

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 (CN 864)
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Fiscal Year July 1, 1989 - June 30, 1990

128635



Terri Howard
Assistant Commissioner

Charles Ferrando
Executive Assistant

Fred B. Holley, Chief
Bureau of Parole

Victor R. D'Ilio
Assistant Chief

128635

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

New Jersey Department of
Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

CONTENTS

Mission	Page 1
Goals and Objectives.	Page 1
Anticipated Needs and Issues.	Page 3
Major Units	Page 7
Governor's 1991 Budget Recommendations.	Page 8
Highlights.	Page 12
Developments.	Page 15
Personnel	Page 21
Caseload.	Page 22
Discharge Prior to Expiration of Maximum.	Page 23
Probable Cause Hearings	Page 23
District Parole Supervisor's Decisions.	Page 24
Ratio of Field to Office Time	Page 25
New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission Project.	Page 25
Night Visits.	Page 25
Casebook Reviews.	Page 26
Job Training and Partnership Act.	Page 26
Furlough/Home Visit/Work/Study Program.	Page 26
Institutional Parole Program.	Page 28
Team Supervision.	Page 29
Parolee Earnings (Calendar 1989).	Page 30
Training.	Page 30
Revenue Program	Page 33
Juvenile Aftercare Program.	Page 44
Intensive Surveillance/Supervision Program.	Page 44

Contents (continued)

Special Projects.	Page 46
Office of Interstate Services	Page 47
Volunteers in Parole Program.	Page 47
NCIC/SCIC Operations.	Page 49
Public Relations.	Page 49
Note.	Page 52
Caseloads	Page 52
Return to Institutions.	Page 52
Missing Cases	Page 53
Supervision	Page 53
Conclusion.	Page 53

Charts, Tables and Graphs

STATE OF THE BUREAU

Mission

As a component of the Division of Policy and Planning, Department of Corrections, the Bureau of Parole's mission is to use Bureau authority constructively in assisting persons under parole supervision to achieve self-control and self-direction within limits set by legal constraints and conditions of release.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal - To augment and support offender potential for avoidance of injury to persons and property.

Objective #1

To assure that persons being released to supervision have a physical environment which enhances prospects of a successful community adjustment.

Standards

- 1) Conduct a needs assessment on all inmates for whom a preparole investigation is being requested. These assessments shall be conducted prior to the submission of the request for preparole investigation.
- 2) All preparole planning reports shall include case plans specific to the problems identified in the needs assessment.
- 3) 90% of the inmates released to parole shall have viable plans.

Objective #2

To assist persons under supervision in obtaining employment, education, or vocational training, and in meeting other obligations.

Standards

- 1) 80% of the capable aggregate caseload assigned to the agency will be engaged in one or more of the following activities: educational, vocational or employment.
- 2) Set supervision statuses for all offenders under supervision in accordance with a Risk Assessment instrument.
- 3) Provide financial assistance to all parolees in need.
- 4) Develop objective-based case plans for all offenders under supervision.

Objective #3

To employ all appropriate community resources as alternatives to further incarceration.

Standards

- 1) Any parolee giving evidence of serious adjustment deterioration shall be referred to a treatment/rehabilitation agency within 48 hours, whenever the officer is unable to effectively abate the deterioration via individual effort.
- 2) Officer follow-up contacts with the involved agency shall continue on at least a weekly basis until the parolee's situation is resolved.
- 3) Parolee failure to adhere to treatment/readjustment efforts will be cause for the holding of a probable cause hearing with a subsequent determination as to whether ISSP/EMHC placement is a viable alternative.

Objective #4

To take effective interdicting action against persons under supervision who seriously or persistently violate the conditions of release.

Standards

- 1) Respond to all instances of parole violation using a graduated sanctions approach to supervision.
- 2) Reassess offender risk at least every six months.
- 3) The number of parolees on whom the revocation process is initiated, absent new criminal charges, will be 70% of the total number facing revocation.
- 4) To investigate, locate and apprehend 10% of offenders who are missing from supervision.

Objective #5

To maintain and improve effective and efficient agency operations.

Standards

- 1) All new professional staff successfully complete a department-approved training course within three months of their starting date.
- 2) All existing professional staff shall be provided with a minimum of forty hours per year of parole-related training.
- 3) All PAR performance standards shall be quantifiable (i.e., measurable).
- 4) Develop and implement a management information system which will indicate agency accomplishments vis-a-vis agency mission, goals and objectives.

ANTICIPATED NEEDS AND ISSUES

Responsibilities created by statute and administrative code along with expanding Bureau responsibilities in correctional field services continue to require maximum use of available resources. The situation has become particularly acute as a result of the status of the state's fiscal crisis which has disallowed any increased resources for the coming fiscal year.

During the past several years, funding for increased supervision has traditionally allowed for staffing patterns of individual caseloads with a ratio of 73 parolees per parole officer. As a result of the lack of any additional allocations for the coming fiscal year it is anticipated that the ratio at the beginning of the period will increase to 1:81 and by the end of the fiscal year, perhaps as high as 1:90. In many instances, special conditions mandate that cases be maintained on intensive supervision. Other special conditions require other agency referrals and monitoring to assure compliance. Parole officer ancillary duties include field investigations, revenue collections, participation in the administration of the Furlough/Work Release Program, provision of institutional parole services to each of the county correctional facilities and certain specialized programs. Present experimentation may lead to long term modification of the traditional caseload concept.

The Bureau has begun administering an Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program which is anticipated to have an impact on the Departmental bed space problem. Funding for the initial phase of the program provided for sixty (60) participants, most of which were inmates with some parole violators who would have consequently required institutional bed space. Minimal resources were made available for program start up which included three senior parole officers and the necessary electronic equipment. Efforts to acquire vehicles for the staff assigned to the program were made with subsequent denial by Treasury despite the availability of funds. Hence, supervision of inmate participation in the Home Confinement Program

is being provided by the Intensive Surveillance/Supervision Program officers. With present plans for expansion, additional staff, vehicles and electronic equipment would appear to be a necessity. Initial expansion of both the Intensive Surveillance/Supervision and Home Confinement Programs was provided by the assignment of senior parole officers previously assigned to field supervision to the specialty programs. Similarly, state vehicles assigned to general field use have been commandeered for program use. Once the capacity is again reached with present resources, further expansion will require resources outside of what the Bureau now has assigned.

As a result of the denial of additional vehicles despite appropriations for the past three years, along with the assignment of those vehicles in the Bureau's fleet to specialized programs, the Bureau finds itself in need of transportation so that field officers may properly perform their responsibilities. The routine car schedule is subject to disruption by emergent needs to attend Probable Cause and Final Revocation Hearings, attend to institutional parole officer work in county jails, attend meetings and training sessions and a variety of other responsibilities which at any time may disrupt the normal car scheduling and individual vehicle allowance to any one parole officer during the course of the month. In the final analysis, beyond providing a mechanism for the parole officer to perform his field responsibilities, the vehicle is also an element of officer safety in many instances. Without sufficient automobiles, officer efficiency is reduced.

A need exists to modify a percentage of Bureau vehicles so as to allow the transportation of arrested parolees or transportation of EMHC violators with reduced risk to parole officer safety. The purchase and installation of security screens so that those in custody placed in the back seat of the vehicles cannot attack the officer in the front seat would have great bearing on officer safety during times when prisoners are being transported. Further, with the use of larger cars in the Bureau's fleet, the need to become physically involved in placing those taken into custody in the rear of the vehicle lessens. Increased types of restraints used in conjunction with the security screens to be installed on larger vehicles should be the initial steps in attempting to assure officer safety.

The use of radios may also be considered as a major step in reducing the risk of harm which might occur to a parole officer on field assignment. This equipment might also be used by supervisors to divert an officer to a point of need to complete an emergency assignment. Available to the Bureau with a major expenditure is a statewide system of communications which would allow an officer entering a dangerous area to relay to a dispatcher the time and location of entrance and the anticipated time of leaving. If the dispatcher has not been contacted within that time frame, his initiation of contact with local law enforcement can bring assistance to the scene. Similarly, certain radio equipment is provided with a push button mechanism which when activated immediately transmits a signal of the location of that radio and the officer to which it is assigned and it may be taken as an indication as an immediate need for assistance.

Modifications to statute have provided the authority for parole staff to make arrests of certain alleged parole violators. Further program design provides for the transportation of inmate home confinement violators by parole staff. However, Statute does not allow the use of weapons by parole officers. Given the great variation of physical and psychological characteristics of present staff, the need for an Apprehension/Recovery Squad attached to each office is foreseen. Specifically trained personnel meeting pre-determined physical and mental capabilities and provided with the necessary equipment and training would be responsible for the apprehension and transportation of delinquent parolees and inmates as required. The activities of this unit would free other officers for casework and reduce the risk of harm present when unarmed officers might try to make arrests of parolees. Limited or full peace officer status to at least a limited number of parole staff is seen as a necessary prerequisite in meeting the needs of such an armed apprehension unit.

Statute requires that the Parole Bureau assist the parolee in securing gainful employment, vocational training and other services in order to enhance the chances for parole success. To this extent, a community resource specialist or employment broker assigned to each office might prove beneficial. Relieved from general casework responsibilities, the specialist would assure that the parolee is job ready and become directly involved in matching employee applicant with job openings. It may be necessary to assist in securing necessary licenses, social security cards, equipment and other accoutrements of employment prior to the job placement all of which might efficiently be managed by the community resource specialist. Such specialists may also be charged with maintaining a compendium of available housing and other community services available within the district.

As increasing numbers of parolees are released with conditions requiring attendance at a variety of mental health or substance abuse counseling programs, it may be an appropriate consideration to provide for treatment specialists regionally throughout the state to provide such services on a group or individual basis at district offices. Such an experiment is presently under way in Passaic County where the Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center's Relapse Prevention Program provides psychologists to the district office to work closely with the parolees and Parole staff. If proven successful and cost efficient, the program could be expanded with limited community resources to include substance abuse counseling and other needed treatment for the clientele at the district parole office.

The Parole Revocation Process is complex with many legal ramifications. Bureau senior parole officers along with other responsibilities, act as probable cause hearing officers and are required to make determinations on presentations by parolees, prosecutor's representatives, and public defenders. Over 3,000 hearings are conducted by Bureau representatives each year. As a result, the need is seen for a special unit of probable cause hearing officers to replace the senior parole officers presently conducting the initial hearing and who must share their time in the performance of a variety of other responsibilities. Staff of the proposed Probable Cause Hearing Unit would have as their full assignment conducting Probable Cause Hearings and preparing the necessary decisions in a timely fashion. Removed from other responsibilities and provided with proper transportation,

each hearing officer might be responsible for two district offices bringing to the job expertise that only experience and specialization might develop. Statute has demanded a great exchange of information and coordination with the Office of the County Criminal Case Managers, public defenders, State Parole Board, witnesses and other interested parties, hence adequate time for the hearing officer to properly perform must be allowed. In addition, such a unit could well serve the Bureau by reviewing selected cases as a mechanism to critique supervision procedures and strengthen casework, along with conducting first level grievance and disciplinary hearings.

A Bureau legal advisor may very well train and supervise the overall performance of the proposed Probable Cause Hearing Unit. It may be conceivable in some instances, to have parole staff consult with the legal advisor on allegations of parole violations and other issues. Counsel might further represent the Bureau at either or both selected Probable Cause and/or Final Revocation Hearings. As liaison with the Office of the Attorney General, questions concerning a variety of issues might receive prompt resolution.

Almost half of the district offices now have two assistant district parole supervisors. The need to supply each district office with a second assistant district parole supervisor appears to be reasonable and appropriate. As responsibilities continue to expand and diversify, each casework supervisor must intensify his efforts to assure that the field work of his subordinates is appropriately discharged. Once the span of control exceeds six or seven employees, who are involved in a multiplicity of responsibilities and particularly in times of turn over, making appropriate decisions and evaluations becomes difficult. With the provision for two assistant district parole supervisors in each district office, certain assurances may also be made that coverage is provided by one in the absence of another.

At the present time, the Bureau is housing two district offices in an office originally negotiated for one. Since arrangements had been made for the housing of District Office No. 2 in its present facility, District Office NO. 13 has been established and additional staff, equipment and parolees have been assigned. As a result, the facility has become overcrowded and working conditions less than desirable. A free standing District Office No. 13 located in its own catchment area in the City of Newark is seen as the most practical solution to the problem.

Parolee caseload in some district offices exceeds 2,000. The establishment of an additional district office would put services closer to the point of need for both state and county parolees and offenders released at expiration of maximum sentence. The office should be located in a north eastern county in order to reduce the population and activities in several of the present district offices. As the size of the district offices are reduced, supervision of both employees and parolees can become more intensive and meaningful. Ideally, district offices should not exceed over 1,000 cases and according to the Accreditation Standards, a supervisor's span of control is ideally set at six which might be increased depending upon the experience of staff.

Payment for urine monitoring of parolees has been born through the district's health services account. For several years, funding in this account has not been adequate to meet the needs and during the second half of the fiscal years, a large transfer of accounts has been needed in order to pay for some 20,000 to 25,000 tests. Recent changes in the contract may somewhat reduce the cost of each test but the numbers needed have increased and tend to indicate the need for a separate account sufficiently funded if the urine monitoring program is to continue at its present rate. Indications are that pending legislation may require that each parolee committed on a drug related offense have his/her urine monitored periodically thereby necessitating even greater expenditures on this program.

The need for bookkeepers in each of the district offices continues to be evident not only with this bookkeeper being involved in the daily transactions attendant to the Revenue Collection Program but also to maintain the necessary accounts attendant to the Financial Aid Program, Inmate Wage accounts, where applicable, and administer the travel expense program in the districts along with petty cash reimbursements and other fiscal matters. At the same time, with the assignment of data entry machine operators to each district office, the Revenue Program could be automated, the OBCIS program could be updated and the districts could have freer access to several other programs available presently only at the Central Office.

