the form of employment, educational and vocational counseling 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 Resources 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 purchase 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 Resources Specialist and the Parole Officer.

Twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) 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 Resources Specialist and the Parole Officer exercise a reasonable screening process in selecting clients for training.

The following is a breakdown of presenting problems and problems resolved by the nine district offices and PROOF:

| | <u>PRESENTING PROBLEMS</u> | <u>SERVICES RENDERED</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Employment | 631 | 185 |
| Financial | 541 | 342 |
| Food | 190 | 173 |
| Housing | 301 | 187 |
| Medical | 82 | 32 |
| Dental | 17 | 4 |
| Mental Health | 79 | 32 |
| Educational | 165 | 59 |
| Vocational | 169 | 37 |
| Substance Abuse | 88 | 61 |
| Other | 420 | 299 |
| Placement Cases | 110 | 86 |
| Transportation | <u>300</u> | <u>297</u> |
| Total | 3093 | 1794 |

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

| <u>D.O.</u> | <u>Amount Spent</u> | <u>No. Mini-Grants</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | \$1000.01 | 64 |
| 2 | 1004.00 | 86 |
| 3 | 1000.00 | 87 |
| 4 | 1003.50 | 73 |
| 5 | 927.00 | 46 |
| 6 | 1003.50 | 43 |
| 7 | 971.64 | 44 |
| 8 | 995.47 | 45 |
| 9 | 998.00 | 44 |
| PROOF | <u>901.15</u> | <u>44</u> |
| Total | \$9804.27 | 576 |

The following figures represent funds spent for purchase of Services (via Form 100), together with the number of grants made by each district office:

| <u>D.O.</u> | <u>Amount Spent</u> | <u>No. Mini-Grants</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | \$ 49.50 | 2 |
| 2 | 387.09 | 19* |
| 3 | 78.35 | 1 |
| 4 | 313.94 | 8 |
| 5 | 102.39 | 3 |
| 6 | 50.00 | 1 |
| 7 | 87.00 | 1 |
| 8 | 337.74 | 7 |
| 9 | 159.30 | 3 |
| PROOF | <u>184.93</u> | <u>5</u> |
| Total | \$1750.24 | 50 |

*Many purchases of services were endeavored without the expenditure of funds.

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>D.O.</u> | <u>Amount Spent</u> | <u>No. Mini-Grants</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | \$1568.00 | 2 |
| 2 | 6785.30 | 11 |
| 3 | 1014.88 | 8 |
| 4 | 790.20 | 6 |
| 5 | 669.00 | 2 |
| 6 | -- | -- |
| 7 | 1574.00 | 4 |
| 8 | -- | -- |
| 9 | -- | -- |
| PROOF | <u>250.00</u> | <u>1</u> |
| Total | \$12683.38 | 34 |

The efficacy of this project has been confirmed by the Bureau in that five Senior Parole Officer positions (Community Resources Specialists) have been assumed by the State.

The New Jersey Correctional Master Plan which was released states on pages 112 and 114 that: "The Community Resources Specialist effort should be expanded particularly in the urban regions of the State."

Parole Vocational Service Center Project. This project was appropriated by a SLEPA grant to begin on November 24, 1976. However, due to delays in authorization to hire staff, the three Unit Managers did not start working until February, 1977. The Vocational Specialist client staff was not hired until June, 1977. In consideration of these circumstances beyond our control, LEAA allowed us to extend the project from its termination date of June 30, 1977 until December 31, 1977. In addition, the project has been funded for a third calendar year (this means that the project will be operational until December 31, 1978).

The purpose of this project is to provide a meaningful, long-term employment following evaluation, individual training and treatment for parole clients, subsequent to meeting their immediate needs.

The location of the project is presently operational in three of the nine district offices, those being District Office #6, Trenton (Burlington, Hunterdon, and Mercer Counties), District Office #7, Camden (Camden, Gloucester, and Salem Counties), and District Office #9, Newark (the city of Newark).

In reference to personnel, this project will not be fully staffed until November 7, 1977. At that time, the final Vocational Specialist vacancy in the Camden office will be filled.

and Training, etc., it was determined that at the end of June, 1977, 3,191 parolees had been accepted in one of the CETA programs. This represents a decrease in acceptances of 873 cases (22 percent) 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 106 reviews were completed, resulting in 16 (18 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 resulting in a higher percent of unsatisfactory ratings, possibly indicating a more critical review process.

