


National Criminal Justice Reference Service

**ncjrs**

This microfiche was produced from documents received for inclusion in the NCJRS data base. Since NCJRS cannot exercise control over the physical condition of the documents submitted, the individual frame quality will vary. The resolution chart on this frame may be used to evaluate the document quality.



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART  
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Microfilming procedures used to create this fiche comply with the standards set forth in 41CFR 101-11.504.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

National Institute of Justice  
United States Department of Justice  
Washington, D. C. 20531

1/12/84

MF-1

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 (P.O. Box 7387)  
Trenton, New Jersey 08628

Fiscal Year July 1, 1982 - June 30, 1983

91142



John P. Zerillo  
Assistant Commissioner

Anthony Venanzi  
Senior Parole Officer

Fred B. Holley, Chief  
Bureau of Parole

Victor R. D'Illo  
Assistant Chief

## CONTENTS

Mission .....	Page 1
Major Objectives .....	Page 1
Performance .....	Page 2
Anticipated Needs and Issues .....	Page 4
Major Units .....	Page 5
Highlights .....	Page 6
Developments .....	Page 8
Personnel .....	Page 9
Organizational Chart .....	Page 11
Caseload .....	Page 12
Discharge Prior to Expiration of Maximum .....	Page 12
Probable Cause Hearings .....	Page 12
District Parole Supervisors' Decisions .....	Page 13
Ratio of Field to Office Time .....	Page 14
Treatment .....	Page 14
Night Visits .....	Page 14
Casebook Reviews .....	Page 15
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) .....	Page 15
Furlough/Home Visit/Work/Study Program .....	Page 15
Institutional Parole Program .....	Page 18
Parole Advisory Committee .....	Page 18
Team Supervision .....	Page 19
Parolee Earnings (Calendar 1982) .....	Page 19
Training .....	Page 20
Revenue Program .....	Page 21
Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility .....	Page 24
Special Projects .....	Page 30
Volunteers in Parole Program .....	Page 30
NCIC/SCIC Operations .....	Page 33
County Identification Team .....	Page 33
Public Relations .....	Page 35
Note .....	Page 36
Caseloads .....	Page 37
Return to Institutions .....	Page 37
Missing Cases .....	Page 37
Supervision .....	Page 37
Conclusion .....	Page 37
Charts and Tables follow	

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 Division of  
Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

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:

1. To provide appropriate investigation and effective supervision for those persons paroled from state and county correctional facilities and from other states which release offenders to programs in New Jersey. Bureau of Parole involvement with offenders begins while they are inmates, continues through the period of parole supervision, extends beyond the maximum expiration date whenever parolees have not completed revenue payments, and is available on an informal basis when ex-offenders seek counselling or delivery of services.
2. To improve the level of community protection against parolees whose potential for recidivism is high by use of surveillance, urine monitoring, mental health treatment services, and ongoing cooperation with law enforcement agencies.
3. To meet the legislative and administrative mandates regarding court assessed revenues (penalty, restitution, and fine).
4. To increase community participation in the reintegration process by involving citizen volunteers from both the private and public sectors in Bureau programs.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES

1. To increase field staff's ability to respond appropriately to individual parolee's needs.
2. To facilitate preparation of inmate's release to parole supervision and to serve in a liaison role between personnel of correctional institutions and training schools and Bureau of Parole field staff.
3. To provide an alternative to reconfinement by use of community-based residential facilities for parolees who are failing to satisfactorily meet certain parole conditions.
4. To provide United States Supreme Court mandated hearings for parolees whose adjustment has deteriorated markedly in one or more serious aspects.
5. To provide a program for interested and qualified citizens from all walks of life who wish to serve as volunteers in the Bureau's effort to reintegrate adult and juvenile parolees from correctional institutions and training schools.
6. To collect, safeguard, and deposit penalties, fines and restitution levied against offenders by the sentencing court, or by the Parole Board. To vigorously pursue delinquent accounts and to initiate formal collection procedures whenever offenders are unresponsive to Bureau efforts to elicit payments.

PERFORMANCE

In that nearly 90 percent of parolees complete the parole period successfully, parole officers are performing a highly cost-effective function. A parole officer's yearly salary and share of office and vehicular expenses total less than the cost of keeping two inmates in a maximum security institution.

Over the last five years the Bureau's average daily caseload has gone from 8,000 to nearly 11,500. The total number of parolees processed in one year also has shown a pronounced increase, particularly since the Bureau was given responsibility for hundreds of offenders committed to and subsequently paroled from county correctional institutions. Responsibility for these relatively short-term county cases has helped raise the total number of offenders processed throughout the year from 11,000 to approximately 14,000. Both daily and yearly totals are expected to continue increasing. Numerical increases have been accompanied by increases in the complexity of parole officer duties and in the number of offender groups served.

While there has been a marked reduction in generic parole conditions, the Parole Board makes wide-ranging use of Special Conditions. Thousands of parolees are under specific obligations via imposition of various Special Conditions. Frequently Special Conditions mandate the acquisition of particular professional services, or certain volunteer efforts, where necessary facilities are not readily available.

Both generic and Special Conditions must be monitored by Parole Bureau personnel regarding compliance. Where persistent/serious non-compliance is found, Bureau field staff must advise the Board via a formal, structured hearing (legal counsel and witnesses present). Such hearings are time-consuming and may, in essence, be duplicated should the initial hearing officer conclude that parole is to be revoked.

The Board's expanding role with county correctional institution cases has necessitated greatly increased Bureau activity in the areas of pre-release services, investigations, and supervision. Whenever case developments may cause the Board to make last-minute additions to lists of potential parole candidates, the Bureau has to make a priority response and, of necessity, reschedule other less urgent business which then can become urgent because of the enforced delay in completion. Bureau involvement with county correctional institution cases may be for a relatively short period when compared to state commitments, but county offenders comprise a volatile, multi-problem group, many of whom require as much planning and supervision as state offenders.

The Bureau's legislatively mandated takeover of responsibility for juvenile offenders formerly paroled to the Division of Youth and Family Services, presented another need for delivery of service to an offender group without an increase in Bureau staff. The acquisition of new Bureau positions is particularly welcome in that these youngest of the state's parolees can, with little or no advance notice, become involved in crises situations which demand an inordinate amount of staff time to effectively resolve. Many are capable of rapidly exhausting personal resources, unfettered by concern for long range consequences.

By legislative mandate, the Bureau entered into collection of penalties, fines and restitution, assessed against prisoners committed to the custody of the Commissioner, Department of Corrections. Several hundred thousands of dollars have been collected. Several millions list as collectibles.

Collections, record keeping, and the making of deposits are carried on at district offices and at the Central Office. Collection efforts extend to all obligated New Jersey parolees living out-of-state. Bureau collection activities are under review not only by departmental auditors but also personnel from the office of Legislative Services and the Treasury Department's audit unit.

In addition to duties as Collector, the Bureau disburses "gate" money at the district office level for state prisoners being paroled from county correctional facilities. It also distributes inmate wage checks. The Bureau's ability to purchase services on a limited basis in response to crisis situations involving medical, dental, or sustenance needs, as well as transportation and tools for the early stages of employment; has proven effective in helping to stabilize parolee adjustment patterns.

Refinement of home visit and furlough standards for juvenile and adult inmates has increased the Bureau workload. The fact that juvenile commitments are immediately eligible for parole consideration has forced Bureau members to accelerate investigative contacts regarding proposed community sites. Work release and study/release programs further involve the Bureau in community activity on behalf of prisoners, including the provision to employers and educators of a follow-up service on absenteeism, performance, and particular inmate goals and aspirations. Should work release and furlough privileges be given state prisoners housed in county facilities, the Bureau will face an appreciable increase in activity.

Institutional parole staff service all penal and correctional institutions and training schools. Staff members conduct personal interviews with inmates, counselling on specific matters to resolve problems, and to develop suitable pre-parole plans. Staff members afford every inmate pre-release classes. They also assist inmates in obtaining necessary clothing and transportation from institutions to residences. The increase in use of home visits and furloughs and the number of state prisoners in county correctional facilities have added considerably to the workloads of institutional parole office staff. Because of this increase in workloads for institutional parole staff, field staff have been pressed into assisting them. This provision of assistance causes backlogs in completion of regular field assignments.