A full time training unit would appear indicated for the professional growth of all employees. New duties, new programs, changes in pertinent statutes and administrative code, exposes staff to a variety of procedural changes which demands specific training if response is to be adequate. Professional growth of the Bureau's 450 plus employees should no longer be assured by pressing line staff into the additional duty of attempting to keep personnel conversant with law enforcement, legal and correctional state of the art. The present part-time training officer must be supplemented with adequate staff and equipment if a proper training program is to be implemented.

Finally, a small research unit may be appropriate. In making comparisons with control groups, experimental programs may be discarded or expanded depending upon the results. In the other instance, the need for modifications might be determined and reported to Bureau management for more effective program implementation. The unit could examine a variety of data concerning parolees and perhaps make determinations as to factors of crime cause and prevention.

MAJOR UNITS

Central Office

The Central Office is the Administrative Unit of the Bureau of Parole. It is staffed by the Chief, two assistant chiefs, several supervising parole officers and the coordinators of specialty programs such as revenue collection, volunteers in parole and information systems. The Institutional Parole Officer Program is administered by a supervising parole officer while others are responsible for coordinating efforts to train Bureau staff. Methods of implementation for innovative projects and means of

dealing with the resolution of problems are also the responsibility of the administrative staff. Necessary research is conducted and efforts are made toward public information and education by the Central Office staff. Overall, this particular unit is concerned with the efficiency and effectiveness of the Bureau and staff makes visits to field sites in order to remain conversant with and/or identify problems in the operational units. Audits are conducted to assure quality control and feedback elicited for use in policy making decisions.

District Offices (13)

District offices are strategically located in the areas of heaviest population concentration for particular catchment zones. Each office has a supervisor, his/her assistant, various field staff and their clerical support. From these offices come the activities attendant to the supervision of a daily average of over 20,000 parolees from New Jersey penal and correctional institutions and certain county jail cases, training schools and from out of state institutions who reside in New Jersey while completing a parole obligation. Services are also provided to inmates released at expiration of their maximum sentence. District staff also complete all those field functions attendant to Departmental Furlough/Work-Study Release and Juvenile Home Visit Programs. Revenue payments by parolees are received and processed in the district offices. Staff assigned to each district office also supervises both inmates and parolees assigned to the Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program.

Institutional Parole Program

The institutional parole office staff, housed in the fourteen major New Jersey institutions, services all penal and correctional institutions, and the training schools at Jamesburg and Skillman. Staff members conduct personal interviews with inmates to resolve problems, assist in preparation of parole plans and provide detailed prerelease instructions and counseling. Parole staff members have an additional assignment, that of providing institutional parole office services to county correctional institutions and to various community release/residential centers.

GOVERNOR'S 1991 BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is an excerpt from the Governor's budget recommendations for Fiscal 1991. Section #7010 contains the recommended appropriations for the Office of Parole and Community Programs. Care must be taken to separate the various community programs from the Bureau of Parole's budget. These centers are not part of the Bureau and are, in fact, accountable to various other divisions.

Refer to pages 9, 10 and 11 following

**10. PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
17. PAROLE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS
7010. OFFICE OF PAROLE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS**

OBJECTIVES

1. To carry out, in the community, programs of conditional release from custody, i.e. furlough, work/study release, which assist institutionalized offenders in reintegrating into the community and preventing their further involvement in the formal institutionalized correctional process.
2. To provide supervision of parolees by making available the necessary assistance, guidance and controls required for community living.
3. To provide residential/community service and treatment programs for reintegrating institutionalized offenders into the community.

PROGRAM CLASSIFICATIONS

03. **Parole.** Supervises all juvenile and adult parolees from state and county institutions and those entering New Jersey from other states. Investigates parole plans, work/study release and furlough sites. Completes executive clemency and extradition investigations for the Executive Office. Collects fines, penalties, and restitution from offenders for deposit into the General Treasury. Obtains treatment for, and provides control over, parolees. Has field offices throughout the State, and institutional parole offices in all major institutions. Provides pre-release services at institutions' satellite units and at county institutions.
04. **Community Programs.** Includes the provision, coordination and supervision of all Department community-based operations for adult inmates. Programs include half-way houses for adult male and adult female prisoners.

EVALUATION DATA

	Actual FY 1988	Actual FY 1989	Revised FY 1990	Budget Estimate FY 1991
PROGRAM DATA				
Parole				
Parolees under supervision (beginning of year)	15,380	16,080	16,985	19,500
Added to parole	8,981	9,910	10,000	10,200
Removed from parole	8,281	9,005	7,485	8,900
County cases under supervision	1,279	1,300	1,325	1,375
Positions assigned to parole supervision	207	217	240	240
Average caseload per officer (beginning of year)	1/74	1/74	1/71	1/81
Community Programs				
Average Daily Population (resident)	84	74	73	73
Community Residence Center, Jersey City	12	5		
Community Service Center, Newark	58	57	60	60
Community Service Center, Essex	14	12	13	13

10. PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
17. PAROLE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS
7010. OFFICE OF PAROLE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

	Actual FY 1988	Actual FY 1989	Revised FY 1990	Budget Estimate FY 1991
PERSONNEL DATA				
Position Data				
Budgeted Positions	404	428	451	491
Parole	362	387	410	459
Community Programs	42	41	41	32
Positions Budgeted in Lump Sum Appropriations	27	27	47	5
Authorized Positions - Federal	23	22	5	5
Total Positions	454	477	503	501

APPROPRIATIONS DATA
(thousands of dollars)

Year Ending June 30, 1989						Year Ending June 30, 1991			
Orig. & (S)Supple- mental	Reapp. & (R)Recpts.	Transfers & (E)Emer- gencies	Total Available	Expended		Prog. Class.	1990 Adjusted Approp.	Kean Admin. Request	Recom- mended
					Distribution by Program				
12,089	16	-219	11,886	11,780	Parole	03	14,633	15,173	14,489
1,575	—	156	1,731	1,731	Community Programs	04	1,779	1,374	1,374
13,664	16	-63	13,617	13,511	Total Appropriation		16,412	16,547	15,863
					Distribution by Object				
					Personal Services:				
11,035	—	429	11,464	11,361	Salaries and Wages		12,609	12,602	12,602
—	—	—	—	—	Positions Established From Lump Sum Appropriation		1,421	991	991
10	—	—	10	10	Food In Lieu of Cash		10	10	10
11,045	—	429	11,474	11,371	Total Personal Services		14,040 ^(a)	13,603	13,603
150	—	-23	127	127	Materials and Supplies		169	150	149
421	—	140	561	561	Services Other Than Personal		561	581	577
596	—	36	632	632	Maintenance and Fixed Charges		729	718	706
					Special Purpose:				
160	—	-14	146	146	Payments to Inmates				
					Discharged From Facilities	03	226	246	246
319	—	-317	2	—	Expanded Juvenile Aftercare Program	03	—	—	—
382	—	-382	—	—	Increased Parole Supervision	03	— ^(b)	667	—
250	—	-52	198	198	Parolee Electronic Monitoring Program	03	280	262	262
—	—	—	—	—	Intensive Supervision/ Surveillance Program				
					Assumption	03	— ^(c)	—	—
54	—	-5	49	49	Community Residence Center, Jersey City	04	57	—	—
181	—	—	181	181	Community Service Center, Newark	04	191	191	191
84	—	11	95	95	Community Service Center, Essex	04	89	89	89
1,430	—	-759	671	669	Total Special Purpose		843	1,455	788

**10. PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
17. PAROLE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS
7010. OFFICE OF PAROLE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS**

Year Ending June 30, 1989					Prog. Class.	Year Ending June 30, 1991		
Orig. & (S) Supple- mental	Reapp. & (R) Recpts.	Transfers & (E) Emer- gencies	Total Available	Expended		1990 Adjusted Approp.	Kean Admin. Request	Recom- mended
22	16	114	152	151	Additions, Improvements and Equipment	70	40	40
OTHER RELATED APPROPRIATIONS								
Federal Funds								
—	—	422	422	355	Parole 03	108	153	153
—	—	422	422	355	Total Federal Funds	108	153	153
All Other Funds								
—	228 56 ^R	-89	195	—	Community Programs 04	—	—	—
—	284	-89	195	—	Total All Other Funds	—	—	—
13,664	300	270	14,234	13,866	GRAND TOTAL	16,520	16,700	16,016

Notes: (a) The 1990 appropriation has been adjusted for the allocation of the salary program.
 (b) Appropriation of \$666,000 distributed to applicable operating accounts.
 (c) Appropriation of \$463,000 distributed to applicable operating accounts.

HIGHLIGHTS

The state's fiscal crisis impacted heavily upon the Bureau during the past year. Freezes on vacant positions began in December 1989 with limited relief being felt through January 1990. At that time, the freeze was lifted on most of the Bureau's professional positions and by the end of April, they were filled. The freeze continued its heaviest impact on clerical positions and measures were taken to deal with the resultant void. Although allocations had been provided for the purchase of additional vehicles for use by Bureau staff, the actual acquisition of this equipment never transpired falling victim to Treasury's Fleet Reduction Program. As the fiscal year moved midway into its final quarter, the Bureau was advised of the Department's decision not to participate in the Summer Employment Program and was forced to temporarily suspend its parolee urinalysis program as a result of fiscal constraints. Early indications pointed to further austerity. In Fiscal 1991, no additional resources were provided in the Governor's recommendations and the average caseload per parole officer was projected as being ten higher than previous years. In the Bureau's efforts to deal with the austerity, the program included dispensing with certain activities, reorganizing caseloads and relaxing certain standards.

In order to maximize limited resources, district offices have begun assigning cases in accordance with their recently promulgated formula for case supervision. Basically, the formula allows caseloads of 55 parolees under intense and regular supervision, 220 advanced and recorded status cases and an unlimited caseload size of recorded revenue cases. Should caseloads exceed the limits set forth, proportionate reduction in contacts are allowed. Traditional caseloads can be approved as justified. Essentially, the formula allows for the most concentrated supervision on those recently released but provides a return to more intensive supervision upon violation of the parole contract by those on a more advanced status. Advancement in supervision status is permitted at an accelerated rate provided there is no violation of the parole contract. Time and resource saving measures adopted by the Bureau includes the suspension of the use of the risk/needs scale allowing the placement releases to seek their own transportation to the district office, elimination in participation of correction officer training, reduction in the participation in the Furlough/Work Release Programs, the use of teleconferencing in Final Revocation Hearings and the allowance of handwritten reports in many instances.

In response to management's inquiry, the commissioner has advised that the official position of the Department of Corrections does not support the carrying of firearms by parole officers. This issue had been discussed and considered over the past several years by Bureau/Division staff. During the latter part of the year, representatives of the Office of Legislative Services telephoned seeking information on the pros and cons of arming parole officers. As a result, formal inquiry of the Departmental position on this matter was made through the chain of command and the aforementioned policy statement was received in response. With his memorandum, the commissioner reinforced his former policy statement concerning the need for approval from his office prior to appearance before the Legislature, Legislative Committee or sub-committees and before corresponding with Legislators or Legislative staff.

Upon advisement by the Departmental Accreditation Manager of the \$7,550 fee to enter the Bureau into the re-accreditation process, a decision was reached that resources were not such so as to make this expenditure during the past fiscal year. As a result, it was determined that if resources were found in the future, efforts for re-accreditation would be made at that time. In the interim, limited available monies would be spent for other significant undertakings. Since its original accreditation almost ten years ago, the Bureau has subsequently been re-accredited on two occasions, and according to the time schedule should be entered into the process during this particular time. The process is expensive and time consuming and demands agency conformity to a variety of statutes. Debate on its value has been encountered since its implementation.

Staff has responded to management's request for input into the revision of the Bureau's mission, goals and objectives. Responses provided significant support for a re-emphasis on the traditional mission of the reintegration of the offender and community protection. Further, the goals and objectives were given certain priorities as itemized by the field's responses. Additional statements were added and other were modified. Discussion continues as to the final fashioning of these statements. However, some of the goals and objectives which have been given significantly high priorities may not be implementable without statutory changes and/or considerable financial allocations.

Efforts have begun to upgrade the education and experience requirements for the Bureau's entry level professional positions. Several years back, entry level positions required a minimum of a BA degree with an MA in one of the social sciences. One year's relevant experience had been an acceptable substitute for the masters degree. In recent years, the BA degree itself has been subjected to a year for year experience substitution for the parole officer title. Trainees still require the BA degree although some exemption has been noted. In some instances, the experience substitute for the degree does not appear to be as relevant as it might. Meetings have been held with the Office of Human Resources, the Department of Personnel and the Division managers in order to investigate methods of dealing with the problem. While job specifications for parole related positions are under review, revision of the duties are also subject to amplification to reflect law enforcement functions, supervision of inmates, shift work, use of pagers, handcuffs and other duties in which have evolved as a result of recent changes in responsibilities of Bureau personnel.

A dress code for professional staff has been proposed in order to assist the Bureau in its attempts to project a professional image. That image involves the appearance and manner of the dress of staff. The minimal standards of dress for men includes shirt, ties and slacks. For women a dress, skirt/slacks and blouse are required. When not attending a formal event such as a court appearance or meetings, males may dispense with the neckties. Staff are expected to be neat and clean when they report for duty and there is a list of specific items which are not be worn while on duty. Ironically, the dress code was proposed and distributed to all units days before a Star Ledger article reported upon the disbursement of clothing allowances for non-uniform employees. There was no conscience connection between the two actions.

The Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program (EMHC) was initially implemented during the course of September 1989. The first participant was a reparaol violator who was quickly joined in the program by several preparole (inmate) participants. Immediately prior to program start up, a series of meetings were held in order to finalize various aspects of the program. For the purposes of preparole participation, the district offices have been assigned to various institutions on a regional basis. These institutions are responsible for preparole participants' medical and dental needs and are the point of initial confinement should the preparole participant seriously violate the contract. Electronically Monitored Home Confinement (EMHC) participants regardless of whether inmates or parolees are entitled to financial aid. They are also subject to the Bureau's urine monitoring program and are eligible for assistance from the Joint Connection in job placement. Successful inmate participants are paroled from the program by the parole officer and assume parolee status without further monitoring. As the year drew to a close, the program was approaching capacity. Determinations regarding its expansion were being made.