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 | 1205 |
| b. Hearing waived and hearing held | 212 |
| c. No response from parolee and hearing held | 528 |
| d. Hearing waived and no hearing held | 214 |
| e. Probable Cause found and formal revocation hearing to follow | 1612 |
| f. Continuation on parole recommended although valid violations determined | 412 |
| g. Continuation on parole--no valid violations determined | 87 |
| h. Other | 48 |
| Total hearings scheduled (columns a+b+c+d) | 2159 |
| Probable Cause found (column e) | 1612 (74.6%) |

Compared to last year, there were 238 less hearings scheduled and 156 less cases of Probable Cause found.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public relations continue to become a more important function of each member 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).

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:

Comprehensive Employment Training Act representatives
 Tri-State Criminal Investigators Association
 National Alliance of Businessmen
 South Jersey Investigators Association
 Newark Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
 Essex County Association of Ex-Offenders
 New Jersey Bar Association
 South Jersey Health Systems Agency
 Project Resource Recycling Organization, Newark
 Garden State School District
 Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Association
 Various college and high school classes and career development programs
 Bridgeton High School Study Team
 Criminal Justice Committee of Hudson County

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE ACTIVITIES

The institutional parole offices located at the various penal and correctional institutions and training schools are vital links between the institutions and field office staffs. During the past year, several posts in the institutional parole offices saw changes in personnel in compliance with the Bureau policy that these positions are subject to rotation for the welfare of the Bureau as well as for the experience and growth of its members. The statistics listed below reflect major activities of the institutional parole office staff.

| | <u>Preparole</u> | <u>Inmate</u> | <u>Released</u> | <u>Parole</u> |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|
| | <u>Interviews</u> | <u>Requested</u> | <u>On Parole</u> | <u>Classes</u> |
| | | <u>Interviews</u> | | |
| NJSP | 3160 | 1915 | 758 | 362 |
| YRCC | 1506 | 2044 | 673 | 86 |
| YCIB | 1411 | 1757 | 991 | 141 |
| YCIA | 1018 | 586 | 775 | 28 |
| TSB-J) | 338 | 251 | 139 | 18 |
| TSG-J) | | | | |
| CIW | <u>313</u> | <u>1003</u> | <u>164</u> | <u>73</u> |
| Totals | <u>7746</u> | <u>7556</u> | <u>3500</u> | <u>688</u> |

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.

The following totals provide a monthly account of activity within the furlough program with regard to field investigations and supervision:

| <u>Month/Year</u> | <u>Field Office Data</u> | | | <u>Institutional Data</u> | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| | <u>Escorted</u> | <u>Unescorted</u> | <u>Follow-ups</u> | <u>No. of Inmates</u> | <u>No. of Furloughs</u> |
| July 1976 | 27 | 18 | 22 | 56 | 61 |
| Aug. 1976 | 23 | 18 | 24 | 88 | 106 |
| Sept. 1976 | 26 | 21 | 54 | 116 | 140 |
| Oct. 1976 | 28 | 19 | 37 | 82 | 99 |
| Nov. 1976 | 34 | 15 | 30 | 111 | 144 |
| Dec. 1976 | 32 | 21 | 47 | 98 | 123 |
| Jan. 1977 | 32 | 20 | 46 | 77 | 99 |
| Feb. 1977 | 31 | 18 | 45 | 77 | 104 |
| Mar. 1977 | 45 | 14 | 52 | 76 | 77 |
| Apr. 1977 | 28 | 20 | 25 | 82 | 85 |
| May 1977 | 18 | 59 | 62 | 73 | 92 |
| June 1977 | <u>31</u> | <u>80</u> | <u>71</u> | <u>117</u> | <u>149</u> |
| TOTALS | 355 | 323 | 515 | 1053 | 1279 |

With restructuring of the work/study release programs in the coming fiscal year, it is anticipated that the activities of the district coordinators will increase proportionally to the work load.

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

On June 30, 1977, the Bureau of Parole was responsible for the supervision of 7,655 cases in New Jersey, 520 cases in other states, and 132 cases in the Central Office Special File for a grand total of 8,307 cases (an increase of 126 cases or 1.5 percent more than the previous year).

However, the total number of parolees supervised during the fiscal year 1977 decreased from 12,421 (last year) to 12,330 for a loss of 91 cases or less than 1 percent of the total caseload. Overall, this was the smallest change in year to year caseload on record.