The Bureau's residential facility - PROOF - is the only unit in the state which provides around-the-clock, short-term alternatives to confinement of selected parole violators. Also it assists parolees who are at a temporary loss to cope with personal and community situations. PROOF maintains an all hours hotline telephone service for parolees, their relatives, law enforcement units, and the general public. Counselling by staff members has expanded to include concerned relatives and friends of parolees. Development of other PROOF facilities is essential, if the needs of youngsters, women, and geriatric cases are to be met. There is an ongoing need for a South Jersey PROOF so that adult failures do not have to be carried across the state for shelter and counselling, far from the areas in which they eventually will have to make a stabilized

community adjustment. PROOF's value has been amply demonstrated for nearly thirteen years, in a densely populated North Jersey environment. Bureau personnel have the knowledge and ability to assure the successful operation of a PROOF in South Jersey.

The Bureau's Probable Cause Hearing Unit was developed in response to the Supreme Court's Morrissey Brewer mandate that alleged violators receive pre-return hearings. No parolee is exposed to parole revocation unless he has first been accorded the opportunity to participate in a hearing at which he may have counsel. Some 2,000 hearings are held yearly by senior parole officers from nine district offices and the Central Office. This obligation to serve as probable cause hearing officers takes them from casework assignments and diminishes the Bureau's ability to cope with more recalcitrant parolees.

The Volunteers in Parole Program has a limited function in all nine district parole offices. Originally, volunteers were recruited only from the legal profession, lawyers paired with parolees on an individual basis. Expansion of the volunteers' role and a widening of the base from which they are drawn have allowed interested individuals from various walks of life to offer their special talents to the reintegration process. As the scope of the volunteer program is increased, training and guidance services to volunteers must be expanded to meet certain interests: some volunteers seek an ongoing relationship with parolees while others request only particular situational involvement. Because of life experience, including (in some cases) very serious criminal histories and many years of imprisonment, parolees pose marked problems in terms of finding volunteers capable of developing an effective relationship with them.

#### ANTICIPATED NEEDS AND ISSUES

The Bureau's efforts to increase responsiveness to demands upon its services will require additional administrative and personnel resources.

Institutional parole office services have been expanded to meet the needs of state prisoners serving state sentences in county correctional facilities and the needs of the county correctional institution cases which come under jurisdiction of the State Parole Board. There is need for additional expansion to provide services to inmates housed in community residential centers (both pre-release facilities and those units which are satellites for adult and juvenile institutions). Institutional parole office personnel face increasing involvement in furlough, home visit, work/study release, and revenue collection activities and present staff cannot cope with the expanding workload. With staff increases, more attention can be given to in-depth counselling and pre-release planning, not only with inmates but with their relatives and friends.

A Revenue Collection and Service Unit has been structured from existing staff. This structuring has placed additional strain upon field personnel in the discharge of their supervisory/investigative responsibilities toward parolees and inmates. The revenue collection activities of the Bureau are becoming more complex as staff seeks payment of penalty, fine and restitution. In the past year penalty assessment increased tenfold. Tracking recipients of revenue payments is complicated, particularly in regards those slated to receive restitution.



The Central Office needs a head bookkeeper to help assure that revenue collection, disbursement of gate money and inmate wages, and payments for medical services and for meeting costs of resolving emergency situations (food, shelter, clothing, etc.), are handled in an efficient, professional manner. The bulk of Bureau records are maintained by manual systems which do not lend themselves to easy updating. Computer terminals are vital to the Bureau's addressing fiscal management needs in an efficient, cost-effective manner. Such terminals also can serve a dual role, by aiding in case management through criminal history record checks, motor vehicle look-ups, reduction of response time to law enforcement inquiries, and the tracking of parolee movement both within the state and among various states.

Recent staff increases have reduced officer caseload averages to the high 70's. Additional parole officers and senior parole officers are needed to fully implement the weighted workload and team concept. Supervision of county correctional institution parolees calls for a staff increase, as does the Bureau's assumption of supervision of all parolees previously supervised by the Division of Youth and Family Services. Furlough and home visit programs are placing increasing demands upon Bureau services, particularly where juvenile offenders are concerned. Because the Parole Board no longer has any obligation regarding revenue collection in those cases whose time portion of sentences has expired, Bureau personnel will be involved in time-consuming activities as they seek leverage from the courts to enforce payment. With Parole Board use of extended maximums via loss of commutation time, for various violations of the parole contracts, caseloads become heavier as does the record keeping attendant to changes in maximum expiration dates.

An increase in the staff of the Volunteers in Parole Program is of particular significance since the Bureau now has responsibility for the very youngest of the state's paroled offenders. Recruiting and training volunteers from a wide range of backgrounds would provide a bank of resource persons who could assist whenever parolees' emotional or physical needs require intervention without sanction. Enthusiasm on the part of volunteer candidates is essential, but not enough; adequate training is vital if misdirection and exploitation are to be avoided.

A full-time training unit is necessary to the professional growth of employees. New duties, new programs, changes in the pertinent statutes, and administrative codes refinements have exposed staff to a variety of procedural changes which demand specific training if response is to be adequate. The training unit would carry the additional duty of evaluating recruitment and assessment techniques. Professional growth of the Bureau's over three hundred employees can no longer be assured by pressing line staff into the additional duties of attempting to keep colleagues conversant with law enforcement, legal and correctional state-of-the-art.

#### MAJOR UNITS

##### Central Office

The Central Office is the Administrative Unit of the Bureau of Parole. It is staffed by the Chief, Assistant Chiefs, five supervising parole officers and the coordinators of such specialty programs as Revenue Collection, Volunteers in Parole, Furlough/Work Release and Informations Systems. Policy, personnel and

certain budgetary matters are also managed from this office. Central Office staff makes frequent visits to field sites in order to remain conversant with and assist in solving operational problems.

##### District Offices (9)

District offices are strategically located in the areas of heaviest population concentration for particular catchment zones. Each office has a supervisor, his assistant, and various field staff and their clerical support. From these offices come the activities attendant to the supervision of a daily average of some 11,500 parolees from New Jersey State 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 prisoners 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.

##### Institutional Parole Program

The institutional parole office staff, housed in the nine 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 pre-parole plans and provide detailed pre-release instructions and counselling. Parole staff members have an additional assignment, that of providing services to certain county correctional institutions and to various community release/residential centers.

##### Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility (PROOF)

Operated solely by the Bureau of Parole and located in a public housing project in Jersey City, PROOF provides a necessary service as a community based facility which supplies total support to parolees who are experiencing difficulty. For the recent institutional releasee PROOF can provide a transitional phase back into the community. As an alternative to incarceration for those who have become involved in community problems with which they cannot adequately cope, an opportunity is offered the parolee to reside at PROOF, and participate in a program of social diagnosis and treatment on a 24 hours a day, 365 days a year basis.

##### HIGHLIGHTS

Enactment of legislation easing the time restrictions pertaining to parole eligibility of county jail prisoners substantially increased the scope of Bureau activity with this type of case. District office staff has been assigned the responsibility for pre-release/release activity involving all those inmates paroled from county facilities within their jurisdiction. Over 700 such cases are being supervised with a turnover each month of some 200 within that total. Most cases paroled must meet several Special Conditions mandated by the Parole Board. The Board has also required intensive supervision in most instances. In order to meet this mandate, the Commissioner authorized the creation of ten positions with attendant vehicular support.

Bureau managerial staff participated on the Corrections Task Force of the Governor's Management Improvement Program. The two part project was led by separate private consulting firms. Organizational structure, staffing, and programs were analyzed and subjected to critical review. As the final reports began to materialize, the Bureau was gratified that its value had been well documented as had some of its needs and responsibilities. The Board's recommendation for its merger with the Bureau was not supported by the task force nor was a recommendation for a further study of that issue. The impact of recent legislation, cost effectiveness of parole supervision and need for adequate staffing was highlighted.

A concurrent resolution adopted in the New Jersey Legislature designated October 1982 as Probation-Parole Month in the state. The resolution specifically recognized the Bureau of Parole and some of its many contributions.

The Bureau's Revenue Collections Program continued to expand. Recently enacted legislation has mandated that the Violent Crimes Compensation Board penalty now be included as a part of each juvenile sentence. Bureau collectibles were approaching five million dollars at the time of an April tally of all revenues involved. The numbers of those delinquent in payments continue to grow and various alternatives are being explored to relieve this problem. Computerization of the program took a step toward reality but it appears that the fully computerized program will not be in place for at least another year. Interest in the program has been evidenced by visits from members of the Violent Crimes Compensation Board, Department of the Treasury, and the Division of Criminal Justice. Several legal issues continue to await resolution.