Subsequent to several months of negotiations, an accord was reached by the Bureau of Parole and the Bureau of Contract Services by which Bureau of Parole staff was relieved of doing the field work attendant to the Work Release Program involving contract half way houses. The Bureau of Contract Administration has developed its own field staff to conduct the necessary investigations and followups. Procedure was approved by the Department and accepted by the contracting agency thereby allowing implementation. Bureau staff continues work release matters involving major correctional facilities along with continued field involvement in the Furlough Program. However, Bureau involvement in the Furlough Program was previously reduced when the call-in requirement was eliminated as a result of PROOF's closure.

The Bureau's participation in the NCIC was audited during the fiscal year. Subsequent to an introductory meeting, auditors spent considerable time reviewing the Bureau's entries and back up material along with procedures used for program participation. Subsequent to the audit, the Bureau again was found to be a low liability risk although certain records had to be modified to come into compliance with current NCIC practices. Interestingly enough, those cases in need of modification had originally been entered by State Police operators prior to the Bureau's activity in direct data entry. The system has become more precise during the course of the years and the Bureau has absorbed this additional responsibility without additional personnel. However, this is the second time over the past four years that the Bureau has been so audited and has been classified on each occasion as a low risk despite the multiple entries and procedures required.

Initial efforts have begun toward the implementation of a pilot project whereby treatment specialists would visit certain district offices to provide therapy to sex offenders in accordance with requirements of their release. Therapists assigned to Avenel visit the district offices in order to conduct necessary treatment sessions. Initial efforts are concentrated in the Passaic County area. District Office No. 12 is the site of the sessions for parolees assigned to both District Offices Nos. 1 and 12 under the pilot project. The initial sessions in the program began during the month of May after preliminary discussion and it is anticipated that beyond

individual and group counseling with the client, therapists will maintain close liaison with the parole officers in order to facilitate necessary information sharing.

Bureau management and administrative staff continue to meet with counterparts of the Joint Connection. In their latest meeting, program officials reported that during the previous fiscal year (1989), they received 811 parolee referrals, made 718 assessments which resulted in 644 job placements. The Joint Connection provides services to parolees assigned to District Office Nos. 2, 7, and 9 and will accept referrals reporting to their offices from District Office No. 5. During the course of the last meeting, they have agreed to process inmates participating in the Electronically Monitored Home Confinement (EMHC) Program. The Joint Connection Parolee Employment Assistance Project contracts with the Department of Corrections for assisting certain inmates in halfway houses and parolees in employment placement. The Joint Connection also contracts with the Department to provide transportation services for the visits of inmates' families.

Bureau staff has been directed by management that in accordance with the deputy compact administrator's perspective, Bureau personnel cannot initiate any case related telephone contacts with out-of-state criminal justice agencies. Further, should out-of-state criminal justice agencies initiate case related telephone contacts, the response of Bureau personnel must be limited to referring callers to the Office of Interstate Services. The aforementioned restrictions upon contacts do not encompass any of the numerous agencies or individuals dealing with welfare, mental hygiene, drug abuse problems, etc. The districts have reported some difficulty with this system particularly with the element of not being able to provide callers with information available directly to them but rather having to redirect them to the Office of Interstate Services.

Several years back, the Attorney General's Office rendered an opinion as a result of the Bureau's request that Bureau staff had no obligation to disclose the identity of a parolee afflicted with AIDS. Such a policy seems to be prevalent throughout the state and recent Legislation appears to further protect the privacy of the AIDS victim while still collecting a variety of data. As a result of situations posed by staff, management has sought a legal opinion as to whether or not disclosure might be accomplished subsequent to the parolee's signature on a waiver. Some form of this procedure is utilized by surrounding states. It would appear that such a procedure would have limited impact taking into consideration that should a parolee be willing to sign a waiver for the parole officer to disclose his/her affliction, there might be little reason why he himself would not disclose to those he might place in danger. Exceptions might be in those third party situations such as laboratory handling of the urine of AIDS victims.

DEVELOPMENTS

Bureau management and several administrators met with representatives of the Developmentally Disabled Offenders Project who have contracted with the Department of Corrections to provide certain services to staff. As a result, project representatives have continued throughout the year to make

presentations as required to each of the Bureau's district offices' staff at their regularly scheduled staff meetings. The planned phase one includes an orientation to the project and identification of clients. Contract services and referrals are defined. After each district has been visited, a second is planned to present phase two. This will include identification of community resources and services as well as sensitivity training. Separate presentations are anticipated at Institutional Parole Office meetings. A total presentation is anticipated to provide approximately four hours of training and has already begun.

The correction officers' orientation to field services, as previously provided by district personnel, was curtailed during the year as a result of the large number of trainees and the increasing responsibilities of restricted numbers of field staff. As a result, speakers have been made available for classroom presentations during each cycle of correction officers' training at the Academy. In an exchange of correspondence between Bureau management and that of the Training Academy, there was a wish expressed that sometime in the future, when adequate resources again become available, that the program might be re-initiated. Toward the end of the interagency involvement, problems had arisen concerning the numbers of correction officers being assigned to each district, the attire of some of the trainees and the punctuality of others. However, there was a positive side expressed to the assignment of correction officers to field staff. In those instances where custody had to be taken or visits made to dangerous areas, the accompaniment of correction staff was seen by some as beneficial.

The Bureau's training officer, along with Intensive Surveillance/Supervision/Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program staff in cooperation with the training staff at Mountainview Youth Correctional Facility have prepared a video tape for use as an orientation to the Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program. The planned use of the tape is for viewing by inmates who may have interest in the program and want to learn more about it. Concomitant with the showing of the tape will be a question and answer session so that once the orientation is completed few questions should remain concerning the program by potential participants. Initial presentation of the tape was scheduled to be given to those inmates at Mountainview Youth Correctional Facility. In the event of program expansion, the tape is to be made available upon indications of need. The Bureau has expressed its appreciation to Mountainview staff for the efforts and expertise they have lent to the project.

The use of teleconferencing of parole officer testimony at Final Revocation Hearings for inmates at Bayside State Prison began as an experiment several years back as a result of a suggestion made by a Bureau employee. At the onset, the program only involved those parole officers who might travel to District Office No. 2 in order to participate. Through the years, it was expanded to allow any parole officer throughout the state to teleconference his/her testimony in such instances where the inmate was confined at Bayside State Prison by use of the telephone on the officer's desk. Presently, the procedure is being implemented at Bayside State Prison alone where the Bureau has had the necessary equipment installed several years back. With additional funding and the cooperation of the Division of Adult Institutions, the program can be expanded. However, adequate resources as

requested were not available during the previous year. The employee who made the original suggestion has received an initial monetary award and it is anticipated that it will be supplemented as teleconferencing of testimony expands. Further, other suggestions have been raised that the use of teleconferencing might eventually be considered at both disciplinary and grievance hearings among other uses. The continual threat of a suit remains to be the largest problem yet to be overcome in the procedure. The public defender has promised to take the "right" case to court which will involve a parolee who has demanded an in-persona hearing but was provided with only teleconferenced testimony.

The Office of the Public Defender has further advised that it will appeal a ruling by the State Parole Board that the same probable cause hearing officer who is involved in adult cases may be involved with juvenile cases. The Departmental Special Assistant for Legal Affairs was inclined to agree with the Parole Board ruling on this matter when the issues first arose. The public defender, however, is not satisfied and has raised objections in other matters subsequent to the decision where the same probable cause hearing officer involved in adult cases heard a juvenile matter. It is the public defender's contention that Title 30 of the Administrative Code requires separate hearing officers. The public defender has stated his intention to appeal this decision. However, the forum that the appeal will take is not known.

The Bureau continues to await the full impact of the Superior Court decision in the matter of Traylor v. the New Jersey Bureau of Parole. The case concerned itself with the matter of confrontation and cross examination of witnesses at Probable Cause Hearings. The determination was that a police report in and of itself was not adequate to sustain a finding of probable cause that a parolee failed to obey the law. The decision went on to direct that the police report must be further supplemented by independent evidence which might include an indictment or an admission. Absent such independent evidence, witnesses must be provided for confrontation and cross examination. Further expansion of this decision provides that witnesses with first-hand knowledge of the offense must be available at the time of the hearing. Additional clarification on this ruling is being sought relative to matters of instances where circumstances disallow the physical presence of witnesses at hearings and whether or not documents supporting other allegations are admissible without independent evidence or available witnesses. Upon the advice of the Departmental Special Assistant for Legal Affairs, management has requested an informal opinion from the Office of the Attorney General. Such an opinion has been requested of the deputy attorney general that represented the Bureau in the above referenced matter. As the year drew to a close, the requested clarification continues to be awaited.

Bureau management met with Governor's Counsel and representatives of the Parole Board concerning certain procedures dealing with executive clemency. An earlier review of the statute concerning the release and supervision of persons granted executive clemency raised several questions which had previously been referred to both Departmental counsel and counsel for the Parole Board. As a result, the need to clarify certain matters was the topic of the aforementioned meeting. Although it was ascertained that the warrant developed by Bureau of Parole personnel was appropriate for the

apprehension and detention of violators, matters dealing with the certificate of release, rules of supervision and due process of violators were determined to require more specificity. During the course of the year, a certificate of pardon release and rules of supervision were developed and closely approximate the parole certificate and rules of parole supervision. The matter of due process continues under review.

As a result of Bureau management's inquiries to the State Parole Board, they were subsequently advised by the Attorney General's Office that the modification of the wording of the Parole Board warrant was desirable to clear up certain ambiguities raised by previous language. Primarily, the warrant spoke of no entitlement to bail which is inappropriate, for the most part, in dealing with the juvenile parolees who are released primarily to responsible adults and for those adults who are released without bail or on their own recognizance. The wording on the revised warrant provides that "said parolee shall not, upon execution of this warrant, be released pending determination of his/her parole status." The representative of the Attorney General indicates that the modification can be accomplished without amending the statutory provision as it is a logical extension of the spirit of the statutory language. The modification of the warrant was approved by the Board at its next subsequent meeting and a print order was subsequently released by the Bureau. As a result, the Departmental Special Assistant for Legal Affairs reviewed the wording on the Bureau's warrant and determined that the wording also should be modified to become closer aligned to statutory language. Subsequently, the modifications were made and a print order for it has also been issued.

As a result of contract bidding for laboratory testing services to meet the Bureau's needs for parolee urinalysis, the contract has been awarded to BioQuest Laboratories of Seaford, Delaware. This contract replaces one of long standing with Roche Biomedical Laboratories. Upon being advised that BioQuest was the low bidder, Bureau staff contacted users of the laboratory and all indications were complete satisfaction with their services. Discussion with the Delaware Department of Corrections and several other users provided information which tended to indicate reliable services for reasonable prices. The contract inception transpired during the month of April at which time BioQuest officials visited each district and held a Bureau-wide orientation concerning procedures and services. Shortly after the contract transition, parolee urinalysis was temporarily suspended in view of the fiscal constraints. The possibility continues that the Department itself will provide laboratory testing to meet all of its needs whether they involved inmates, parolees or potential employees.

Management's ongoing correspondence with Treasury officials over the past several years has come full circle. Responses received toward the end of the fiscal year raised questions which were similar to those first posed and which require a further response prior to being of any benefit to the Bureau. It would appear that in order to write off any debt including those that are outstanding subsequent to the death of the obligator submission of certain data must be provided to Treasury officials for their review. Methods of transmitting this data and prerequisite to the transmission have not been made known. The one aspect which has been made clear by Treasury officials is that any person with an obligation may petition the courts concerning commutation of sentence concerning that aspect of

their sentence. Management has long been seeking a method for removing from its caseload those whose maximum has expired and continue to be the responsibility of the Bureau for purposes of revenue collection. In many instances, these individuals cannot or will not amortize the obligation. A means of removal must be found. The issue is complicated since the Bureau is only a collector and passer-through of funds. It is not the recipient of the receivables.

The Bureau's participation in the BSP/SA has now reached the point of implementation. Management has representation on the BSP/SA Committee which has prepared the five-year plan for Departmental automation. During the first year of implementation, microcomputers were delivered to all district offices and the Central Office. Several sets of software have also been provided. Most units are not familiar with word processing applications and the Bureau's Executive Assistant is evaluating an expansion of the use of the microcomputers as appropriate. Even as the first implementation was in process, efforts began to implement the second year of the plan. The executive assistant working with representatives of the Bureau of Management Information Systems compiled a User Needs Survey in accordance with procedures directed by the Office of Telecommunications and Information Services (OTIS). By adhering to their guidelines, it might be easier to secure funding for the sophisticated equipment. As the users needs were being compiled, the Bureau assembled a Quality Control Board to provide input into the procedure. As the year drew to an end, site visits were made by the executive assistant and Management Information Systems' representatives at several of the Bureau sites as a follow up to the completed survey. Individual unit responses indicate that workload control, warrant control, offender information, timekeeping/payroll and revenue issues were among the biggest priorities for automation. Subsequent to the completion of present efforts, funding must be sought for more sophisticated hardware and software.

During the course of the year, at least two bills were introduced in the Legislature which would allow the Bureau to initiate accelerated revocation action on those parolees involved in new offenses by applying to the Parole Board under circumstances similar to those which allow the prosecutors to now initiate the revocation process. The first bill A4020 received a conditional veto by the Governor according to unofficial information available to the Bureau early in the fiscal year. The fate of the second bill has not as yet been learned. It would provide that a parolee not own or possess any firearm or any other weapon as defined in NJS 2C:39-1 and secondly that the parolee not violate any provisions of Chapter 35 of Title 2C of the New Jersey Statutes concerning possession, use, sale or distribution of any controlled dangerous substance. Finally, it would permit the Chief of the Bureau of Parole to initiate a parole revocation proceeding on the basis of new criminal charges against the parolee. However, continued pursuit of revocation proceedings subsequent to application would rest upon the determination of the paroling authority.