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 year 1977. During 1976-77, 3,878 cases were added, making a total of 11,440 cases supervised throughout the year.

New Jersey Cases Being Supervised in Other States. In the fiscal year 1976-77, 241 cases were added to and 202 cases removed from the 481 cases being supervised in other states, resulting in a net gain of 39 cases. At the close of the year there were 520 parolees from New Jersey under supervision in other states, or 8.1 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 138 cases in the Central Office Special File at the beginning of the fiscal year 1976-77. An additional 30 cases were handled throughout the year and 36 were removed, resulting in a total decrease of 4.3 percent from the previous year. As of June 30, 1977, there were 132 cases remaining in this category of which 61 (46.2 percent) were missing cases.

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

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during 1976-77 fiscal year decreased 0.8 percent in relation to the total caseload (11.8 percent as compared to 12.6 percent in 1975-76).

The amount returned by court commitments in 1976-77 remained essentially unchanged from the previous 1976 record low of 4.2 to 4.3 percent, whereas the percentage returned by the paroling authority decreased significantly from 8.4 to 7.5 percent.

During the last five years, court commitments ranged from a high of 6.5 percent in 1973 to a low of 4.2 percent in 1976. As a result, the combined total returns decreased from 12.6 percent in 1976 to 11.5 percent 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 10.8 percent, reversing the increasing upward trend which peaked out last year at the historical high of 11.4 percent. Numerically, there was only a 3.6 percent drop in the total number of cases recorded as missing (whereabouts unknown) at the close of the fiscal year (934 in 1976 vs. 900 in 1977); attributable, in part, to the disproportionate number of cases that became missing between July 1, 1976 and June 30, 1977 (68 cases less than the previous year) in relation to the number accounted for within the same year (34 cases).

Parolees from the Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown, and the Psychiatric Hospitals - sex offenders accounted for the largest percentage of missing cases (14.3 percent each) in relation to respective caseloads, followed by the Corrections Institution for Women, Clinton (13.2 percent). In descending order, the other institutions show the following: State Prison (11.7 percent); Youth Reception and Correction Center, Yardville (10.8 percent); Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale (8.4 percent); Training School for Boys, Jamesburg (7.6 percent). For the first time, there were no missing parolees from the Training School for Girls.

SUPERVISION (See table #4)

In the performance of their assignment in 1976-77 parole officers made 284,184 supervisory contacts and 15,961 investigatory contacts. This was a 4.3 percent decrease from the total number of contacts made in the previous year. On

the basis of the number of field parole officers (118) in service, these figures show that the average number of contacts made by each parole officer increased from 2,425 to 2,543 contacts.

Included in the total figure of contacts from 1976-77, there were 52,201 home visits (compared to 58,532 last year); 74,246 community contacts, other than employment or school (84,433 last year); 3,747 employment visits (4,451 last year); and 471 school visits (534 last year).

The efforts of the parole officers resulted in the submission of 55,400 written reports, including 46,569 supervision reports and 7,831 investigation reports as contrasted to 55,315 total reports, 48,133 supervision reports and 7,182 investigation reports in 1975-76.

The districts reported travelling 739,220 miles in the performance of their duties as compared to 794,940 miles in 1975-76.

TABLE #1

TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - 1976 - 1977 (By Institutions)