Despite the Bureau's repeated requests for greater professional discretion in development of parolee prescription and treatment plans, the Board persists in the use of multiple Special Conditions on almost every case. The indiscriminate use of conditions requiring intensive supervision, random urinal monitoring, and referrals to various treatment programs restrict the way Bureau personnel handle certain cases. It also precludes the practical use of the N.I.C. Client Classification and Evaluation Program which may indicate factors and needs contrary to the Board's dictates. The request that one district be allowed to remain free of these impositions so that it may effectively use the Client Management System has drawn no response, as yet.

Efforts continued throughout most of the fiscal year in preparation for the Bureau's reaccreditation audit by the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections of the American Correctional Association. The supervising parole officers were given the task of moving this project toward its ultimate goal. The Administrative Manual was completely updated and distributed to all units. Much of the primary documentation previously used to evidence standards compliance had to be revised to come into conformity to modified standards or updated procedures. The complete revision of the numbering system and the modification of a significant number of standards complicated the effort.

Bureau administrative staff were consulted by personnel from the Administrative Office of the Courts during the developmental stages of the program of intensive probation supervision. The concept was critically reviewed and ideas, suggestions, and impressions were exchanged and discussed. Ultimately departmental personnel were assigned to the advisory and screening committees.

#### DEVELOPMENTS

Bureau Central Office staff had continued involvement in administering and monitoring the Department's contract with Newark Recycling Incorporated. District Offices No. 2 and 9 and Newark House referred clientele to the Newark Recycling Incorporated Vocational Services Unit for training or job placement. As the fiscal year closed the contract for the coming year was in the process of finalization.

Ultimate disbursement of inmate wages for many state prisoners released from county facilities continue at the district offices which also act as intake for parolee claim on unpaid wages. Gate money for both state and county prisoners released from county facilities and community release locations is also granted by the field units.

Increasing numbers of parolees were released with the stipulation that they perform a designated number of hours of community service. Investigation revealed that if the performance of same was court mandated and part of the parolee's sentence, participation in probation administered/insured programs was permissible. If Board mandated, admittance to these existing programs cannot be forced. In view of any alternative state sponsored and insured program, the Board continues to be advised by field staff of those instances where compliance is not feasible.

Procedural changes included the authorization of district parole supervisors to prepare and issue termination certificates. They have also been authorized to approve pre-parole plans without the necessity of a Central Parole Bureau recommendation. An Opinion from the Office of the Attorney General has mandated the holding of probable cause hearings upon prosecutor's request on new charges even when indictments have been returned. Should a parolee be held in custody, subsequent to any probable cause hearing, pending the final revocation hearing, the reasons for this action must be made part of the recorded decision of the probable cause hearing officer.

Responsibility for all parole matters in Bergen County has been transferred to District Office No. 4. Previously they shared this responsibility with District Office No. 1. Attempts to somewhat equalize district caseloads led to this realignment during the latter days of this fiscal year.

With the upgrading of clerical titles in the institutional parole offices during the past fiscal year, all but a few of the Bureau's positions have undergone reclassification in the past three years. The fact that the Bureau continues to lose experienced people to better paying positions, some within the Department, after their training and experience with the Bureau, may be indicative of the caliber of many of the Bureau's employees.

Bureau entries, removals, and responses to the NCIC/SCIC system continues to be electronically processed by Central Office staff. The Division of Motor Vehicles data bank is also accessed routinely; computerized criminal history lookups and requests for FBI "rap sheets" are also completed via terminal operations. As the fiscal year ended, three field sites were preparing to begin initial involvement in terminal operations. Efforts were also underway to accelerate installation of terminals in all field sites in order to convert the Revenue Program into an electronic operation.

The Bureau has been pleased to note increasing support, reflected in the printed media, for the use of parole to assist in the overcrowding crisis in the penal and correctional institutions. Judiciously granted to non-violent offenders on an accelerated basis has been reported to be a cost effective means of contributing to the relief of a very serious problem.

#### PERSONNEL

As of June 30, 1983, the total complement of 304 staff members were distributed as follows:

Chief	1
Assistant Chiefs	2
Supervising Parole Officers	5
Volunteers in Parole Program (Supervisor of Volunteers and Senior Parole Officer)	2
Revenue (Senior Parole Officer)	1
County Classification Team (Senior Parole Officer)	1
County Intensive Supervision Program (Senior Parole Officer)	1
Statistics and Research (Senior Parole Officer)	1
District Parole Supervisors	9
Assistant District Parole Supervisors	11
Senior Parole Officers (Field and Institutional Parole Officers)	53
Supervisor, PROOF	1
Residential Parole Officers (PROOF)	7
Parole Officers	121
Clerical	88
Total	304

The Bureau was saddened upon the demise of former District Parole Supervisor Pratt, District Office No. 4, on January 26. His death followed a lengthy illness during which he evidenced great courage. He is missed by his friends and co-workers.

Staff increased by 20 positions in February as the Bureau added 1 supervising parole officer, 9 parole officers, 1 principal clerk transcriber and 9 senior clerk transcribers.

Bureau staff was expanded by an additional 10 positions in April when authorization was granted to hire 9 parole officers and 1 senior parole officer to implement a program of intensive supervision on selected county parolees.

The Central Office position of Furlough/Work Release Coordinator, along with its incumbent was upgraded and reassigned to the then Bureau of Community Release Program.

The senior parole officer position assigned to the County Classification and Identification Unit now shares time with the institutional parole office at Jamesburg.


The Bureau absorbed, via bumping rights, former employees of other divisional units at the time of cutbacks translating into layoffs within those units.

A former VISTA worker joined the staff of District Office No. 6 where he had served his VISTA tenure as a parole officer.

Reasons for resignations from the Bureau included acceptance of higher paid institutional positions, higher paying positions in the Department and with the Federal Civil Service.

The Bureau of Parole Organization Chart follows on the next page.

BUREAU OF PAROLE  
Organizational Chart





# CASELOAD

As of June 30, 1983, a total of 11,900 cases were reported under the supervision of the Bureau of Parole by its various components. This represented a total increase of 2,277 cases during the course of the fiscal year. District caseloads as of June 30, 1983 were as follows:

DO#1 - 1629	DO#6 - 1267
DO#2 - 1460	DO#7 - 1175
DO#3 - 1258	DO#8 - 1208
DO#4 - 1379	DO#9 - 1151
DO#5 - 1076	*COSF - 297

Bureau Total - 11,900

\*COSF does not entail supervision - rather it is a caseload of inmates "max cases" and New Jersey parolees residing out of state with revenue obligations being handled by the Parole Bureau as part of its legislated responsibilities.

Total Bureau caseload of 11,900 included 539 females under supervision.

## 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 by the paroling authority on Bureau's recommendations:

Type of Commitment	Granted	Denied	Total
Prison	47	16	63
Young Adult	49	21	70
Juvenile	7	0	7
Total	103	37	140

## 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 Chiefs) to formulate operating procedures, establish policy and to conduct the hearings. Having accomplished these goals, in January, 1978 a Probable Cause Hearing Unit composed of four senior parole officers was established. Under the supervision of a supervising parole officer, the senior parole officers were responsible for conducting all probable cause hearings throughout the state.

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

In order to comply with a Supreme Court Decision, the following tabulation of probable cause hearings and decisions was compiled in Fiscal 1983:

a. Hearing requested and hearing held	772
b. Hearing waived and hearing held	65
c. No response from parolee and hearing held	754
d. Hearing waived and no hearing held	215
e. Probable cause found and formal revocation hearing to follow	1579
f. Continuation of parole recommended although valid violations determined	193
g. Continuation on parole -- no valid violations determined	34
h. Other	0
Total hearing scheduled (columns a+b+c+d)	1806
Probable cause found and revocation hearing to follow	1579 (87.4 percent)

## DISTRICT PAROLE SUPERVISORS' DECISIONS

DO#	Authorization to Continue on Parole	Continue on Bail*
1	125	246
2	145	159
3	348	258
4	370	267
5	300	191
6	226	149
7	277	184
8	119	193
9	147	194
Totals	2057	1841

\*Prosecutors did not request probable cause action. Bureau currently lacks authority to act regardless of circumstances surrounding offense.