During the course of the year, the Department has begun per diem payments to counties for housing parole violators commencing on the sixteenth day subsequent to incarceration or in the case where a parolee is serving a county sentence, on the sixteenth day subsequent to the completion of service of sentence. These payments are made whether or not the parolee

has charges pending against him or her. Previously, payment did not commence until the date of revocation. The new policy did not relieve the problem existing in Mercer County where formerly payment was demanded from the first day of confinement on a parole violator and later payment was eliminated as an issue as a result of an executive order banning the entrance of any parole violator without pending charges to the Mercer County Facility. As the year drew to a close, the order was under advisement in the Office of the Attorney General.

The Bureau has begun to enter lost or stolen identification shields into the NCIC/SCIC. It has been ascertained that the Internal Affairs Unit is the only Department of Corrections' element authorized to process such transactions. As a result, the Bureau has developed a procedure whereby a report of a lost or stolen shield will be submitted immediately by personnel to whom the shield is assigned through his supervisor to the Office of the Chief. The report will then be directed to the Statistical Unit to be placed in a format compatible to NCIC/SCIC entries and then forwarded through for authorization to the Central Office Communication Units for entry into the NCIC/SCIC. Whenever the lost or stolen shield is recovered, a similar process will be used in order to remove the entries from the system. It has been determined that charges may be made against unauthorized persons who are attempting to identify themselves through the use of the shield.

The Bureau of Parole along with the remainder of the Division of Policy and Planning has experienced a change of leadership during the course of the year. Former Assistant Commissioner Zerillo returned to the State Parole Board, the agency with which he was associated prior to his appointment as division head. Assistant Commissioner Howard has assumed the leadership role bringing with her a background which includes association with the court system in New Jersey. In the fourteen year history of the division, she has become the third assistant commissioner joining also Mr. Albert Elias who was initially appointed to that position upon the creation of the Department of Corrections and when the Division was descriptively entitled Parole and Juvenile Services.

PERSONNEL

As of June 30, 1990, according to the administrative assistant, the total compliment of 464 staff members were distributed as follows:

Chief	1
Assistant Chiefs	2
Supervising Parole Officers	5
Project Director	1
District Parole Supervisor	14
Assistant District Parole Supervisor	19
Senior Parole Officer	69
Senior Parole Officer (IPO)	17
Executive Assistant	1
Project Specialist (Community Resource & others)	1
Parole Officer	203
Parole Officer (IPO)	2
Administrative Assistant	1
Clerical	<u>128</u>
TOTAL	<u>464</u>

Funding for Fiscal Year 1990 provided the Bureau with an additional sixteen (16) parole officer positions and nine (9) clerical positions in order to allow for increased parolee supervision. In addition, state funding was allotted for twelve (12) senior parole officers and four (4) senior clerk stenographers and one (1) project director for the Intensive Surveillance/Supervision Program (ISSP) which was formerly federally funded. Also funding was continued for the Electronically Monitored Home Confinement Program (EMHC) which provided for three (3) senior parole officers, one (1) senior data entry machine operator and a project director.

The hiring freeze which had been imposed effective December 1, 1988 was somewhat eased the past fiscal year. The Bureau was permitted to fill all of its professional vacancies while only permitted to fill a limited amount of its clerical openings. Positions associated with those previously assigned to PROOF, for the most part, remain frozen.

Of the sixteen (16) positions assigned for increased supervision, eight (8) were filled by bilingual officers in order to meet needs expressed by a variety of district offices. These assignments allowed for two (2) bilingual officers in several districts.

An additional ISSP senior parole officer for placement in District Office No. 13 was approved by the Department and was provided as a result of one of the positions formerly associated with PROOF.

During the course of the year, a second assistant district parole supervisor was created for placement in District Office Nos. 7, 9 and 13 which now join District Office Nos. 4, 6, and 12 who have two assistant district parole supervisors.

The five (5) project specialist positions formerly assigned to the Bureau were eliminated during the latter months of the fiscal year.

Toward the end of the year, thirteen (13) regularly assigned senior parole officer positions were transferred into the ISSP/EMHC Programs in order to expand its capacity. These positions were formerly field supervision positions and the transfer to the program did not constitute either additional positions or a promotion.

DPS Pavelec, Central Office and Sr. P.O. Halpin, District Office No. 4 and P.O. Tienken, District Office No. 6 continue as officers in the Volunteers in Courts and Corrections of New Jersey. Mrs. Pavelec is also a member of the Special Classification Review Board at Avenel.

The juvenile variant was removed from all of the state funded positions previously carrying same leaving five (5) federally funded juvenile after-care positions remaining within the Bureau.

As the fiscal year drew to a close, the Bureau was anticipating no additional positions as a result of the state's fiscal crisis. Efforts would continue to gain exemptions from the hiring freeze for open positions and as vacancies occur.

In accordance with contractual arrangements, openings are posted within work units thereby allowing personnel with seniority the chance for reassignment prior to filling of a vacancy from a Department of Personnel list.

Former Executive Assistant Josephine McGrath, a long time Bureau of Parole staff member, was laid to rest having lost her fight with cancer early in the Fiscal Year.

CASELOAD

As of June 30, 1990, a total of 21,118 cases were reported under the supervision of the Bureau of Parole by its various components. This represented a total increase of 1,621 cases during the course of the fiscal year. District caseloads as of June 30, 1990 were as follows:

DO #1 - 2,088	DO #8 - 1,673
DO #2 - 1,618	DO #9 - 1,290
DO #3 - 1,179	DO #10 - 1,068
DO #4 - 1,914	DO #11 - 1,407
DO #5 - 1,260	DO #12 - 2,051
DO #6 - 1,971	DO #13 - 1,697
DO #7 - 1,900	

Bureau Total - 21,118

COSF includes various inmates owing and amortizing revenue obligations, but does not appear as part of the Bureau count because they continue on the counts of various institutions.

Total Bureau casecount of 21,118 included 1,319 females under supervision in New Jersey and 6,048 cases were being carried beyond their maximum in order to allow for amortization of revenue obligations. Further, the district offices were monitoring 1204 New Jersey cases resident out of state. The count does not include the 72 inmates being supervised by the Bureau of Parole under the EM/HCP program on 6/30/90.

DISCHARGE PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF MAXIMUM

Grants of Discharge from parole are extended by the Parole Board upon the recommendation of the Bureau.

The following figures represent the actions taken during the fiscal year by the paroling authority on the Bureau's recommendations:

<u>Type of Commitment</u>	<u>Granted</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>Administrative Termination</u>	<u>Total</u>
Adult	87	0	0	87
Young Adult	34	0	0	34
Juvenile	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	126	0	0	126

PROBABLE CAUSE HEARINGS

This hearing, mandated by the Supreme Court Morrissey vs. Brewer Decision, was initiated under urgent requirements with the assignment of supervising parole officers (highest level under Chief and Assistant Chief) to formulate operating procedures, establish policy and to conduct the hearings. Having accomplished these goals, in January, 1978, a Probable Cause Hearing Unit composed of four senior parole officers was established. Under the supervision of a supervising parole officer, the senior parole officers 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 are now held by the administrative senior parole officer assigned to each district office.

In order to comply with the Supreme Court Decision, the following tabulation of Probable Cause Hearings and Decisions was compiled in Fiscal 1990:

a. Hearing requested and hearing held	1693
b. Hearing waived and hearing held	327
c. No response from parolee and hearing held	1460
d. Hearing waived and no hearing held	715
e. Probable Cause found and formal revocation hearing to follow	3891
f. Continuation of parole recommended although valid violations determined	227
g. Continuation on parole - no valid violations determined	42
h. Other	<u>36</u>
Total Hearing Scheduled (columns a+b+c+d)	4195
Probable Cause found and revocation hearing to follow	3891 (92.7%)

DISTRICT PAROLE SUPERVISOR'S DECISION

<u>DO#</u>	<u>Authorization to Continue on Parole</u>	<u>*Continue on Bail</u>
1	155	197
2	85	147
3	131	112
4	100	129
5	129	114
6	20	74
7	83	133
8	75	358
9	131	104
10	65	95
11	48	107
12	131	147
<u>13</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>143</u>
Totals	1203	1860

*Prosecutors did not request probable cause action. Bureau lacks authority to initiate revocation proceedings regardless of circumstances surrounding the offense. Parole Board still lacks authority to revoke on new offenses, absent a conviction or prosecutorial application.

RATIO OF FIELD TO OFFICE TIME

The following chart indicates the hours and percentage of officer's time spent in the office as compared to the field in Fiscal 1989.

<u>Month/Year</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Total</u>
July 1989	13,795	9,344	23,139
August	15,355	11,188.5	26,543.5
September	14,731.5	9,190	23,921.5
October	15,505.5	10,202	25,707.5
November	12,526	8,324.5	20,850.5
December	14,679.5	7,872.5	22,552
January 1990	14,369	11,509	25,878
February	14,975.5	9,211.5	24,187
March	16,604	11,343	27,947
April	15,725.5	10,936.5	26,662
May	19,411.5	12,462	31,873.5
June	<u>18,412</u>	<u>11,743</u>	<u>30,155</u>
Totals	186,090	123,326.5	309,416.5
Percent	60.1%	39.9%	100%

NEW JERSEY REHABILITATION COMMISSION PROJECT

As of June 30, 1990, the New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission indicated that it was servicing a total parole caseload in Newark of 107 cases of which 28 were on active status and 79 on referred status. Although, at one time, specialized rehabilitation caseload covered the entire Essex County, funding cutbacks reduced service to only the city of Newark.

NIGHT VISITS

DO #1 - Staff made total of 470 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #2 - Staff made total of 144 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #3 - Staff made total of 139 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #4 - Staff made total of 173 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #5 - Staff made total of 320 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #6 - Staff made total of 123 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #7 - Staff made total of 285 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #8 - Staff made total of 607 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #9 - Staff made total of 56 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #10 - Staff made total of 473 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #11 - Staff made total of 743 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #12 - Staff made total of 782 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #13 - Staff made total of 22 contacts after normal working hours.

Bureau staff made a grand total of 4,337 contacts after normal working hours.

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 365 reviews were completed, resulting in 15 (4.1%) unsatisfactory ratings. An unsatisfactory rating is to be followed by 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.

JOB TRAINING AND PARTNERSHIP ACT

C.E.T.A.'s phase out has been followed by the implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act. Throughout the fiscal year, 826 parolees were referred, 463 accepted, and 48 completed various aspects of this program. The program is administered in each county through the private industry counsel and some differences in program intensity may be evident.

FURLOUGH/HOME VISIT/WORK/STUDY PROGRAM

A fair share of the credit for the continued success of the pre-parole temporary community release programs may be claimed by the Bureau of Parole, as the district offices maintain their role in the investigation and monitoring of adult furlough and juvenile home visit sites, initial investigation of employment sites for institutional work release programs, and sustaining liaison/contact with the appropriate police departments affected by these programs. The Bureau's contributions include: insuring uniformity and consistency in operating procedures, notifying law enforcement authorities, and providing feedback to Institutional Classification Committees. During the course of the year, the Bureau was released from call-in responsibilities previously established as part of the Furlough Program. The Bureau also was released from responsibility for field investigations related to the Work/Study Release Program where that program involved Residential Community Release Facilities.

Adult Furloughs: During Fiscal Year 1990, the Bureau of Parole's district offices report receiving 3,108 requests for investigations of destinations proposed for escorted/unescorted furloughs from adult institutions and home visits from juvenile institutions. 2,538 investigations were completed as approved; 427 disapproved. In addition, 13 district coordinators initiated 714 routine contacts with residences of furloughees or with law enforcement agencies as follow up investigatory efforts. The district offices received 60 telephone calls from furloughees in fulfillment of the previous "check-in" requirement.

Juvenile Home Visits: During Fiscal Year 1990, the Bureau of Parole received 272 requests for investigations of destinations proposed for escorted and unescorted juvenile home visits. 219 were completed consisting of 193 approvals and 26 disapprovals. The district offices also initiated 81 contacts with home visit destinations or with law enforcement agencies subsequent to the initial investigation. They received 9 "check-in" telephone calls from juveniles on home visits.

All of the above activity in both the adults and the juvenile programs involved driving a total of 29,430 miles and spending a total of 6,249 hours on furlough/home visit related work. The following table provides a distribution of the Fiscal 1990 furlough/home visit related investigatory efforts by district offices.:

<u>District Parole Office No.</u>	<u>Requested/Completed/Disapproved</u>		
1	151	131	25
2	167	180	30
3	226	200	34
4	258	203	56
5	245	202	24
6	253	148	37
7	383	372	58
8	418	307	54
9	167	167	0
10	196	135	35
11	179	129	13
12	280	251	29
13	<u>185</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>32</u>
TOTAL	2745	2540	427

Work/Study Release

During Fiscal Year 1990, the requests for investigations of pre-parole community release job sites and completion of these investigations began to exclude contract halfway house activity.

372 requests for investigations of job sites were received by the districts during the fiscal year. The completed investigations consisted of 307 approvals and 65 disapprovals. The reasons for disapproval might center around questions concerning the legitimacy of the firm, possible connection with organized crime, the character of some employees, and the general reputation of the employer. Other matters investigated include a verification of workman's compensation insurance, the job's description as put forth by the institutional authorities, and perhaps a police check on the potential employer. Hours expended for this work were 717. Also, 1,092 miles were driven in order to complete this work, and the Furlough/Work Release activities.

As the number of State institutions and the inmate population increases, the number of furloughs and required investigations may increase, simply on the basis of a comparable increase in the number of eligible inmates. Providing the privilege of work release for state sentenced inmates, housed in county facilities, remains a possibility; enlarging the scope of the program in this way would require additional initial investigations and could very well add the responsibility of ongoing monitoring in those counties having work release programs.

In the pre-parole Community Release Programs, as in other areas of the Bureau activity, the workload potentially becomes greater.

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE PROGRAM

Institutional Parole Offices located at the following institutions provided necessary services between the institution and field staff to affect a smooth reentry into the community by over 5,200 parolees during the past Fiscal 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, as is the need for a unit to service county facilities and pre-release centers.