| | IN NEW JERSEY | | | | IN OTHER STATES | | | | CENTRAL OFFICE SPECIAL FILE | | | | TOTAL UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/77 |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/76 | TOTAL CASES ADDED | TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1976-1977 | UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/77 | UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/76 | TOTAL CASES ADDED | TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1976-1977 | UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/77 | UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/76 | TOTAL CASES ADDED | TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1976-1977 | UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/77 | |
| Training School for Girls | 17 | 6 | 23 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Correctional Institution for Women | 309 | 137 | 446 | 281 | 18 | 9 | 27 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 303 |
| Training School for Boys, Jamesburg | 193 | 137 | 330 | 206 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 211 |
| Youth Correctional Institution Complex | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Annandale | 1,542 | 917 | 2,459 | 1,668 | 46 | 31 | 77 | 55 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 1,732 |
| Bordentown | 1,770 | 911 | 2,681 | 1,836 | 122 | 56 | 178 | 127 | 28 | 7 | 35 | 27 | 1,990 |
| Youth Reception & Correction Ctr. | 1,315 | 711 | 2,026 | 1,345 | 102 | 58 | 160 | 109 | 25 | 9 | 34 | 30 | 1,484 |
| State Prison | 1,943 | 795 | 2,738 | 1,831 | 186 | 82 | 268 | 203 | 68 | 12 | 80 | 59 | 2,093 |
| Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders) | 35 | 1 | 36 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Out-Of-State Cases in New Jersey | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 20 | 10 | 30 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Male | 418 | 253 | 671 | 428 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 428 |
| TOTAL | 7,562 | 3,878 | 11,440 | 7,655 | 481 | 241 | 722 | 520 | 138 | 30 | 168 | 132 | 8,307 |
| Under Supervision 7/1/76 | 7,562 | | | | 481 | | | | 138 | | | | 8,181 |
| Total Cases Added | | 3,878 | | | | 241 | | | | 30 | | | 4,149 |
| Total No. Supervised 1976-1977 | | | 11,440 | | | | 722 | | | | 168 | | 12,330 |
| Under Supervision 6/30/77 | | | | 7,655 | | | | 520 | | | | 132 | 8,307 |

TABLE #1A

NUMBER OF PAROLEES SUPERVISED
5 Year Comparison - (1973 - 1977)

| 1972 - 1973 | 1973 - 1974 | 1974 - 1975 | 1975 - 1976 | 1976 - 1977 |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 12,852 | 13,609 | 13,061 | 12,421 | 12,330 |
| +10.0% | +5.8% | -4.0% | -4.9% | -0.7% |
| -4.1% | | | | |

TABLE #2

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS

BY DISTRICT AND SEX

Based on Total Number Supervised

1976 - 1977

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 | 1,472 | 118 | 8.0% | 53 | 3.6% | 171 | 11.6% |
| 2. East Orange | 1,280 | 51 | 4.0% | 73 | 5.7% | 124 | 9.7% |
| 3. Red Bank | 1,566 | 75 | 4.8% | 117 | 7.5% | 192 | 12.3% |
| 4. Jersey City | 1,403 | 49 | 3.5% | 187 | 13.3% | 236 | 16.8% |
| 5. Elizabeth | 1,070 | 54 | 5.0% | 122 | 11.4% | 176 | 16.4% |
| 6. Trenton | 1,054 | 37 | 3.5% | 101 | 9.6% | 138 | 13.1% |
| 7. Camden | 1,115 | 52 | 4.7% | 101 | 9.0% | 153 | 13.7% |
| 8. Atlantic City | 842 | 33 | 3.9% | 79 | 9.4% | 112 | 13.3% |
| 9. Newark | 1,292 | 55 | 4.3% | 60 | 4.6% | 115 | 8.9% |
| 10. In Other States | 694 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1.6% | 11 | 1.6% |
| 11. Central Office (Special File) | 160 | 1 | 0.6% | 7 | 4.4% | 8 | 5.0% |
| TOTAL MALE | 11,948 | 525 | 4.4% | 911 | 7.6% | 1,436 | 12.0% |

Female

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1. Clifton | 80 | 4 | 0.5% | 4 | 0.5% | 8 | 1.0% |
| 2. East Orange | 62 | 1 | 1.6% | 4 | 6.5% | 5 | 8.1% |
| 3. Red Bank | 78 | 1 | 1.3% | 6 | 7.7% | 7 | 9.0% |
| 4. Jersey City | 25 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8.0% | 2 | 8.0% |
| 5. Elizabeth | 60 | 1 | 1.6% | 4 | 6.7% | 5 | 8.3% |
| 6. Trenton | 75 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.3% | 1 | 1.3% |
| 7. Camden | 38 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7.9% | 3 | 7.9% |
| 8. Atlantic City | 24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4.2% | 1 | 4.2% |
| 9. Newark | 85 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.7% | 4 | 4.7% |
| 10. In Other States | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11. Central Office (Special File) | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL FEMALE | 563 | 7 | 1.2% | 29 | 5.2% | 36 | 6.4% |
| GRAND TOTAL | 12,511 | 532 | 4.3% | 940 | 7.5% | 1,472 | 11.8% |

*Figures include inter-office transfers of cases.