# RATIO OF FIELD TO OFFICE TIME

The following chart indicates the hours and percentage of officers' time spent in the office as compared to field in Fiscal 1983.

<u>Month/Year</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Total</u>
July 1982	7,599	8,220	15,819
August	7,226	8,825	16,051
September	6,717	9,633	16,350
October	7,626	9,225	16,851
November	6,880	7,959	14,839
December	7,304	8,704	16,008
January 1983	7,950	9,186	17,136
February	7,083	8,020	15,103
March	9,808	10,685	20,493
April	7,846	9,703	17,549
May	8,441	9,909	18,350
June	9,286	10,257	19,543
Totals	93,766	110,326	204,092
Percent	46%	54%	100%

# TREATMENT

As of June 30, 1983, the New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission indicated that it was servicing a total parole caseload in Newark of 102 cases of which 53 were on Active status and 49 on Referred status. Although the 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 1,232 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#2 - Staff made total of 77 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#3 - Staff made total of 217 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#4 - Staff made total of 124 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#5 - Staff made total of 80 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#6 - Staff made total of 596 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#7 - Staff made total of 282 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#8 - Staff made total of 536 contacts after normal working hours.
- DO#9 - Staff made total of 372 contacts after normal working hours.

Bureau staff made a grand total of 3,516 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 90 reviews were completed, resulting in 4 (4.4 percent) 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.

# COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT (CETA)

As the result of Bureau referrals, it was determined that at the end of June 1983, 1100 parolees had been accepted in the various CETA programs.

# FURLOUGH/HOME VISIT/WORK/STUDY PROGRAM

The Bureau of Parole continued to provide, during the past fiscal year, the field investigation and monitoring for the Furlough Program which had been absent prior to its reinstitution in March of 1976. Thus, the Bureau has maintained its important contributions, insuring uniformity and consistency in operating procedures, helping to protect the community by completing field investigation of furlough destinations, notifying local law enforcement authorities regarding each furlough, and providing feedback to the institutional classification committees. In no small measure, the program's continued success can be attributed to these factors.

Although the Bureau's activity during the past fiscal year did not match the dramatic rises of Fiscal 1981 (+45.5%) and Fiscal 1982 (+33.5%), the overall district office responsibility continued to expand. In the most vital aspect, the initial investigation of furlough destinations, 1591 were completed, an increase of 1.3%; the rejection rate remained about the same, slightly under 13%. However, both the 2397 follow-up investigations at furlough addresses or at local police departments, and the 1637 telephone "check-in" calls received at the district offices or at PROOF, represented decreases, 15.4% and 2.0% respectively, compared to the previous fiscal year.

The expansion of the Juvenile Home Visit Program brought a corresponding increase of work for the Bureau. The 207 initial investigations of home visit destinations and the 402 follow-up contacts represent an identical percentage increase, 10.7%, over the investigations completed during Fiscal 1982. The disapprovals of 32 of the home visit destinations amounted to a rejection rate of 15.5%.

All of the above activity in both the Adult Furlough Program and the Juvenile Home Visit Program required the driving of 27,613 miles and the spending of 4160 work-hours, decreases of 8.2% and 5.7% in mileage and time expenditure.

The program which involved the greatest increase in demand of time and effort from the district offices was the Work/Study Release Program. As the economy improved and the contract halfway houses complied more completely with standards, more requests for investigation of work/study sites were sent to the district coordinators. With all of the district coordinators involved to some degree: 160 initial investigations were completed, a 24.0% increase over Fiscal 1982; 25 of the work sites were disapproved (+19.0%); 2,889 miles were driven (+20.5%); and 319½ hours were expended (26.9%) to accomplish the work. At the present time, program standards do not provide for on-going monitoring of work/study releasees from either the institutions or the halfway houses except by special request. No such requests were received during the past year, and therefore, no monitoring was performed by the district offices.

All indications point to a continued increase in the volume of activity for the Bureau in connection with the various pre-parole Community Release Programs. As the institutional population increases, the number of furloughs and investigations will likely increase, simply on the basis of a comparable increase in the number of eligible inmates. New Juvenile Home Visit Standards will extend the Bureau's responsibility to include home visits from the juvenile community residential centers and will likely involve twice the time and effort that the district offices currently expend on the juvenile program. Increase of placements in the halfway houses is likely to continue, requiring additional furlough and work/study site investigations. The provision of work release for state-sentenced inmates housed at county facilities remains a possibility; such a program would require initial investigations as well as on-going monitoring in those counties having work release programs.

In the pre-parole community release programs, as in other areas of Bureau activity, the workload constantly becomes greater. More help is needed.

	INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED								MILEAGE	HOURS
	INITIAL						FOLLOW-UP (Home or P.D.)			
	HOME or P.D.				REJECTION (Rate) %					
1981 - 1982	Adult	H.V.	Adult	H.V.	Adult	H.V.	Adult	H.V.		
July 1981	119	30	21	8	17.6	26.7	203	46	2646	372
Aug. 1981	116	18	16	4	13.8	22.2	241	24	2418	354
Sept. 1981	132	20	17	2	13.0	10.0	224	31	2776	403
Oct. 1981	129	16	12	7	9.3	43.8	227	29	2056	343½
Nov. 1981	106	11	16	2	15.1	18.2	223	23	2016	324
Dec. 1981	122	10	13	0	10.7	0.0	302	41	2088	326
Jan. 1982	136	20	19	5	13.9	25.0	222	17	3062	421
Feb. 1982	125	15	25	3	20.0	20.0	209	49	2406	367
Mar. 1982	174	17	17	4	9.8	23.5	233	24	2833	373
Apr. 1982	115	5	15	1	13.0	20.0	255	37	2155	352
May 1982	146	16	16	3	11.0	18.8	250	23	3129	382
June 1982	150	9	24	0	16.0	0.0	241	19	2508	396
(Avg. Per Mo.)	(130.8)	(15.6)	(17.6)	(3.3)	-	-	(236.0)	(30.3)	(2507.8)	(367.8)
TOTALS	1570	187	211	39	13.4	20.9	2832	363	30093	4413½
COMPARISONS										
%INCREASE	1.3%	10.7%						10.7%		
%DECREASE			2.4%	17.9%	-	-	15.4%		8.2%	5.7%
1982 - 1983										
July 1982	145	41	20	7	13.8	17.1	266	41	2990	451
Aug. 1982	119	15	10	1	8.4	6.7	226	42	1327	303
Sept. 1982	121	8	22	1	18.2	12.5	225	48	2058	322
Oct. 1982	131	17	16	2	12.2	11.8	270	38	2103	324
Nov. 1982	117	16	17	2	14.5	12.5	219	38	1986	321
Dec. 1982	116	15	18	2	15.5	13.3	213	34	1326	283
Jan. 1983	140	13	16	2	11.4	15.4	168	21	3163	370
Feb. 1983	121	18	13	4	10.7	22.2	165	20	2401	355
Mar. 1983	123	12	19	0	15.4	0.0	193	41	2799	361
Apr. 1983	153	19	18	3	11.8	15.8	165	32	2549	362
May 1983	161	17	21	4	13.0	23.5	134	26	2028	365
June 1983	144	16	16	4	11.1	25.0	153	21	2883	343
(Avg. Per Mo.)	(132.6)	(17.3)	(17.2)	(2.7)	-	-	(199.8)	(33.5)	(2301.1)	(346.7)
TOTALS	1591	207	206	32	12.9	15.5	2397	402	27613	4160

# INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE PROGRAM

Institutional parole offices located at the following institutions provide necessary services between the institution and field staff to affect a smooth, scientific reentry into the community by over 4,300 parolees during the past calendar year. Other services not included in the statistics listed below have overtaxed the current staff members and a need for expansion in personnel in some offices is evident, as is the need for a unit to service county facilities and pre-release centers.