Through September, 1983, the prison institutional complex was administered by a centralized unit with sub-offices at some of the facilities. As of October 1, 1983 all major prisons housed institutional parole offices which also serviced their satellites.

	<u>Pre-Parole Interviews</u>	<u>Inmate Requested Interviews</u>	<u>Released On Parole</u>	<u>Parole Classes</u>	<u>Orientation Classes</u>
NJSP	1493	842	264	261	50
EJSP	1023	749	437	385	39
MSCF	725	955	246	238	5
BSP	2153	907	519	433	0
SSCF	1157	1051	325	340	15
RFSP	803	1078	227	168	46
NSP	1109	594	255	262	4
EMCF	638	704	373	337	0
GSRCC	1200	559	462	198	48
AWYCF	884	235	431	213	7
MYCF	2143	2350	966	118	50
NJTS	928	84	445	217	154
LMTS	<u>739</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>297</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>365</u>
Totals	<u>14995</u>	<u>10257</u>	<u>5247</u>	<u>3305</u>	<u>783</u>

In addition, the districts report the following I.P.O. activities in various county and community release facilities:

	<u>Preparole Interviews</u>	<u>Parole Classes</u>	<u>Parole Releases</u>
DO #1	703	477	477
DO #2	779	725	725
DO #3	169	109	119
DO #4	483	418	418
DO #5	190	181	181
DO #6	738	517	517
DO #7	916	573	577
DO #8	929	685	685
DO #9	261	261	261
DO #10	945	457	457
DO #11	654	312	299
DO #12	1247	760	760
DO #13	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Totals	8014	5475	5476

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. As of June 30, 1990, the districts reported the following team involvement:

- DO #1 - No longer operational.
- DO #2 - Two teams of seven each.
- DO #3 - Team approach is being abandoned.
- DO #4 - One team of six, one team of seven.
- DO #5 - Team concept has been abandoned.
- DO #6 - One team of seven, one team of three.
- DO #7 - Three teams of six each.
- DO #8 - One team of four.
- DO #9 - Two teams of five each.
- DO #10 - One team of eleven.
- DO #11 - Two teams of seven each.
- DO #12 - Team structure changes are still in progress.
- DO #13 - Team supervision temporarily suspended.

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.

Team leaders usually are senior parole officers. They play an essential role in the field training of team members who are usually parole officers

and may have significantly less experience. Team members usually cover caseloads of those on the team who are absent either because of illness or vacation.

Further, classification teams comprised primarily of the assistant district parole supervisor and senior parole officers, continue to meet periodically in each district office. They make decisions/recommendations regarding such casework matters as caseload assignment, status assignments, changes, degree of supervision, VIPP matchups, discharge consideration, and like matters.

PAROLEE EARNINGS (Calendar 1989)

District Office staff has been advised that the annual collection of data concerning parolee earnings will be required for Calendar Year 1990. The report continues under review relative to content and timing but a determination has been made to publish the report at least once every five (5) years. District staff have been advised to begin data collection as parolees reach the maximum sentence during the course of the year and complete the data once W-2 forms are distributed early in 1991. An estimate will then be made of all other earnings which cannot be verified.

The last time data was collected, there were 16,892 parolees under supervision in New Jersey in 1986 and they earned \$61,128,616. At that time, 50% of all parolees were employed, 30% were unemployed and 20% were unemployable. Five years earlier as a result of the 1981 tally there were 11,998 parolees under supervision in New Jersey and they earned \$33,166,411. At that time, 47% were employed, 25% were unemployed and 28% were unemployable.

TRAINING

- A. Orientation: In addition to the Bureau-wide orientation provided periodically to a gathering of professional employees, each field officer hired is given a 30 day on the job training in the district office. Prior to assuming a caseload, each officer is given an orientation to office procedure and systems and is familiarized with the Administrative Manual. He is then required to accompany experienced staff into the field for introduction to other agencies and district caseload. His observation of the field officers daily activities is followed by his performance under the critical scrutiny of veteran personnel. Caseload assumption does not transpire until after a full 30 days of intensified training.

Similar on the job training is also provided for those senior parole officers who assume the duties of a probable cause hearing officer. They, too, observe hearings being conducted by more experienced officers and then are under critical scrutiny in the performance of their new responsibilities until they feel comfortable in acting independently. Meetings are held at the Central Office to discuss emergent issues and to ensure as much procedural uniformity as is possible. Central Office also pro-

vides necessary reference material for the hearing officer's ongoing use. The updated policy is distributed as the need arises.

- B. In-Service Training: Training is held on a district office level usually at staff meetings where various concepts, procedures and agencies are introduced to staff. Bureau policy is reviewed at each district staff meeting when a portion of the Administrative Manual is read and discussed. Further, policy emanating at the managerial level is presented to staff at these forums. Finally, significant personnel from various community agencies with whom the district works directly are invited to the staff meetings to make presentations and answer staff questions.
- C. Other Training Activities: Until shortly after the beginning of the fiscal year, district staff had previously provided orientation to field services at least monthly, usually more frequently, to correction officers attending formal training at the Academy. This activity has been suspended as a result of resource limitations and growing numbers of trainees.

The Bureau continues to provide a one-day orientation to programs and administrators to newly hired staff.

Selected members of the Bureau's staff continued participation in a course of Certified Public Management. This course is sponsored by the Department of Personnel in conjunction with Rutgers University.

Selected personnel attended the Annual Conference of the Middle Atlantic States Correctional Association, the Volunteers in Courts and Corrections of New Jersey and the American Probation and Parole Association.

Selected Bureau staff took advantage of a course of Alcohol Studies offered at Rutgers University.

Selected staff members attended a variety of programs offered at the National Institute of Corrections in Boulder, Colorado.

Newly promoted supervisory staff, so requiring, attended a seminar on the PAR system.

Required training in Legal Concerns of Arrest, Handcuffing and Street Survival was offered by COTA staff to recently hired parole officers.

An orientation to the services and procedures of BioQuest Laboratories relative to parolee urinalysis was attended by supervisory staff.

Certain district staff attended a seminar on Chrono Report Writing.

Head clerks and other selected staff attended training in the Use of Personal Computers.

Interested staff attended Training Academy Presentations on Controlling Employee Absenteeism, a Lyme Disease Seminar, Behavior Modification, Achieving Maximum Performance, Crack and Cocaine in Corrections, Cocaine Addiction and Sexuality, and Women in Prison.

Selected supervisors attended a seminar on Disciplinary Hearing Procedures.

Selected staff so requesting, attended a session on OBCIS Entries and Lookups.

Members of the Statistical Unit attended training on the NCIC/SCIC Systems and also made a presentation to the assembled group.

The revenue officers attended Quarterly Meetings at Central Office and were provided with required training.

Interested staff attended a session in Working Toward Wellness in the Black Community.

Interested Parole staff were authorized to attend Training Academy offerings in Methods of Instruction and Firearms Training in order to ascertain the usefulness of the training for some future role that the parole officer may engage.

Interested clerical staff attended a session entitled the Business Writing and Editing Workshops.

A supervising parole officer attended a presentation on the Role and Function of OAL.

ISSP staff attended training involving Arrest, Search and Seizure, Use of Force, Mace and Restraint Equipment and Transportation of Prisoners which was offered at the Training Academy.

Concerned staff attended a Stop Smoking Seminar.

The executive assistant attended a D-Base III Workshop provided by the Department of Personnel.

Supervisors and Bureau management attended a session on Contract Training.

Interested staff attended a Child Abuse and Prevention offering.

Presentation to Bureau field staff concerning the developmentally disabled offender by the project director and coordinators for education and training services of the Developmentally Disabled Offenders Project started during the year and continued through its end.

REVENUE PROGRAM

Revenue collection by the Bureau of Parole is authorized by statute. Both the Parole Act of 1987 and 2C:46-4 allow the collection of certain revenues by the Bureau.

VCCB Penalty - a court imposed assessment ranging from \$30 (\$15 on juvenile commitments) to \$10,000 collected and forwarded to the State Department of Treasury for deposit in a separate account available to the Violent Crimes Compensation Board. \$5 of each VCCB penalty is applied toward the Witness/Victim Advocacy Fund administered by the Division of Law. Penalty payments have first priority and all payments apply entirely to the penalty balance until paid off completely.

Forensic Laboratory Fees - in addition to any penalties and/or fines and restitutions, the courts, when disposing of charges attendant to the Drug Reform Act of 1986 must assess a criminal laboratory analysis fee of \$50 for each offense for which convicted. Forensic Laboratory Fees has second priority in that the VCCB penalty assessment must be paid in full before any payment is made toward the Forensic Laboratory Fee, but these fees must be paid in full before any payments can be credited to the Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalties, restitution or fine.

Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalties - in addition to any VCCB penalty, Forensic Laboratory Fees, restitution or fine, each person convicted or adjudicated delinquent for a violation of any offense delineated in the Comprehensive Drug Reform Act of 1986 must be assessed by the courts a Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalty ranging from \$500 to \$3,000 for each such offense. The MDEDR penalty has a third priority in payment in that a VCCB penalty and a Forensic Laboratory Fee must first be paid in full before any payment is made for the Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalty and this penalty must be paid in full before any payment is made toward restitution or a fine assessment.

Restitution - in addition to VCCB penalties, the Forensic Laboratory Fees and the Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalties, the court might award crime victims restitution for losses suffered. The State Parole Board may also require that the parolee make full or partial restitution, the amount of which is set by the sentencing court upon the request of the Board. Restitution has fourth priority in that a VCCB penalty assessment, a Forensic Laboratory Fee and the Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalty must be paid in full, if applicable, before any payment is made for restitution and restitution payments must be paid in full before any payment is collected for fine assessment.

Fine - in addition to penalties, Forensic Laboratory Fees, Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction penalties and/or restitution, the court may impose a fine as punishment upon conviction of a criminal act. Fines collected are deposited to the Treasury's General Funds. Fines,

having the fifth priority, are the last balances to be paid off when the parolee is obligated to make VCCB penalty, Forensic Laboratory Fee, Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalty and/or restitution payments in addition to fine payments.

The Central Office Revenue coordinator reports:

Central Office Revenue Unit (CORU) collected \$159,171.00 and ended the year with an accounts receivable of \$2,976,336.00.

The Bureau's thirteen (13) District Offices and CORU collected \$837,328.00 and ended the year with an accounts receivable of \$19,163,740.00. Both amounts are the highest in the ten (10) years of the Bureau revenue operation.

Central Office has 3,320 open revenue accounts and the thirteen (13) District Parole Offices have a total of 19,415.00 open revenue accounts. (One or more revenue accounts (ledger cards) have been opened for each inmate or parolee revenue case from the five (5) categories of collection; VCCB Penalty, Forensic Lab Fee, Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalty, Restitution and Fine).

The total number of Bureau open revenue accounts at the end of the year is 22,735. This is an increase of 5,506 open revenue accounts since the end of Fiscal Year 1989.

A break down of the Bureau open revenue accounts by categories of collection is as follows: 14,604 VCCB Penalties, 1,682 Forensic Lab Fees, 2,040 DEDR Penalties, 2,036 in Restitution and 2,373 Fines.

Of the \$837,328.00 total Bureau collection, \$384,074.00 was Violent Crimes Compensation Board (VCCB) penalties. This money is forwarded to the VCCB and disbursed to the innocent victims of violent crimes to reimburse them for loss of earnings and non-reimbursed medical expenses. A Restitution total of \$129,250.00 was collected and this money is disbursed to the victim/beneficiaries of court ordered restitution through the Bureau of Parole and the Department of Corrections, Bureau of Audits & Accounts. A \$179,909.00 total Fine collection was made and the money becomes a part of Treasury's General State Fund. Also included in this annual collection was \$37,134.00 in Forensic Lab Fees. These fees are disbursed to the county treasurer of the county that performed the laboratory analysis or to the State Forensic Laboratory that performed the analysis. A total of \$106,961.00 was collected for the Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction (DEDR) penalty. This penalty is forwarded to the Department of Law and Public Safety Fund.

The Bureau collected \$201,889.00 more in Fiscal Year 1990 than it collected in Fiscal Year 1989. This is a 32% increase over the Fiscal Year 1989 collection.

The Bureau collected \$781,268.00 more in Fiscal Year 1990 than it collected in Fiscal Year 1981, the first and lowest year of Bureau revenue collections with a total collection of \$56,060.00.

The total Bureau revenue collection from all categories of payment since Fiscal Year 1981 is \$3,977,480.00.

Bureau accounts receivable increased by \$5,042,542.00 over Fiscal Year 1989.

The highest District Office total collection for Fiscal Year 1990 was made by District Office #8-Atlantic City with \$78,208.00.

The second highest District Office total collection for Fiscal Year 1990 was made by District Office #1-Clifton with \$77,995.00.

District Office #11-New Brunswick was third with a total collection of \$68,239.00.

BUREAU REVENUE COLLECTION RESPONSIBILITY

By statute, the Bureau of Parole is mandated to collect the aforementioned five (5) categories of court imposed revenue obligations from all New Jersey inmates and parolees who were sentenced to the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections or whose sentences aggregated to a State sentence (365 days or more - excluding "County" sentences of up to 18 months to be specifically served in County "workhouses" or "penitentiaries").

Also, as per Bureau policy, transfers of revenue account balances are accepted from County Probation Departments after a probationer under their supervision receives a State sentence.

Collections are made from inmates largely by Department of Corrections deductions of inmate wages as per the authorization of statutes dealing with deductions from inmate institutional and work release wages.

Collections are made from parolees by the District Offices by requiring parolees to maintain a schedule of payments based on their realistic ability to pay. Revenue adjustment sessions and Probable Cause Hearings (part of the parole revocation process) are held for parolees who fail to maintain their schedule of payments.

All inmates/parolees who have reached the maximum date of their sentence (x-max) still owing revenue continue to be supervised by the Bureau of Parole as Recorded Revenue cases. Their debt may be referred to the Attorney General for collection if they have a source of income and/or assets and a known address.

During Fiscal Year 1990, sixteen (16) Attorney General referrals were made by the District Offices. District Office #7-Camden made the most with six (6) referrals. Parole/Revenue Officer Robert Sarson is credited with making all of the Camden office's six (6) referrals.