TABLE # 2A

PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED

By District
1976 - 1977

| DISTRICT OFFICE | TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED | COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED | TECHNICAL VIOLATORS | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-------|
| 1. Clifton | 1,552 | 7.9% | 3.7% | 11.6% |
| 2. East Orange | 1,342 | 3.9% | 5.7% | 9.6% |
| 3. Red Bank | 1,644 | 4.6% | 7.5% | 12.1% |
| 4. Jersey City | 1,428 | 3.4% | 13.2% | 16.6% |
| 5. Elizabeth | 1,130 | 4.9% | 11.2% | 16.1% |
| 6. Trenton | 1,129 | 3.3% | 9.0% | 12.3% |
| 7. Camden | 1,153 | 4.5% | 9.0% | 13.5% |
| 8. Atlantic City | 866 | 3.8% | 9.2% | 13.0% |
| 9. Newark | 1,377 | 4.0% | 4.6% | 8.6% |
| 10. In Other States | 722 | 0 | 1.5% | 1.5% |
| 11. Central Office (Special File) | 168 | 0.6% | 4.2% | 4.8% |
| TOTAL | 12,511 | 4.3% | 7.5% | 11.8% |

TABLE #2B

PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED

5 Year Comparison
1973 - 1977

| COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED | | | | | TECHNICAL VIOLATORS | | | | | TOTAL | | | | |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|---------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 |
| 6.5 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 7.5 | 12.6 | 13.2 | 13.5 | 12.6 | 11.8 |

TABLE #3

RECORD OF MISSING CASES

By Institution

1976 - 1977

| INSTITUTION | TOTAL ON PAROLE ON 6/30/77 | MISSING AS OF 6/30/76 | BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/76 AND 6/30/77 | TOTAL MISSING | ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/76 AND 6/30/77 | TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/77 | NET DIFFERENCE | PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/77 |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|--|
| Training School for Girls | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - 1 | 0 |
| Correctional Institution for Women | 303 | 43 | 34 | 77 | 37 | 40 | - 3 | 13.2% |
| Training School for Boys, Jamesburg | 211 | 15 | 19 | 34 | 18 | 16 | + 1 | 7.6% |
| Youth Correctional Institution Complex | | | | | | | | |
| Annandale | 1,732 | 145 | 170 | 315 | 169 | 146 | + 1 | 8.4% |
| Bordentown | 1,990 | 331 | 190 | 521 | 237 | 284 | - 47 | 14.3% |
| Youth Reception & Correction Ctr. | 1,484 | 156 | 162 | 318 | 158 | 160 | + 4 | 10.8% |
| State Prison | 2,093 | 236 | 105 | 341 | 97 | 244 | + 8 | 11.7% |
| Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders) | 35 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 14.3% |
| Out-of-State | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Male | 428 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 13 | 5 | + 3 | 1.2% |
| TOTAL | 8,307 | 934 | 696 | 1,630 | 730 | 900 | -34 | 10.8% |

TABLE #3A
RECORD OF MISSING CASES
By District
1976 - 1977

| DISTRICT | CASELOAD ON 6/30/77 | MISSING AS OF 6/30/76 | BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/76 AND 6/30/77 | TOTAL MISSING | ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/76 AND 6/30/77 | TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/77 | NET DIFFERENCE | PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/77 |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 1. Clifton | 1,045 | 117 | 123 | 240 | 112 | 128 | + 11 | 12.2% |
| 2. East Orange | 915 | 97 | 82 | 179 | 100 | 79 | - 18 | 8.6% |
| 3. Red Bank | 1,074 | 77 | 49 | 126 | 55 | 71 | - 6 | 6.6% |
| 4. Jersey City | 852 | 125 | 164 | 289 | 169 | 120 | - 5 | 14.1% |
| 5. Elizabeth | 709 | 82 | 38 | 120 | 50 | 70 | - 12 | 9.9% |
| 6. Trenton | 743 | 92 | 58 | 150 | 75 | 75 | - 17 | 10.1% |
| 7. Camden | 783 | 82 | 46 | 128 | 46 | 82 | 0 | 10.5% |
| 8. Atlantic City | 569 | 68 | 43 | 111 | 46 | 65 | - 3 | 11.4% |
| 9. Newark | 965 | 125 | 85 | 210 | 61 | 149 | + 24 | 15.4 % |
| 10. Central Office (Special File) | 132 | 69 | 8 | 77 | 16 | 61 | - 8 | 46.2% |
| 11. Central Office (N.J. Cases Out-of-State) | 520 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 8,307 | 934 | 696 | 1,630 | 730 | 900 | -34 | 10.8% |