	Pre-Parole Interviews	Inmate Requested Interviews	Released On Parole	Parole Classes	Orientation Classes
*NJSP	2774	1257	1167	484	83
YRCC	745	1996	696	212	49
YCIB	1077	1361	636	101	50
YCIA	1372	2474	885	161	7
TS-J	783	1163	522	190	18
TS-SK	378	797	167	136	--
CIW	635	1591	250	245	32
Totals	7764	10,639	4323	1529	239

\*Includes offices at Trenton, Rahway, Midstate, and Leesburg State Prisons

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

D.O.	Preparole Interviews	Parole Classes	Parole Releases
DO#1	653	403	456
DO#2	980	484	574
DO#3	702	257	231
DO#4	428	314	231
DO#5	174	58	166
DO#6	591	526	520
DO#7	291	314	318
DO#8	487	302	317
DO #9	265	214	198
Totals	4571	2872	3011

## PAROLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

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

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

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

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

## TEAM SUPERVISION

Team membership does not lessen a parole officer's individual caseload responsibilities. It does make his particular expertise - and that of other team members - available to the aggregate caseload. The caseload is comprised of service and hard-to-manage categories of parole supervision: no routine involvement of orientation cas@s. As of June 30, 1983, the districts reported the following team involvement:

- DO#1 - One team of two officers, three teams of three, one team of five.
- DO#2 - Three teams of four each, one team of three.
- DO#3 - Four teams of four each.
- DO#4 - Three teams of four each, one team of five.
- DO#5 - Two teams of four each, one team of three.
- DO#6 - Two teams of three, two of four each.
- DO#7 - One team of five, another of seven.
- DO#8 - Three teams of three each.
- DO#9 - Three teams of six each.

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.

Further, classification teams comprised 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 1982)

During calendar year 1982, 12,753 parolees under supervision earned \$32,247,172, a decrease of \$919,221 under earnings for calendar year 1981.

Forty-four percent (5641) of those under supervision during the year were classified as employed (worked all or part of the period under supervision,

which period of supervision could be from one week to the full year) and twenty-four percent (3084) were unemployed throughout their entire period of supervision, although employable. The other thirty-two percent (4028) were classified as unemployable by reason of being missing, or in custody for the entire period of supervision during the year, or attending school, being engaged in homemaking, or being incapacitated.

#### TRAINING

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

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

Speakers for the training sessions were recruited from Gamblers Anonymous, the Council for the Prevention of Child Abuse, the Parole Board, VIPP, the NCIC/SCIC Data Entry Operator, and the Bureau's Revenue Coordinator.

B. Other Training Activities: Bureau staff interfaced with probation officers in a series of training sessions including Basic Guided Group Interaction, Advanced Guided Group Interaction, Recognition and Treatment of the Alcoholic, and Counseling Techniques.

District staff provided orientation to field services at least monthly, usually more frequently, to correction officers attending formal training at the Academy.

Central Office provided a staff speaker on the responsibilities of the Bureau at each of the bi-monthly departmental orientations.

Training relative to the N.I.C. Client Classification and Management System continued throughout most of the year and involved the entire field staff.

The Bureau provided a one day orientation to programs and administrators to newly hired staff.

The Department sponsored two middle management seminars for Bureau staff. The first dealt with inter-personal relationships while the issues of the second surrounded legal rights of parole staff.

Selected members of the Bureau's supervisory staff began a course in Certified Public Management offered by the Department of Civil Service in conjunction with Rutgers University.

Bureau staff attended several stress management seminars conducted by Dr. Cheek. Included was a Train the Trainer course, Stress Management Techniques and Managerial Strategies to Reduce Correctional Stress.

The Bureau's supervisory and managerial officers were addressed by staff of the Bureau of Personnel.

Several staff members attended a course, sponsored by the Correction Officers Training Academy, dealing with advanced juvenile officers training.

Selected staff members attended annual conferences of the Middle Atlantic States Correctional Association, New Jersey Volunteers in Courts and Corrections, and American Probation and Parole Association.

#### REVENUE PROGRAM

Revenue collection by the Bureau of Parole is authorized by recently (1981) enacted laws resultant from former Assembly Bills 3093 and 3648. The Bureau's involvement in revenue collection is in the following three areas:

Penalty - a court imposed assessment ranging from \$25 (\$10 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. Penalty payments have first priority and all payments apply entirely to the penalty balance until paid off completely.

Restitution - in addition to penalty or penalties and/or fines, the court may award crime victims financial restitution for losses suffered. The State Parole Board may require that the parolee make full or partial restitution, the amount of which is set by the sentencing court upon request of the Board. Restitution has second priority in that a penalty assessment must be paid in full before any payment is made for restitution, and restitution payments must be paid in full before any payment is made for a fine assessment.

Fine - in addition to penalty or penalties and/or restitution, the court may impose a fine as partial punishment upon conviction of a criminal act. Fines collected are deposited to the Anticipated Revenue Account of the Administrative Office of the Courts. Fines, having the third priority, are the last balances to be paid off when the parolee is obligated to make penalty and/or restitution payments in addition to fine payments.

The following two pages provide a summary of collections to date, by district, type of revenue and totals. Further, it contrasts the collections of Fiscal Year 1983 with Fiscal Year 1982 and that of Fiscal Year 1981, the first three years of the Bureau's involvement in this type of responsibility.



	FY '82	-22-	FY '83	3 Year Total
District Office 1	Penalty \$ 3,036.50		Penalty \$ 8,171.00	
	Restitution 225.00		Restitution 994.00	
	Fine 4,360.00		Fine 6,238.00	
	Annual Collection \$ 7,621.50		Annual Collection \$15,403.00	\$25,509.50
District Office 2	Penalty \$ 1,339.00		Penalty \$ 5,537.00	
	Restitution -		Restitution 20.00	
	Fine 9,556.45		Fine 10,624.00	
	Annual Collection \$10,895.45		Annual Collection \$16,181.00	\$32,631.95
District Office 3	Penalty \$ 4,665.00		Penalty \$ 8,376.50	
	Restitution 1,460.00		Restitution 1,435.00	
	Fine 19,990.30		Fine 10,560.00	
	Annual Collection \$26,115.30		Annual Collection \$20,371.50	\$52,331.80
District Office 4	Penalty \$ 987.00		Penalty \$ 4,538.50	
	Restitution 100.00		Restitution 50.00	
	Fine 10,783.00		Fine 18,838.98	
	Annual Collection \$11,870.00		Annual Collection \$23,427.48	\$47,712.48
District Office 5	Penalty \$ 2,239.21		Penalty \$ 6,923.09	
	Restitution -		Restitution 1,006.00	
	Fine 4,620.00		Fine 4,290.00	
	Annual Collection \$ 6,859.21		Annual Collection \$12,219.09	\$22,692.30

	FY '82	-23-	FY '83	3 Year Total
District Office 6	Penalty \$ 1,405.00		Penalty \$ 7,205.00	
	Restitution -		Restitution 964.18	
	Fine 5,053.67		Fine 12,015.00	
	Annual Collection \$ 6,458.67		Annual Collection \$20,184.18	\$29,622.85
District Office 7	Penalty \$ 1,613.00		Penalty \$ 8,168.00	
	Restitution 462.16		Restitution 423.00	
	Fine 2,011.00		Fine 4,305.00	
	Annual Collection \$ 4,086.16		Annual Collection \$12,896.00	\$17,841.16
District Office 8	Penalty \$ 4,170.00		Penalty \$11,795.52	
	Restitution 1,040.55		Restitution 4,385.48	
	Fine 4,901.00		Fine 10,215.00	
	Annual Collection \$10,111.55		Annual Collection \$26,396.00	\$39,672.55
District Office 9	Penalty \$ 455.00		Penalty \$ 2,650.20	
	Restitution -		Restitution -	
	Fine 2,435.00		Fine 3,200.00	
	Annual Collection \$ 2,890.00		Annual Collection \$ 5,850.20	\$ 9,685.20
District Office 10	Penalty \$11,542.19		Penalty \$30,445.03	
	Restitution 150.00		Restitution 1,602.00	
	Fine 40,653.00		Fine 15,497.00	
	Annual Collection \$52,345.19		Annual Collection \$47,544.03	\$118,085.2
Totals	Penalty \$31,451.90		Penalty \$93,809.84	\$126,256.74
	Restitution 3,437.71		Restitution 10,879.66	\$ 15,209.37
	Fine 104,363.42		Fine 95,782.98	\$254,318.90
Bureau Accumulative Total	\$139,253.03		\$200,472.48	\$395,785.01
	FY '81 \$56,059.50			

## PAROLE RESOURCE OFFICE AND ORIENTATION FACILITY

### I. Statement of Purpose

The Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility (PROOF) is a community based facility operated by the Bureau of Parole, Division of Policy and Planning, Department of Corrections. It is a resource available to the field parole staff of the nine district offices statewide, which provides supportive services to parolees who are experiencing difficult adjustment problems in the community. It is staffed 24 hours per day, 365 days per year by professional parole officers who are skilled in counselling and community resource development.