The Bureau total number of referrals since a record was begun in Fiscal Year 1989 is 39. It is noted that such referrals are very time consuming and require that Bureau professional staff take time from their duties to conduct the necessary investigation to make such referrals, (i.e. verification of current address; source of income and/or assets; obtaining commitment orders, probation transfers and other documentation needed to verify the debt.

As more Districts assign parole officers to specialized recorded revenue caseloads, it is believed that more Attorney General referrals will be made during Fiscal Year 1991.

It is noted that recoveries of this revenue are being made by the Attorney General by utilization of several methods including but not limited to; placing a lien on a subject's wages and/or property; intercepting a subject's state income tax refund and/or homestead rebate through use of the State Treasury Department's Set Off of Individual Liability (S.O.I.L.) Program.

Amounts collected are sent to Central Office Revenue Unit (CORU). An appropriate accounting procedure is then used by CORU and the District Parole Offices to credit the inmate/parolee account with these payments.

Pending full computerization of the revenue system, the Bureau continues to work with a time consuming, manual bookkeeping/accounting system that requires handwritten entries on journal pages, ledger cards and receipts and a manual system of researching inmate/parolee revenue obligations.

Despite this limitation, the work done by Bureau professional and clerical staff made an outstanding revenue collection of \$837,328.00 during Fiscal Year 1990.

Revenue accounts are presently opened by Central Office Revenue Unit for New Jersey inmates when a payment is received for the inmate; when a parolee is returned by a District Parole Office to a New Jersey correctional facility as a parole violator or as a new commitment while on parole; for those inmates owing court imposed restitution; and for all inmates serving a concurrent New Jersey sentence in some other State or Federal Prison (STOS cases).

It should be noted that although accounts are unable to be opened at this time for all New Jersey inmates, the revenue obligation that they owe is available on their superior court commitment order and county probation department revenue transfer. These documents are available on file with the Central Office Revenue Unit and/or DOC Offender Records Unit.

When an inmate is paroled or reaches his or her date of maximum sentence, all available revenue information is sent by Central Office Revenue Transmittal Forms to the appropriate District Parole Office supervising subject's parole and/or revenue collections.

The thirteen (13) District Parole Offices maintain open revenue accounts for the following subjects owing revenue; for all New Jersey parolees being supervised by that office; for all New Jersey parolees being jointly supervised by another State and for all subjects residing in New Jersey and other States who have reached their parole maximum dates still owing revenue (x-max cases).

As a result of documented requests for additional staff and on-going follow up by Bureau Management a Parole Officer and a Senior Bookkeeper were hired to augment the Central Office Revenue Unit staff (CORU).

The revenue duties performed by these additional staff members have resulted in a very substantial improvement in the overall CORU revenue function.

The chronic CORU backlog of inmate payments to be processed has been eliminated and all inmate payments received are now processed in a timely manner. This expeditious processing of inmate revenue payments facilitates the paroling process because many of these payments are now required to be made before an inmate is eligible to be paroled. Inmate payments are now processed well in advance of the check and/or money order expiration date; and the problem of expired "STALE" checks has been eliminated.

These additional staff members have enabled CORU to purge nearly 5,000 open revenue accounts (ledger cards). As a result of this purge, hundreds of revenue accounts are being transferred to district offices for collection because the inmate has been paroled or has been discharged from the institution upon reaching his/her maximum date still owing revenue. Backlogs in acceptance of revenue transfers from County Probation Departments and in identifying and contacting victims to receive court ordered restitution have also been greatly reduced.

OTHER CENTRAL OFFICE REVENUE UNIT FUNCTIONS

Responded to victim-beneficiary inquiries regarding their restitution;

Made contacts with District Parole Offices, County Prosecutors and Superior Court Judges regarding the identification of victim-beneficiaries of restitution and the amounts due;

Advised the Bureau of Audit and Accounts of victim-beneficiaries to receive restitution and/or provided address corrections;

Sent letters to known victim-beneficiaries advising that the Bureau of Parole supervises the collection of their court ordered restitution;

Requested the Bureau of Audit and Accounts to reimburse subjects who have overpaid their revenue obligations;

Responded to inquiries from inmates and parolees, (and from others on their behalf) regarding their revenue obligations;

Continued to send letters to inmates on work release advising them of their revenue obligations and continued to send receipts for inmate payments to Institutional Parole Officers and Directors of halfway houses for distribution to inmates;

Received and processed inmate payments and forwarded payments to District Offices for subjects who were paroled or reached the maximum date of their sentence (x-max);

Responded to inquiries from Institutional Parole Officers, Ombudsmen, District Revenue Officers, County Probation Departments and halfway houses personnel regarding inmate and parolee revenue obligations;

Continued to transfer cases to the Administrative Office of the Courts, Intensive Supervision Program and to County Probation Departments when these agencies had primary responsibility to collect revenue;

Continued to open accounts on cases transferred by District Parole Offices as parole violators and new commitments;

Received Revenue Transfers from County Probation Departments and continued to review previous Revenue Transfers received from County Probation Departments. As a result of this review, sent requests to Probation Departments for clarification of their revenue transfers or rejected the transfers because the Bureau of Parole lacked jurisdiction to collect their revenue;

Continued to assist New Jersey Municipal Courts who requested the collection of fines and penalties from inmates pursuant to NJSA 20:43-3.1c, institutional deductions from inmate wages;

Made requests to County Clerks and Institutional Parole Officers for inmate and parolee Superior Court Commitment Orders;

Sent transmittals of revenue information to District Offices for subjects who have been paroled or have reached the maximum date of their sentence (x-max) still owing revenue;

Processed commitment orders received from the Prison Reception Unit (PRU), Institutional Parole Officers, County Probation Departments and County Clerks;

Continued to maintain contact with halfway houses and the Bureau of Contract Services regarding the timely submission of their resident inmates revenue payments to Central Office Revenue Unit (CORU);

Continued to transfer Recorded Revenue (STOS cases) to Districts, when these subjects have reached their New Jersey concurrent maximum date while serving other State or Federal time;

Processed and submitted to the Bureau of Audit and Accounts CORU and District Office journal pages;

Continued to provide information to District Offices to enable an interested party to make a revenue payment for a State inmate by making a payment in person at the most conveniently located District Parole Office. These inmate payments, which are normally processed through CORU, can be made to District Offices in exigent circumstances when a payment must be received before a subject can be paroled; or that a payment must immediately be made pursuant to a court order;

Maintained contact with County Prosecutors regarding revenue payments sent by the prosecutors to CORU and District Parole Offices. These payments resulted from a disposition of inmate/parolee forfeited property by the County Prosecutors and are credited by the Bureau of Parole toward payment of the subject's revenue obligation;

Ordered and distributed revenue supplies to district offices and maintained an inventory control of such supplies;

Maintained contact with the Violent Crimes Compensation Board (VCCB) Counsel regarding Assignments of Interests signed by victims who have received compensation from the VCCB, and are also entitled to received court ordered restitution. The Assignment of Interest subrogates the VCCB as the party to receive restitution as reimbursement for the compensation paid to the victim;

Maintain contact with the Counsel of the Client's Security Fund of the New Jersey Bar, regarding restitution owed to victim-beneficiaries who have been defrauded by New Jersey attorneys;

The Client's Security Fund, which is funded by mandatory annual contributions from every member of the New Jersey Bar, pays court ordered restitution directly to such victim-beneficiaries. The Client's Security Fund is then subrogated as the party to receive restitution as reimbursement for compensation paid to the victim-beneficiaries.

Responded to requests to send commitment orders and other information to banks, insurance companies and other corporations who are the beneficiaries of court ordered restitution. This information assists then in contacting the appropriate county probation departments to obtain information, from pre-sentence reports, that will enable them to identify the correct account, for which the restitution is being paid.

Sent requests, pursuant to the guidelines of the Federal Inmate Financial Responsibility Act to Federal Wardens, Case Managers and/or to the following Federal Agencies in Washington, D.C. regarding the collection of revenue for the Bureau of Parole from New Jersey inmates who are serving concurrent federal time; or were paroled to a federal detainer; or are New Jersey x-max cases under federal supervision;

1. U.S. Bureau of Prisons - Public Information Officer (custody location of all federal inmates - excluding those in protective custody);

2. U.S. Bureau of Prisons - Inmate Monitoring Section (federal inmates in protective custody);
3. U.S. Marshall's Service - Witness Security Section (federal witnesses, including those released from federal custody, who are under the protection of U.S. Marshall's Service);
4. U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service - Detention and Deportation Section (illegal aliens in U.S. Immigration Custody pending deportation and those released pending appeal of their deportation).

REVENUE TRAINING

On 9/22/89; 1/18/90; 4/11/90; and 6/21/90 quarterly Revenue Officers' training sessions were held at the Correction Officers Training Academy (COTA).

All thirteen (13) Districts were represented at these meetings at which Bureau Management and the CORU professional staff spoke on a variety of subjects including revenue probable cause hearings, attorney general referrals, correct accounting procedures; the collection and disbursement of restitution; dealing with the victim-beneficiaries of restitution; collection of revenue from federal inmates; revenue OBCIS and NCIC computer use; and the current and future objectives of the Bureau's revenue program.

Guest speakers at these meetings were Marian Copeland, Esq., Senior Deputy Counsel of the Client's Security Fund of the New Jersey Bar; Mary Raney, Coordinator, Victim/Witness Unit of the Mercer County Prosecutor's Office; Joseph P. Miele, Esq., Chairman, Governor's Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse; Cindy Merker, Esq., Board Counsel of the Violent Crimes Compensation Board and Thomas Brettell, Technical Director of the New Jersey State Police Forensic Laboratory.

All presentations were excellent and were well received by Bureau staff.

It is noted that, as a result of the training and reviews provided at these quarterly meetings, District Office journal pages are being submitted accurately; Attorney General Referrals are being made; collections are now made through contacts with Federal Case Managers; the victim-beneficiaries of restitution are being promptly assisted with their inquiries regarding the collection of their restitution; and Bureau staff has a better understanding of the Bureau's relationship with other agencies who receive funds from the Bureau's revenue collection or provide the Bureau with the identities of victims to receive restitution.

Additional quarterly meetings with guest speakers from agencies that are involved in the Bureau's revenue program are planned for Fiscal Year 1991.

LARGE REVENUE RECOVERIES

Through their efforts to demand payment from parolees delinquent in their revenue payments; contacts with attorneys representing parolees; and Attorney General Referrals the following Bureau Professional staff made outstanding revenue recoveries during Fiscal Year 1990;

Amount of Recovery

- | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|-------|
| 1. | Parole Officer Robert Royle
District Parole Office #8-Atlantic City | \$14,405.00 | Fine |
| 2. | Senior Parole/Revenue Officer
James Erdmann
District Parole Office #12-Paterson | \$10,000.00 | Fine |
| 3. | Senior Parole/Revenue Officer
Rudolph Bailey
District Parole Office #1-Clifton | \$14,575.45 | Fine |
| 4. | Senior Parole/Revenue Officer
Diane Lonesome
District Parole Office #2-East Orange | \$18,800.00 | Rest. |
| 5. | Senior Parole/Revenue Officer
Joseph Georgewitz
District Parole Office #2-East Orange | \$5,500.00 | Rest. |

TEN (10) YEAR TOTAL COLLECTIONS

(all payment categories included)

FISCAL 1981

District Parole Offices	\$	37,864.00
Central Office	\$	18,196.00

FISCAL 1982

District Parole Offices	\$	86,908.00
Central Office	\$	52,345.00

FISCAL 1983

District Parole Offices	\$	152,928.00
Central Office	\$	47,544.00

FISCAL 1984

District Parole Offices	\$	276,484.00
Central Office	\$	83,995.00

FISCAL 1985

District Parole Offices	\$	240,303.00
Central Office	\$	92,446.00

FISCAL 1986

District Parole Offices	\$	320,258.00
Central Office	\$	106,957.00

FISCAL 1987

District Parole Offices	\$	315,900.00
Central Office	\$	154,879.00

FISCAL 1988

District Parole Offices	\$	411,252.00
Central Office	\$	106,954.00

FISCAL 1989

District Parole Offices	\$	477,264.00
Central Office	\$	158,175.00

FISCAL 1990

District Parole Offices	\$	678,157.00
Central Office	\$	159,171.00

NOTE: ALL AMOUNTS ROUNDED OFF TO THE NEAREST WHOLE DOLLAR VALUE.

BUREAU OF PAROLE CUMULATIVE REVENUE COLLECTIONS
FISCAL YEAR 1981 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1990
(Ten (10) Year Total)

DISTRICT	<u>VOCB PENALTY</u>	<u>FORENSIC *LAB FEE</u>	<u>DEDR *PENALTY</u>	<u>RESTITUTION</u>	<u>FINE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1	\$ 138,694.00	\$ 2,626.00	\$ 11,688.00	\$ 47,792.00	\$ 131,361.00	\$ 332,161.00
2	107,661.00	957.00	1,186.00	58,600.00	158,235.00	326,639.00
3	123,517.00	3,369.00	14,724.00	33,340.00	81,338.00	256,288.00
4	76,572.00	2,195.00	3,460.00	9,204.00	145,953.00	237,384.00
5	153,745.00	3,034.00	10,055.00	83,194.00	133,765.00	383,793.00
6	92,240.00	1,356.00	4,177.00	35,486.00	69,575.00	202,834.00
7	103,839.00	2,209.00	6,439.00	28,227.00	41,786.00	182,500.00
8	158,511.00	4,126.00	11,062.00	56,375.00	140,975.00	371,049.00
9	78,285.00	865.00	1,397.00	3,234.00	27,389.00	111,170.00
**10	100,541.00	2,490.00	10,932.00	27,282.00	32,737.00	173,982.00
**11	113,087.00	3,432.00	8,829.00	40,878.00	68,835.00	235,052.00
**12	103,633.00	2,692.00	7,217.00	47,260.00	45,415.00	206,217.00
**13	26,149.00	1,020.00	2,260.00	3,235.00	9,793.00	42,457.00
ORU	581,399.00	13,153.00	33,831.00	60,651.00	226,920.00	915,954.00
TOTAL	\$ 1,957,875.00	\$ 43,515.00	\$ 127,257.00	\$ 534,758.00	\$ 1,314,077.00	\$ 3,977,480.00

* Note that Forensic Lab Fees and the Mandatory Drug Enforcement and Demand Reduction Penalty (DEDR) were only enacted on June 22, 1987 and began appearing on Superior Court Commitment orders during the latter part of Fiscal Year 1988.