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


| 1972-1973 | 1973-1974 | 1974-1975 | 1975-1976 | 1976-1977 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 9.1% | 10.8% | 11.3% | 11.4% | 10.8% |

STATE OF NEW JERSEY - BUREAU OF PAROLE
TABLE #4
SUMMARY DAILY RECORD OF ACTIVITIES
 Fiscal Year 1976 - 1977

| 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 | T | P | PO | R | P | N | F-19 | F-21 | AR | PP | SR | DR | OA | TR | TS | | | | |
| DO 1 | 6487 | 239 | 5574 | 1602 | 6153 | 12 | 7117 | 11075 | 14463 | 1615 | 1185 | 374 | 2556 | 3420 | - | 721 | 174 | 79 | - | 84 | 139 | 12375 | 13326 | 98096 | 2499 |
| DO 2 | 5924 | 243 | 4773 | 1813 | 5139 | 14 | 7772 | 10644 | 13339 | 1196 | 1038 | 336 | 2606 | 2270 | - | 624 | 181 | 43 | 13 | 134 | 115 | 9070 | 10051 | 37784 | 442 |
| DO 3 | 10445 | 339 | 7507 | 1553 | 9675 | 65 | 10758 | 14993 | 20270 | 1838 | 2152 | 399 | 2765 | 2594 | 109 | 735 | 265 | 59 | 8 | 147 | 177 | 11541 | 13840 | 154079 | - |
| DO 4 | 11470 | 243 | 5155 | 3151 | 7127 | 14 | 13478 | 14928 | 22950 | 2401 | 1075 | 549 | 2420 | 3747 | - | 607 | 247 | 47 | 16 | 102 | 152 | 11060 | 13266 | 58408 | 582 |
| DO 5 | 5646 | 268 | 4858 | 1520 | 5246 | 8 | 6860 | 8607 | 12492 | 835 | 1552 | 786 | 1556 | 2366 | 7 | 483 | 228 | 18 | 6 | 94 | 94 | 7947 | 8045 | 47382 | 24 |
| DO 6 | 9112 | 595 | 6636 | 1659 | 5710 | 47 | 9520 | 11230 | 19031 | 1612 | 831 | 312 | 2059 | 2432 | 2 | 533 | 149 | 36 | 26 | 105 | 95 | 8160 | 10058 | 92318 | 413 |
| DO 7 | 11398 | 535 | 5299 | 2169 | 6236 | 76 | 13271 | 10792 | 25422 | 4226 | 1715 | 307 | 1890 | 4689 | 2 | 607 | 607 | 23 | 12 | 76 | 129 | 9108 | 9851 | 90269 | 1910 |
| DO 8 | 5337 | 623 | 2912 | 687 | 6946 | 88 | 4799 | 6665 | 9081 | 1581 | 1661 | 276 | 965 | 1513 | - | 501 | 207 | 19 | 69 | 68 | 95 | 5173 | 8320 | 114541 | - |
| DO 9 | 8427 | 662 | 9487 | 1034 | 7868 | 147 | 4656 | 10742 | 18233 | 1439 | 1011 | 402 | 3215 | 3506 | 2 | 573 | 267 | 16 | 16 | 109 | 150 | 9253 | 14560 | 39491 | 982 |
| TOTAL | 74246 | 3747 | 52201 | 15188 | 60100 | 471 | 78231 | 99676 | 155281 | 16743 | 12220 | 3741 | 20032 | 26537 | 122 | 5384 | 2325 | 340 | 166 | 919 | 1146 | 83687 | 101317 | 732368 | 6852 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 284184 | | | | | | | 271700 | | | 15961 | | 46569 | | 7831 | | | 2571 | | | | 185004 | | 739220 | |

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 | | | OA - Other Agency Summary |
| H - Home Contact | PO - Positive Contact other than Parolee | | F-21 - Special Report | PP - Pre-Parole Report | TR - Transfer Summary |
| N - Visit Made - No Contact | | | | SR - Special Report | TS - Termination Summary |
| O - Office Contact | R - Case Review with or without Parolee | | | | |
| S - School Contact | | | | | |
| T - Telephone Contact (Significant) | | | | | |



END