A unique aspect of PROOF is its ability to provide emergency housing for up to 15 dislocated male parolees. Newly released parolees, as well as those who have been in the community for extended periods, frequently find themselves unable to maintain themselves in the community as a result of unemployment, collapse of family support, and other reasons. In such situations of stress the parolee is referred by the field officer to PROOF for intensive supervision and casework services which are designed to assist the resident with his efforts to reorganize or reintegrate with the community.

The residential setting permits extensive individual and group counselling; observations and evaluation of social and behavioral problems; designing and planning of a comprehensive community reintegration program which may include employment, medical and financial support services, etc.; and organization and mobilization of community resources through appropriate referrals and follow through. PROOF is non-custodial and is not viewed as an alternative to incarceration but rather as an intervention tool which might, when properly used, prevent eventual return to an institution.

PROOF maintains a 24 hour per day hotline service. All persons released on parole are advised of the number, as are family members and all police agencies. If a problem arises at a time when the district offices are closed, a parole officer can be reached for information, advice, and counselling.

PROOF also maintains a complete mirror file of all Bureau issued NCIC/SCIC Wanted Person Notices. Through PROOF, the Bureau of Parole is therefore capable of providing nearly instant confirmation of "hits" on a 24 hour, seven day a week basis. This capability is vital to the Bureau's participation in the NCIC/SCIC information network.

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

### II. Statistical Information

#### A. History

PROOF was opened late in 1969 and admitted its first resident on December 2,

1969. Thirteen and one half (13½) years later, on June 29, 1983, PROOF admitted their 1775th resident.

#### B. Utilization Rate

From July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1983 there were a total of 5475 resident days available (15 beds x 365 days). Of this total, 4080 days were utilized. The average daily population was 11.2 residents for an operating average of 74.52%. For the same period last year the facility operated at 77.68% of capacity with an average daily population of 11.7. This represents an insignificant change in rate of utilization. The average occupancy rate for the previous five years (Fiscal 1978 to 1982) has been 71.21%.

#### C. Admissions

On June 30, 1982 there were 13 parolees in residence at PROOF. From July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1983 there were 172 admissions. In Fiscal 1982 there were 166 admissions. The 13 in residence plus the 172 admitted made a total of 185 residents serviced during the year. This is 8 more than last years total of 177.

#### D. Terminations

During the year there were 170 terminations of residency leaving 15 parolees in residence as of June 30, 1983. These 170 cases spent a total of 3872 days in residence for an average length of stay of 22.8 days. This is down from last years average length of stay of 25.6 days.

Ninety-five (55.9%) of the terminations were by reason of relocation in the community. Twenty-eight (16.5%) were AWOL, failed to return and are presumed to have relocated in the community. Thirteen (7.7%) had been admitted on an emergency basis for the night only and were referred to the district office for further assistance. Nine (5.3%) entered other residential programs more suited to their needs (drug, alcohol, or hospital). Twenty-one (12.4%) were asked to leave for various infractions of house rules ranging from curfew violations to assaulting staff members. The remaining 4 (2.4%) were known to be arrested on new charges in the community.

#### E. Referrals

PROOF received 281 referrals during the year which resulted in the above noted 172 admissions. The breakdown of admission according to referring district office and institutions of parole is shown in Table I which is appended to the end of this section. District Office No. 4 provided the most admission with 50 (27%).

### III. Casework

A. One of the major goals of the program is to assist residents in developing self-sufficiency so that they can maintain themselves in the community. For most residents this means obtaining full time employment. To this end PROOF has employed the services of various community resources such as New Jersey State Employment Service, New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission,

U.S. Armed Forces, Newark Services Agency, and Job Bank. (Almost all residents are usually successful in obtaining temporary employment on a daily basis through private agencies as Labor Pool, Olsten's, Thompson's Staff Builders, and Manpower.

Staff also works to the best of its abilities in developing direct employment referrals for the residents. At the time of their termination, 73 (43%) residents were employed.

The overwhelming majority of those who left residence without employment stayed at PROOF for only brief lengths of time. About 5% are unemployable and staff assists these individuals in applying for SSI or Welfare benefits as is appropriate.

B. Many residents have taken advantage of the education and training programs available in the area. Some have continued their education in general equivalency diploma programs and at Jersey City State College and at Hudson County Community College. Others have gained occupational training through CETA programs.

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

During the year PROOF was able to provide financial assistance through Mini-Grants totaling \$41. A total of 13 grants were made. Most grants were for transportation expenses. Some were for toilet articles and clothing. A few were for medical prescriptions.

The lack of refunding of the Mini-Grant fund has severely curtailed PROOF's ability to help indigent residents with minor but necessary expenses for transportation, etc. Residents often arrive with no financial resources and are unable to buy a 60¢ bus ride to the various industrial areas where most of the jobs are.

Clothing is solicited and many donations of used items are received during the year for resident use.

D. Health care needs also present a problem for residents. Acute illnesses are treated through the Jersey City Medical Center Emergency Room and various clinics including the dental clinic and the venereal disease clinic.

The declaration of bankruptcy this past January by the Jersey City Medical Center has caused that facility to severely cut back on its clinic services to indigents in need of medical treatment.

Restorative dental care and other health services have also been provided through New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission. New Eyes for the Needy has provided several residents with prescription eyeglasses. Community Mental Health Center has been used for the mental health care of the residents.

E. Counselling remains one of the most basic services which we provide the residents. The intensive, in-depth, intake interview enables the staff to evaluate the resident's current situation and problems. A plan for return to the community which is individually designed to meet the resident's needs is then developed. A staff member is assigned to each resident to provide for continued counselling. The assigned counselor meets with the resident at least weekly to review prior performance, identify problems and suggest corrective measures, and to assist the resident in planning for relocation.

F. Attendance at the weekly house meeting is required for all residents. Upon the direction of Residential Parole Officer Gremmo, the groups enter into free wheeling, open ended discussion of a wide range of topics. Meetings are not considered therapy, nor just bull sessions, but deal with the practical problems facing residents such as employment, sexual relationships, group living, etc. The rate of unexcused absences is low and resident interest and participation is quite good.

G. This year PROOF has resumed Pre-Employment Preparation (PEP) Workshops. All new admissions are strongly encouraged to attend PEP. The session provides an overview of the current employment situation in the area, gives information on various resources that are available and helps residents plan an employment seeking strategy. The strategy covers where to look, how to file an application, how to interview and how to follow up an application. Most participants respond favorably to the experience and report positive results when they employ various aspects of the strategy.

#### IV. Hotline and Furlough Reporting Service

A. The hotline was established at PROOF on October 1, 1974. All parolees upon their release, as well as most police agencies are informed of the number. Over the past year PROOF received a total of 486 calls. The number is 68 more calls than received last year and represents an average of 40.5 calls per month. Since the start of the hotline service PROOF has received a total of 2215 calls.

Effective January 28, 1982 a "mirror file" of all NCIC/SCIC Wanted Person Notices issued by the Bureau was established at PROOF. This file has enabled the Bureau, through PROOF, to provide 24 hour confirmation of "wants" in response to NCIC "hits" with a "turn around time of 10 minutes or less." This capability is mandated as a national policy for all users of NCIC. This year PROOF has responded to a total of 84 NCIC inquiries.

B. During the year PROOF received 1237 furlough calls. All calls are recorded and are held for verification by the district Furlough Coordinator.

#### V. Personnel

A. There is a total of nine staff positions assigned to PROOF. These include one supervisor, parole residential facility; seven residential parole officers; and one senior clerk transcriber.

B. All positions were filled at the beginning and end of the fiscal year. Residential Parole Officer Ferrel has submitted his resignation effective

June 22, 1983. In anticipation of his departure, Parole Officer Brunner, District Office No. 4, has been assigned to PROOF for orientation and training effective June 27, 1983 in anticipation of promotion to fill Mr. Ferrel's vacated position.

#### VI. Management

A. PROOF continues to function without benefits of a lease. The lease with Jersey City Housing Authority expired October, 1978. PROOF continues to work towards a new lease agreement and has been encouraged by some signs of apparent movement.