** Also note that only District Parole Offices #1 through #9 were in operation during the entire ten (10) years of Bureau revenue collection.

*** All amounts have been rounded off to the nearest whole dollar value.

JUVENILE AFTERCARE PROGRAM

The Juvenile Aftercare Program was established to create linkages between juvenile inmates/parolees and community based programs. By interfacing between the community agency, the institution and the inmate/parolee, juvenile aftercare specialists are in the best position to identify case needs and develop comprehensive case plans. Juvenile Aftercare Specialists also coordinate supervisory and service delivery functions with County Youth Services Commissions. Supportive aftercare services include counseling, utilization of vocational, educational and employment resources and residential living arrangements.

The philosophy underlying the Juvenile Aftercare Program is that smaller specialized caseloads will enable the juvenile aftercare specialist to develop comprehensive case plans and perform increased supportive and monitoring functions. Juvenile aftercare specialists are required to begin the case planning process and develop linkages with community agencies prior to an inmate's release on parole. Smaller caseloads also afford specialists the time to work with family members (e.g. mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters) in order to resolve problems which negatively impact on a juvenile's adjustment on parole.

Program Criteria: In order to be eligible for program placement, an individual must be eligible for parole or already on parole. Additionally, there must be justification for assignment to the program based upon a need for a comprehensive and coordinated treatment plan, intensive parole supervision and close monitoring of behavior once released to parole. The complete program is operational in five district offices but a modified program continues in the remaining eight.

INTENSIVE SURVEILLANCE/SUPERVISION PROGRAM

The Intensive Surveillance/Supervision Program (ISSP) is based upon the belief that smaller caseload size will enable parole officers to provide higher levels of service delivery and monitoring of parolee activities. The existence of this program enables the release on parole of individuals requiring special supportive services and/or very intensive supervision. As such, the program has a positive impact on prison overcrowding, inasmuch as these inmates would not have been released on parole if the ISSP did not exist.

Parole officers assigned to the ISSP vary their work schedules in order to meet caseload demands. It has not been uncommon for staff to work before or after normal work hours, on weekends and on holidays. Parolees are held to a high standard of accountability. In order to provide the highest level of community protection, parolee compliance with program rules and conditions of parole are vigorously monitored. It is a goal of the ISSP to provide a parole release mechanism for difficult cases which does not jeopardize the public safety.

The ISSP provides relief to prison overcrowding as an alternative to continued incarceration for those inmates who could safely be paroled provided that they were under very intensive supervision. As alternative to continued incarceration upon parole eligibility, the ISSP is one of a few programs nationwide to address the overcrowding issue from the back end of the criminal justice process. Most Intensive Supervision Programs address overcrowding through the system's front end by providing a sentencing alternative.

Unlike most Intensive Supervision Programs, the ISSP provides services to the type of inmate who are in the most need. The profiles of the typical inmate placed in other Intensive Supervision Programs indicate a type of client most likely to succeed under community supervision. There is clearly a need for front and back end intensive supervision programs in order to provide the most effective alternatives to incarceration while at the same time not undermining the community protection responsibility of community supervision.

The project director reports:

The ISSP added an electronic monitoring component in September of 1989. At same time, caseload caps were increased from twenty to twenty-five. The institution of electronic monitoring into the ISSP program design provided sufficient home confinement controls so as to permit the release of certain inmates to the program. The intent was and is to reduce prison populations in state and county facilities by utilizing the ISSP/HCP as a cost effective alternative to incarceration.

The population of inmates and parolees assigned to the ISSP/HCP has gradually increased since September of 1989. At the end of the fiscal year, there are ninety-five inmates and parolees under electronic monitoring. The ratio of inmates to parolees has remained fairly consistent. At any given time there are approximately 85% to 90% inmates and 10% to 15% parolees assigned to the ISSP/HCP.

A pilot project was developed at Mountainview Correctional Facility. The purpose of the pilot project was to expedite the processing of inmates who are within 120 days of their parole date. As a result of this pilot project, referrals from Mountainview significantly increased. The cooperative efforts of the SPB and the DOC have made this project a success.

Plans are underway to implement the Mountainview model to Edna Mahan Correctional Facility. A meeting between the SPB and the DOC is scheduled for July 30 , 1990. It is anticipated that the expedited processing of cases will be up and running at Edna Mahan by mid-August 1990.

A preliminary assessment of the success/failure of the ISSP/HCP has shown a high rate of success. Of the parole violators who were released to the ISSP/HCP, none were arrested for new charges and there were no absconders. Of this group 33% were returned to custody for program violations. Of the inmates assigned to the program, there has been one arrest for a narcotics related offense and four absconders. Approximately 9% of the inmate population have been returned to custody for program violations.

The staff of the ISSP/HCP continue to employ a primary philosophy of risk control. Staff utilize social casework intervention strategies to control and reform behavior. It is an essential component of the ISSP/HCP that staff continually assess offender risk factors. At such time as it is no longer possible to control risk through casework techniques or use of other intermediate sanctions, the offender is returned to custody. ISSP/HCP staff have conducted the majority of returns to custody for inmates and parolees assigned to the program. Staff have received special training in arrest and transports of offenders as well as the inmate disciplinary process.

Plans are under way to provide advanced training in various intervention strategies which have long term positive effects on recidivism.

The capacity of the ISSP/HCP was doubled in recent months as a result of the assignment of an additional ISSP/HCP officer to each district parole office. Presently, there are 29 ISSP/HCP officers assigned to the program. Three of these officers are assigned to a regional coordination function.

JAP cases will now be assigned to ISSP/HCP staff. Federal funding expired at the end of the last fiscal year.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

During the fiscal year, federal funding continued to partially provide for a special program for the supervision of juveniles in selected counties. The juvenile specialist handles no more than 50 cases a piece in order to provide intensive supervision and agency networking as required. Five (5) positions were available and handled juveniles paroled to Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Passaic, Somerset, Mercer and Burlington Counties. The parole officers assigned to this program also participated in the meetings and activities of the County Youth Service Commissions in those counties where the program is operational.

The previously federally funded Intensive Surveillance/Supervision Program has completed its second full year of operations and was formerly funded by state allocations. The program provides specially selected offenders additional support services and close supervision when released on parole. Caseloads of no more than 20 allow maximum service/surveillance contacts to assure that required treatment programs are being attended and needs are being adequately met. The program provides specially trained selected offenders additional support services and close supervision when released on parole. Caseloads of 20 allow maximum service/surveillance contacts to assure that required treatment programs are being attended and needs are being adequately met.

The Intensive Surveillance/Supervision Program's caseload was expanded by an additional five (5) to implement a program of electronic monitoring. Each ISSP caseload is now capped at 25 which includes a combination of both electronically monitored home confinement cases and those in need of intensive supervision. The electronically monitored home confinement cases include both parolees and inmates. The programs allow the monitoring of home confinement of participants except within stipulated hours when the

participant might seek or obtain employment or be involved in other essential activities. As the year drew to a close, a second ISSP/EMHC officer was being added to each district office to allow program expansion.

The Bureau continues in cooperative arrangement with staff of the Joint Connection's Parolee Employment Assistance Project. Client referrals for job placement are made by staff of Parole District Office Nos. 2, 5, 7, 9 and 13. The Parolee Employment Assistance Project is responsible for applicant screening, testing, job development and placement.

The Bureau continues participation in the TURRELL funds Scholarship Program. Field units submit applications on behalf of qualified parolees who wish to be considered for a scholarship to the college of their choice. This long standing cooperative effort has led to the education of several individuals who might not have otherwise been afforded the opportunity.

The Bureau participated in the Governor's Summer Employment Program during the summer of 1989 as a placement agency. Until that time, each summer, limited numbers of students were provided with summer employment through this program. The Bureau received notification as the fiscal year drew to a close that due to budgetary constraints, the Department would not be participating in this program during the summer of 1990.

Students from various colleges and universities continue to serve internships at the Bureau field sites as part of a cooperative effort involving the Volunteers in Parole Program.

OFFICE OF INTERSTATE SERVICES

Formerly a part of the Bureau of Parole and in the Division of Policy and Planning, the Office of Interstate Services was transferred on December 1, 1986 to the Division of Adult Institutions. Although it is no longer a part of the Bureau of Parole, there is presently under implementation a procedure which involves placing the New Jersey cases residing out of state on a New Jersey district office caseload which then becomes responsible for maintaining the correspondence, follow ups and certain decision-making authority over these cases. They also maintain contacts, as necessary, with other states through the Office of Interstate Services. Similarly, the New Jersey cases who are residing out of state and who have completed the time portion of their parole still owing revenue obligations are also being monitored by the district offices for collection purposes.

VOLUNTEERS IN PAROLE PROGRAM

As a component of the Bureau of Parole, the Volunteers in Parole Program is designed to provide a pool of individuals from the community that are qualified and willing to assist the Bureau personnel serve the varied needs of its many diverse clients.

The following volunteer categories reflect the service needs of the Bureau of Parole while giving an indication of the scope of ways in which volunteers can provide valuable assistance.

Casework Aide - works in conjunction with a parole officer to provide one to one supervision and crisis intervention.

Parole Officer Aide - assists the parole officer with various investigations and acts as officer of the day.

Professional Aide - a member of a profession offering specific services on an as needed basis.

Administrative Aide - works in a district office in an administrative or clerical capacity.

Student Intern - assumes the same role as Parole Officer Aide. The category is the development of the cooperation between the Bureau and institutions of higher learning.

The Central Office volunteer liaison reports:

This past fiscal year, we increased our total pool of volunteers. As many of our volunteers serve on a relatively short term basis, this years volunteers plus others from last year has given us a total pool of 17 individuals servicing from July 1989 through June 1990.

TWO YEAR COMPARISON - TYPES OF VOLUNTEERS

	<u>FY 89</u>	<u>FY 90</u>
Casework Aide	2	2
Parole Officer Aide	0	0
Professional Aide	1	0
Administrative Aide	0	0
Student Aide	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	9	8

During the past year, three Bureau staff members, Maureen Halpin, Susanne Pavelec and Walter Tienken served (and continue to serve) on the Board of Directors of Volunteers in Courts and Corrections of New Jersey. Mrs. Pavelec currently serves as secretary. VCCNJ was founded in 1972 as a non-profit organization to provide statewide support for volunteers and to promote volunteerism and volunteer programs.

NCIC/SCIC OPERATIONS

The primary responsibilities of the NCIC/SCIC operator is to enter all "wants", supplemental wants, modifications and cancellations as well as to obtain administrative inquiries, criminal histories and to take the necessary actions in notifying the Office of Interstate Services and the district office involved of any "hits". Further, unit personnel directs that a notice to "clear" appropriate entries is forwarded and follows up to assure that the action is taken. In addition, all entries (wants) and cancellations are relayed to the Department's Central Communications Unit daily where a mirror file is kept so as to provide 24 hour a day, 365 days a year verification of the status of wanted persons for requesting agencies.

As a prerequisite for staying in the system, a validation of a selection of previously entered records must be completed and notice of same given to the New Jersey State Police on a monthly basis.

The figures for computer activity for the fiscal year indicate a high rate of usage, which was luckily accomplished with a minimum of "down time" as most of the bugs appeared to have been worked out of the system.

The yearly computer activity was as follows:

Entries	1232
Cancellations	1211
Criminal Histories	5649
Modifications	55
Supplementals	756
Inquiries	138
Hit Notifications	779
Triple III Raps	1044
Teletypes	34
Law Enforcement Inquiries	<u>152</u>
Total	11,050

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Positive public relations contacts are always an essential responsibility of each Bureau of Parole employee. Parole failures tend to be well publicized, while parole successes, although a good deal larger in number, are understandably usually known only to a relatively few. Further, as the Bureau's responsibilities expand into larger, more complex programs, emphasis must be placed on educating the public as to the role that the Bureau plays in New Jersey today.

A random sampling of some of the direct contacts within the community where impact is notable is as follows:

The Federal Drug Enforcement Agency
Monmouth County Juvenile Conference Committee
The Center of Love (A drug and alcohol counseling center)
The Bayshore Youth and Family Services
Volunteers in Courts and Corrections of New Jersey
The Union County Investigators Association
The Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Association
New Beginnings
The North Ward Cultural Center of Newark
Essex County Boys and Girls Club
The Newark Branch of the NAACP
The Northwest New Jersey Detectives Association
HOPE for Ex-Offenders
New Jersey Mental Health Association
ALCON Project of Newark
Women as Role Models
Juvenile Conference Committee of Red Bank
Monmouth/Ocean County Intelligence Bureau
Mid-Monmouth Detectives Association
New Jersey Shore Medical Center
Matawan Rotary Club
Burlington County Detectives Association
North Brunswick/Milltown Kiwanis Club
The New Will Drug Treatment Center
The National Council of Alcoholism
Union County Municipal Investigators Association
Hunterdon County Investigators Association
The Newark Community Project for People with AIDS
National Drug Research Institute
Passaic County Police Academy
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
New Jersey American Correctional Association
Trenton Lodge B-Nai-Briith
Tri-State Investigators Association
Hamilton Township Detectives Association
Mercer County Youth Services Commission
The Offender Aid and Restoration of Essex County (OAR)
Youth Services Advisory Council of Burlington County
Newark Rotary International
Mutual Benefit Life Association
Newark Zoning Board
Bloomfield College
Rutgers University
CURA
Passaic Valley/Northern Valley Detective Group
Hispanic Information Center of Passaic, Inc.
Passaic County Crime Clinic
Genesis Program of Union County
Elizabeth General Medical Center
Henry Beck School

The Ridge Street School
Volunteers of America
Criminal Justice Committee of the Presbytery of the Palisades
Salvation Army
St. Lucy's Shelter, Jersey City
SHARE (Self Help and Resource Exchange)

-and a variety of police departments, prosecutors offices, Mental Health Facilities, and other community agencies.