B. During the latter part of the year PROOF has been making arrangements for the installation of a computer terminal. The phone lines and electrical service have been installed and PROOF is now awaiting delivery of the actual hardware.

C. Effective January 1, 1983, Jersey City Medical Center ceased to provide food services to PROOF. The termination of this service after 13 years was brought about by the declaration of bankruptcy by that facility.

PROOF was successful in making arrangements with a nearby restaurant for food service. So far this arrangement appears to be satisfactory. However, several limitations including menu, cost, service, and atmosphere leave PROOF looking for a more permanent and more appropriate method of feeding residents.

#### VII. Public Relations

The reintegration of the parolee within his environment cannot be accomplished without the cooperation, assistance, and support of the community. A good rapport with many agencies and individuals in the community is essential to the effective operation of the facility. Throughout the year PROOF is in frequent contact with various employment placement agencies, social services agencies, medical facilities, and private citizens. PROOF believes they are fortunate in enjoying a good working relationship with the people most helpful to their operations.

TABLE I  
ADMISSION TO PROOF BY DISTRICT OFFICE AND BY INSTITUTIONAL DESIGNATIONS  
7-1-82 to 6-30-83

	TSBJ	YRCC	YCIA	YCIB	NJSP	OS	COUNTY JAIL	FY 83 TOTAL	FY 82 TOTAL
DO #1	1	2	4	1	9	1	0	18	22
DO #2	2	3	0	3	8	0	2	18	30
DO #3	2	6	4	6	14	2	1	35	33
DO #4	2	4	6	9	26	0	3	50	43
DO #5	0	3	6	3	6	0	1	19	15
DO #6	0	0	3	0	3	2	0	8	8
DO #7	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	5	4
DO #8	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	5	7
DO #9	2	1	5	1	17	0	1	27	15
FY 83 TOTAL	9	20	29	24	89	6	8	185	XXX
FY 82 TOTAL	4	29	31	32	77	4	0	XXX	177



#### SPECIAL PROJECTS

Reduced availability of federal funding has diminished Bureau involvement in special projects for the second consecutive year.

However, participation in National Institute of Corrections sponsored project of Client Classification and Management continues. The Core Team met periodically during the year and was provided with the technical assistance of several consultants. The CMC trainers organized and presented training to most of the field staff. Several problems attendant to proper implementation have developed and are in the process of study and deliberation. Some funding remains available to the Bureau, but not in the areas of staffing or vehicular support.

Throughout the fiscal year the Bureau continued as host agency for VISTA workers assigned to several different districts and the Central Office; their duties were varied. The consensus is that they are an asset to the units to which they were, and in some instances, still are assigned. The present program has been given an extension beyond the close of the current fiscal year. The Bureau's proposed program for future involvement with VISTA remains pending. Apparently continuation funding for the entire VISTA concept is undergoing congressional review and debate. Should the Bureau's proposed program receive approval, the number of participants will be set by the size of the grant.

The Bureau continues participation in the Turrell Fund's Scholarship Program. Field units submit applications on behalf of qualifying 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 quite a few individuals who might not otherwise been given the opportunity.

Presently, other than the VISTA application cited above, the Bureau has no projects awaiting specialty funding.

#### VOLUNTEER IN PAROLE PROGRAM

Organizationally the Volunteers In Parole Program is an auxiliary component of the New Jersey Bureau of Parole and is used to deliver many and varied services to parole clients. Since parole is a service-oriented concept in addition to being supervisory, volunteers can play an important role in conjunction with the parole officer.

Volunteers continue to be recruited from every phase of society and when possible, colleges and universities are solicited for students interested in interning with the Bureau of Parole. Hopefully, this segment of volunteerism will increase as our recruitment becomes more intense.

Continuation funding for the program with VISTA remains questionable; however, it continues to function on a month to month basis. At present there are two VISTA volunteers and they have proved invaluable to the districts to which they are assigned. It is interesting to note that four VISTA volunteers have left in the past year, one of whom was hired as a parole officer with District Office No. 6. One returned to college, one retired, and the last gained fulltime employment.

Again, as last year, the amount of volunteers seems to be dwindling instead of increasing. Traditionally, volunteers are recruited by staff members who speak to church groups and social or business club meetings. However, the present situation may necessitate a more innovative approach. In short, there appears to be no shortage of those who want to help. There is a problem locating and assigning them. This will be addressed in the coming months and we anticipate the cooperation of all districts.

The chart on the following page is a statistical breakdown of the program.

SCATTER AND TYPES OF VOLUNTEERS  
1982-1983

DO#	ASSIGNED	UNASSIGNED	INACTIVE	SPECIAL SERVICE	TOTAL ASSIGNED	TOTAL AVAILABLE	TOTAL VOLUNTEERS	PERCENT ASSIGNED
1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	100
2	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	50
3	6	4	3	0	6	7	13	46
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	100
6	3	5	7	3	3	15	18	16
7	1	4	5	0	1	9	10	10
8	5	10	2	0	5	12	17	29
9	0	9	0	0	0	9	9	0
Total	19	32	18	3	19	53	72	26

#### NCIC/SCIC OPERATIONS

With the advent of the Bureau's own terminal in June, 1982 Central Office staff assumed all input of entering wanted persons, supplementals, modifications, and cancellations. In addition, staff is responsible for obtaining all criminal histories and administrative inquiries, receipts and processing of all "hit" notifications from in and out of state and the notification of all "wants" and cancellation on a daily basis to PROOF. The latter is done so that we may provide, on a 24 hour 365 day a year basis, a requesting agency with verification as to whether a parole subject is in or out of the system. In addition, validations of all records are completed two times per year through the Bureau in accordance with State Police requirements. This has been proved a learning experience for all involved and as per the results of the most recent validations list it appears that the districts are, for the most part, properly processing their entries in a timely fashion. We had experienced a great deal of "downtime" because of software problems with the computer, however, it was finally rectified and for the past three months of this fiscal year we appeared to be running at peak efficiency. The yearly computer activity was as follows:

Entries	585
Supplementals	736
Modifications	353
Inquiries	164
Cancellations	543
Criminal Histories	902
Hits Processed	839

Obviously, terminal activity played a major role with the Volunteers in Parole Program staff.

#### COUNTY IDENTIFICATION TEAM

The major activity of the County Identification Team during the year has been priority processing of state inmates confined in various county facilities and who are awaiting transfer into an appropriate state institution. The prevailing situation has remained relatively unchanged through the year, and is particularly grave at the following county jails: Essex, Monmouth, Hudson, Passaic, Mercer, Bergen, and Atlantic. These seven jails account for 70% of the total number of inmates processed by the Team. Statistical data is provided in a later section of this report.

One of the continual problems confronting the Team has been the sudden changes in site visits. This is usually in response to unanticipated emergencies arising at a particular county jail. By continually making improvements in Team scheduling practices, the Team's overall effectiveness has remained at a high level of performance. While this cycle remains greatly influenced by court mandated transfers, State Parole Board requests and other factors unique to the county jail crisis, an accurate schedule of site visits has improved the quality and quantity of work performed by the Team.

Another Team function has been to provide to the State Parole Board classification material used at parole hearings. Several procedures needed were

developed in order to streamline this process and to reduce the problems encountered initially, including duplication of effort and timely delivery of this material to the Board.

In November, 1982 the County Identification Team moved from Prison Reception Unit, Yardville to newly renovated offices on departmental grounds at Central Office. The move provided the Team with its own office and significantly better accommodations than those provided at Yardville. However, Prison Reception remains the central location of all folders generated by the Team and continues to be the source of the materials provided to the State Parole Board and the Bureau.

The matter of access to dependable transportation on a daily basis has been worked out with few problems, but restricts the senior parole officer to the Team's schedule without consideration to related institutional parole office duties and tasks. Adequate transportation to perform Bureau related work has remained an ongoing issue throughout the year and is not yet resolved. Without greater independence from the Team work flow pertaining to Bureau matters remains dependent upon the Team's schedule. The impact of this situation is obvious; the amount of time spent servicing pre-parole planning and release of state prisoners from local county jails remains a major activity for field personnel.

During the past year the County Identification Team recognized additional services it could perform for the Bureau, in particular the Revenue Unit. In August, the Team started to distribute information regarding the Bureau's procedures for collection of court assessed fines, penalties, and restitution. More than 2500 inmates have received such letters and hopefully many of these inmates will take the initiative to satisfy their revenue obligations prior to release. Additionally, the Team will also provide a copy of the Judgment of Conviction on each inmate processed during each month. This development will enhance just one of the many methods of identifying inmates who owe a penalty or other financial obligation.