Central Office DPS Pavelec is a member of the Special Classification Review Board at ADTC.

Central Office DPS Pavelec, District Office No. 4's Sr. P.O. Halpin and District Office No. 6's P.O. Tienken are on the Board of Directors of the Volunteers in Courts and Corrections of New Jersey.

District Office No. 1's softball team, the Absconders, continue to meet and play a variety of other teams representing both the public and private sector.

District Office No. 1's P.O. Bernal has been appointed to the Board of Directors of the Hispanic Information Center of Passaic, Inc.

District Office No. 3's P.O. Diana Farrell continues as a member of the Monmouth County Juvenile Conference Committee.

District Office No. 3's P.O. Michael Johnson continues as a member of the Board of Trustees for the Center of Love, a drug and alcohol counseling center. P.O. Michael Johnson also received a community humanitarian service award at their eleventh anniversary dinner.

District Office No. 3's Sr. P.O. Alexander Domorski is a member of the Professional Advisory Committee for the Bayshore Youth and Family Services.

District Office No. 6's Sr. P.O. Swayser is the elected treasurer of the Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Association.

District Office No. 6's P.O. Kevin Mahoney is a member of the Mercer County Youth Services Commission and the Youth Services Advisory Council of Burlington County.

District Office No. 6's P.O. Norman Picker has been elected financial secretary of the 1268 Trenton Lodge, B-Nai-Brith.

District Office No. 9's Sr. P.O. Fanning continues affiliation with the Essex County Boys and Girls Club, the North Ward Cultural Center and the Newark Branch of the NAACP.

District Office No. 12's Sr. P.O. Erdmann continues as president of HOPE for Ex-Offenders.

District Office No. 13's Sr. P.O. Couillard continues to serve on the Board of Directors of the Mental Health Association in Passaic County and the New Jersey Mental Health Association. He also continues to serve on the Advisory Board of the ALCON Project of Newark.

District Office No. 13's P.O. Cynthia Strunk serves on the Board of Directors of WARM (Women as Role Models)

District Office No. 13's P.O. (trainee) Eve Reese-Washington serves on the Parole/Mental Health Liaison Committee of the Mental Health Association in Essex County.

Sr. P.O. Martin Fitzgerald, Institutional Parole Officer, Training School for Boys, Jamesburg, continues his participation on the Juvenile Conference Committee of Red Bank.

NOTE

Figures compiled for and reported in the following charts and tables are completed manually. Various staff members from several of the operating units are responsible for this duty along with many other job responsibilities. Hence, a margin of error must be allowed.

A responsibility of the Bureau of Parole, but not included in the reported statistical figures are inmates. The Bureau is responsible for collection of court imposed penalties, fines and restitution from all state sentenced inmates regardless of location. The Bureau is responsible for the supervision and monitoring of all state sentenced inmates while in the Electronic Monitoring Home Confinement Program. Also, the Bureau is responsible for monitoring certain inmates while on furlough and/or work release.

CASELOADS (See Table 1)

On June 30, 1990, the Bureau of Parole was responsible for the supervision of 21,118 cases by New Jersey district offices which included 6048 cases being supervised for revenue collection activity only. During the fiscal year, 32,440 cases were actively supervised by the Bureau while it continued to handle cases released at their maximum expiration date, referrals from other components of the criminal justice system, and various investigative responsibilities.

RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS (See Table 2)

Figures concerning the recidivism rate require some elaboration. The percentages are based on total cases supervised during the year, which because of the current decentralized and manual record keeping process includes cases transferred between districts which might somewhat inflate that denominator. Further, those who are sentenced subsequent to expiration of maximum sentence for crimes committed while under parole supervision are not included in the committed or recommitted figures. However, cases who are recommended from a revenue responsibility only status are included with commitment numbers but not in the total caseload by which these recidivism rates are computed.

Further, the Revocation Process can be initiated as a result of violation of technical conditions only in those instances when those violations can be interpreted as serious and/or persistent. The Parole Act of 1979 has allowed the diminution of the number and type of parole conditions. It removed the authority from the Bureau to initiate revocation proceedings against those who admit guilt to a new offense or those whose arrests were under circumstances which might lend prima facie evidence to their guilt. Hence, those returned are those who find themselves falling within the narrow focus resulting from the present refinements to the definition.

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during the 1989-1990 fiscal year totaled 13.4 percent of the Bureau's caseload excluding revenue only cases. The court commitment/recommitment equaled 3.2 percent while the technical violations rate equaled 10.2 percent of the total rate cited above. These figures cannot be compared to prior year as revenue only cases were included in these base figures.

MISSING CASES (See Table 3)

The percentage of missing cases, in relation to total Bureau caseload, totaled 8.9 percent. The percentage of missing cases this fiscal year represents an insignificant change from last year (8.9% compared to 9%).

SUPERVISION (See Table 4)

In the course of supervising the Bureau's caseload during Fiscal 1990, Bureau field staff made a grand total of 318,179 contacts. An additional 37,714 investigation contacts were made. State vehicles assigned to districts were driven a total of 1,103,709 miles in spite of difficulties encountered, in many instances, with service, repairs, and car shortages. A total of 270,452 hours of the officer's time was spent in the field. Again, automobile shortages and difficulty with car service may have lowered the amount of time spent in the field.

CONCLUSION

The Bureau of Parole is presently reliant solely on its components for manual submission of information to compile statistical data. Attempts to further refine our statistics have not been completely successful; with manual data gathering, and turnover in personnel, a margin of error still exists. Hope for the future is bright: Terminals have been installed at field sites and updating of electronic files will eventually be done daily, staff permitting.

VRD:mps

TABLE #1

TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - FISCAL YEAR 1989 - 1990 (By Commitment Type)

COMMITMENT TYPE					
	Under	*Total No.		Total	Under
	Super-	*Total	Super-	Cases	Super-
	vision	Cases	vised	Cases	vision
	7/1/89	Added	1989-90	Dropped	6/30/90
Juvenile Females	38	17	55	15	40
Adult Females	896	487	1383	351	1032
Out-of-State Females	51	40	91	40	51
County Females	172	491	663	461	202
Juvenile Males	982	833	1815	670	1145
Youth Males	4494	1405	5899	1854	4045
Adult Males	10764	5705	16469	4148	12321
Sex Offender (Diagnostic Center)	108	54	162	27	135
Out-of-State Males	686	438	1124	419	705
County Males	1304	3475	4779	3337	1442
TOTAL	19495	12945	32440	11322	21118

CATEGORIES					
Under Supervision (1989)	19495				
Total Cases Added *		12945			
Total Number Supervised			32440		
Total Cases Dropped *				11322	
Under Supervision (1990)					21118

*Figures include cases involving transfers between districts.

Figures include revenue only cases

TABLE #2

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
 BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
 BY DISTRICT
 1989 - 1990

	1	2	3					
	*Total	No. and Percent of Returns						
Districts	Number	Committed or	Technical					
	Supervised	Recommitted	Violators				Total	
1. Clifton	2611	105	4.0%	206	7.9%	311	11.9%	
2. East Orange	1967	127	6.5%	146	7.4%	273	13.9%	
3. Red Bank	1617	48	3.0%	248	15.3%	296	18.3%	
4. Jersey City	2377	55	2.3%	290	12.2%	345	14.5%	
5. Elizabeth	1647	57	3.5%	251	15.2%	308	18.7%	
6. Trenton	2670	26	1.0%	263	9.9%	289	10.8%	
7. Camden	2686	68	2.5%	371	13.8%	439	16.3%	
8. Atlantic City	2672	70	2.6%	308	11.5%	378	14.1%	
9. Newark - East	1565	54	3.5%	119	7.6%	173	11.1%	
10. Vineland	1670	20	1.2%	247	14.8%	267	16.0%	
11. New Brunswick	1651	53	3.2%	95	5.8%	148	9.0%	
12. Paterson	2497	116	4.6%	160	6.4%	276	11.1%	
13. Newark - West	2157	94	4.4%	139	6.4%	233	10.8%	
TOTAL	27787	893	3.2%	2843	10.2%	3736	13.4%	

*Revenue only cases are not included

TABLE #3

RECORD OF MISSING CASES
BY DISTRICT
1989-1990

Districts	*Caseload on 6/30/90	Missing as of 7/1/89	Became Missing Between 7/1/89 and 6/30/90	Total Missing	Accounted for Between 7/1/89 and 6/30/90	Total Missing 6/30/90	Net Difference	Percent of Missing in Relation to Caseload on 6/30/90
1. Clifton	1419	97	103	200	107	93	-4	6.6%
2. East Orange	1088	86	22	108	72	36	-50	3.3%
3. Red Bank	878	83	85	168	105	63	-20	7.2%
4. Jersey City	1353	195	285	480	285	195	0	14.4%
5. Elizabeth	891	130	120	250	140	110	-20	12.3%
6. Trenton	1649	140	66	206	48	158	18	9.6%
7. Camden	1421	80	79	159	37	122	42	8.6%
8. Atlantic City	1229	67	86	153	81	72	5	5.9%
9. Newark - East	803	99	80	179	76	103	4	12.8%
10. Vineland	812	72	123	195	110	85	13	10.5%
11. New Brunswick	950	59	66	125	58	67	8	7.1%
12. Paterson	1425	130	103	233	132	101	-29	7.1%
13. Newark - West	1152	107	52	159	24	135	28	11.7%
TOTAL	15070	1345	1270	2615	1275	1340	-5	8.9%

*Revenue only cases are not included

TABLE #4

SUMMARY OF DAILY RECORDS OF ACTIVITIES
1989 - 1990

District Offices	FIELD AND OFFICE CONTACTS												REPORTS SUBMITTED						SUMMARIES SUBMITTED (6)				HOURS		MILEAGE	
	TYPE OF CONTACT (1)								SUPERVISION (2)				INVESTI- GATION (3)		SUPERVISION (4)		INVESTI- GATION (5)									
	C	E	H	N	O	S	PCH	RH	P	PO	R	P	N	F-19	F-21	PP	SR	DR	DA	TR	TS	OFFICE	FIELD	STATE	PER- SONAL	
DO #1	6100	317	6886	3629	5373	51	110	98	13308	13331	1722	2245	919	1816	2748	1157	228	19	0	127	316	15187	11275	120071	3865	
DO #2	2624	107	3267	2050	6363	343	41	33	9512	7445	921	647	544	1013	1010	678	312	10	10	105	300	25003	17283	33247	46	
DO #3	7967	529	6792	3098	8334	25	104	83	16497	1217	2028	690	1455	1795	1009	270	11	1	106	235	11607	1307	121907	406		
DO #4	6707	252	3648	2121	11538	10	233	102	17275	12757	2216	2027	689	2251	2432	1768	247	3	4	81	13	17832	7325	71715	914	
DO #5	5838	136	4995	1969	7183	4	193	71	11237	12134	1335	1991	1129	1566	1696	1054	244	5	14	79	189	41522	16267	77111	418	
DO #6	7007	496	5625	3224	10313	24	99	77	16654	14436	2456	2106	735	1472	1732	1271	55	7	84	154	536	14215	11559	95890	10	
DO #7	7128	381	9720	4627	18638	135	248	115	23100	19006	3671	3099	1018	2468	2768	2111	832	7	535	158	676	19027	10306	101062	104	
DO #8	9708	561	7164	3914	13348	25	203	93	16180	10457	2783	2289	1067	2193	2610	2012	719	2	375	211	722	11377	18937	165320	60	
DO #9	2878	334	7381	3058	7293	95	121	25	11148	9724	1156	1526	1482	1761	1454	803	147	15	0	121	272	15965	8325	43845	0	
DO #10	9582	320	4913	3153	11428	14	239	44	13637	20038	2973	1126	613	1995	3345	1427	827	7	481	174	347	21042	9965	164100	594	
DO #11	6133	277	4585	2113	6999	11	101	50	12906	11458	2151	2597	519	1349	2010	1080	657	19	4	125	314	15014	7679	74998	339	
DO #12	5000	270	4976	2202	8619	5	60	62	14514	12297	1831	3974	852	1490	1998	1755	107	25	0	140	354	14569	24974	123605	334	
DO #13	2533	122	2809	1562	6362	16	98	51	8007	5646	953	1378	997	710	1357	1103	235	10	12	102	320	14047	4650	32339	1063	
TOTAL	79205	4102	72841	36728	121791	758	1850	904	104135	157946	26196	25695	12019	21879	26169	16409	4621	130	1625	1812	15974	226107	270452	1103709	7747	
GRAND TOTAL								310,179			368,277		37,714		48,048		21,110				19,541		496,559		1,111,456	

Legend:

(1) C - Community Contact other
than E or S
E - Employment Contact
H - Home Contact
N - Visit Made - No Contact
O - Office Contact
S - School Contact
PCH - Probable Cause Hearing
RH - Revocation Hearing

(2) P - Positive Contact
with parolee
PO - Positive Contact
other than Parolee
R - Case review with or
without parolee

(3) P - Positive Contact
N - Negative Contact

(4) F-19 Chronological
Report
F-21 Special Report

(5) PP - Preparole
Report
SR - Special
Report

(6) DR - Discharge
Summary
DA - Other
Agency
TR - Transfer
Summary
TS - Termination
Summary

E R R A T U M

TRAINING (Page 30)

The assistant commissioner has advised management that she wishes to develop a basic training program for Parole staff. As a result, a committee has begun to be assembled to develop the training curriculum. Training Academy staff have been invited to participate in program development. They will join the Bureau's training officer, additional supervising parole officers, district parole supervisors, assistant district parole supervisors and other staff as committee members. Once the curriculum is developed, it is hoped that training will be provided in two-week sessions and will direct the trainees in Bureau philosophy, operations and other essential matters.

VRD:mps
2/11/91