Finally, in February an agreement was reached with the Bureau of County Services for the Bureau to utilize the services of the Team's senior parole officer to assist the institutional parole office at Jamesburg two days per week. Emphasis was placed on assuming responsibility for the many satellite units located throughout the state. Although this assignment has brought relief to the many district offices who were burdened with requests from the institutional parole office for aid in parole releases, two days per week is insufficient to provide complete latitude in servicing the satellite units throughout the entire state. A full time position could be reasonable justified.

#### Statistical Data:

Total number of inmates processed	2932
State Prison	2369
Indeterminate	563
Pre-Parole Interviews	224

Workload by County (seven busiest jails) -- Percentages

Essex	18%
Monmouth	11
Hudson	10
Passaic	9
Mercer	9
Bergen	8
Atlantic	5

70%

Note: 15 remaining sites generate less than 30% of total workload.

TSB & G Jamesburg (Satellite Units)  
(4 month period ending June 30, 1983)

a) Parole releases during the period	25
b) Number of parole classes and participants	15(25)
c) Requested inmate interviews granted	37
d) Pre-Parole interviews held	68

PUBLIC RELATIONS

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

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

Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Association  
Tri-State Association of Criminal Investigators  
Rutgers University  
Hispanic Health and Mental Health Association of Camden  
Frontiers International  
Cape May County Investigators Association  
Deborah Hospital  
Salvation Army  
H.O.P.E.  
Hispanic Coalition on Alcohol and Drug Abuse  
Essex County Mental Health Association  
Peter W. Rodino Institute of Criminal Justice  
N.J. Association for Ex-Offender Employment Services  
Somerset Chaplaincy Council  
Camden County College  
The National Council of Jewish Women

Essex County College  
International Youth Organization  
N.J. Association on Corrections  
Kiwanis Club of Warren County  
Monmouth County Police Academy  
Glassboro State College  
Violent Crimes Compensation Board  
Council of Black Churchmen

and a variety of police departments, probation departments, prosecutor offices, mental health facilities, school, and other community agencies.

District Office No. 1's Parole Officer Bernal continues as Vice-Chairman of the Hispanic Coalition on Alcohol and Drug Abuse. Senior Clerk Stenographer Russo continues her involvement as a volunteer for Deborah Hospital.

District Office No. 2's Assistant District Parole Supervisor Joyce has been elected Chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Youth Organization.

District Office No. 4's Senior Parole Officer Erdmann continues on the Board of Trustees for Project HOPE for Ex-Offenders.

District Office No. 7's Senior Parole Officer Dawson continues on the Board of Trustees of the New Jersey Volunteers in Courts and Corrections. Parole Officer Tweed is a long-time Board member of the Hispanic Health and Mental Health Center of Camden.

District Office No. 8's Parole Officer Yancy presides as President of Frontiers International.

District Office No. 9's District Parole Supervisor Patterson continues as Vice-President of the New Jersey Association on Corrections and Chairman of their Personnel Committee. Senior Parole Officer Paparozzi presides as Chairman of the Social Service Advisory Board of the Salvation Army.

The Asbury Park Press carried a comprehensive story on the Bureau's Volunteers in Parole Program.

The Bureau was gratified with the growing support in the printed media for the use of parole for non-violent offenders as one means of solving the state's overcrowding problem.

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 small margin of error must be allowed.

The Central Office Special File (COSF) has been defined to include only those New Jersey cases residing out-of-state with a revenue obligation existing



in New Jersey, whether or not the time portion of their sentence has expired. Certain inmates who have begun, but not completed, revenue payments are also included on this caseload. Those cases traditionally comprising the COSF are now being supervised by the district offices. As these present COSF cases are responsible to the Bureau only relative to their revenue obligation, we have not, as yet, refined manual record keeping to determine which ones may be missing rather than simply delinquent in payment.

#### CASELOADS (See Table 1)

On June 30, 1983, the Bureau of Parole was responsible for the supervision of 11,601 cases in New Jersey and 298 cases in the Central Office Special File, with a grand total of 11,899. During the fiscal year 17,687 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 Tables 2, 2A, and 2B)

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during the 1982-1983 fiscal year totaled 8.6 percent on the Bureau's entire caseload. The court commitment/recommitment equaled 2.9 percent while the technical violations rate equaled 5.7 percent of the total rate cited above. These figures represent a 1.1 percent decrease in commitments/recommitments over the past fiscal year and a decrease of .2 percent in technical violation rate. The overall rate drifted downward from 9.9 percent in Fiscal 1982 to 8.6 percent in Fiscal 1983, an overall decrease of 1.3 percent.

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

The percentage of missing cases, in relation to total Bureau caseload, totaled 9.3 percent. Parolees from the Youth Correctional Institution at Bordentown had the largest percentage of missing cases (14.3 percent); however, the caseload from Clinton was close behind with 11.5 percent. The caseload from the Training School for Girls has become so small that it disallows reasonable comparison with other institutions.

#### SUPERVISION (See Table 4)

In the course of supervising the Bureau's caseload during Fiscal 1983, Bureau field staff made a grand total of 276,585 contacts. An additional 29,446 investigation contacts were made. State vehicles assigned to districts were driven a total of 912,779 miles in spite of difficulties encountered, in many instances, with service, repairs and car shortages. A total of 108,850 hours or 53.8 percent of the officers' 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 now reliant solely on its own components for information to compile statistical data. Statistics on numbers and activities

of New Jersey cases paroled out-of-state have, by administrative action, been eliminated from the Bureau of Parole's reports. 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.

TABLE #1

## TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - FISCAL YEAR 1982-83 (BY INSTITUTIONS)

Institution	IN NEW JERSEY				CENTRAL OFFICE SPECIAL FILE				TOTAL
	Under Super- vision 7/1/82	*Total Cases Added	*Total No. Super- vised 1982-83	Under Super- vision 6/30/83	Under Super- vision 7/1/82	*Total Cases Added	*Total No. Super- vised 1982-83	Under Super- vision 6/30/83	Under Super- vision 6/30/83
Training School for Girls,	31	15	46	28	0	0	0	0	28
Training School for Girls, Skillman	7	9	16	10	0	0	0	0	10
Correctional Institute for Women	327	236	563	424	13	32	45	22	446
Training School for Boys	432	489	921	568	0	5	5	1	569
Training School for Boys, Skillman	111	151	262	170	0	0	0	0	170
Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale	1,455	826	2,281	1,733	6	66	72	12	1,745
Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown	1,439	578	2,017	1,467	13	61	74	28	1,495
Youth Reception & Correction Center	1,277	760	2,037	1,435	55	119	174	52	1,487
State Prison	3,807	2,141	5,948	4,393	43	260	303	181	4,574
Adult Diagnostic & Treatment Center	70	17	87	69	1	3	4	1	70
Out-of-State Cases in New Jersey (Male)	472	343	815	507	0	0	0	0	507
Out-of-State Cases in New Jersey (Female)	22	20	42	25	0	0	0	0	25
County (Male)	51	1,886	1,937	742	1	0	1	1	743
County (Female)	4	33	37	30	0	0	0	0	30
TOTAL	9,505	7,504	17,009	11,601	132	546	678	298	11,899
Under Supervision (1982)	<u>9,505</u>				<u>132</u>				9,637
Total Cases Added*		<u>7,504</u>				<u>546</u>			8,050
Total Number Supervised			<u>17,009</u>				<u>678</u>		17,687
Under Supervision (1983)				<u>11,601</u>				<u>298</u>	11,899

\*Figures include cases involving transfers between districts

TABLE #2

## NUMBER AND PERCENT OF VIOLATORS

## BY DISTRICT AND SEX

## BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED

FISCAL 1982-1983

MALE

District	Total Number Supervised During Year*	Number and Percent of Violators				TOTAL	
		Committed or Recommitted		Returned as Technical Vio.		Number	Percent
1. Clifton	2,290	93	4.0%	94	4.1%	187	8.1%
2. East Orange	2,075	48	2.3%	89	4.2%	137	6.6%
3. Red Bank	1,753	59	3.3%	150	8.5%	209	11.9%
4. Jersey City	1,864	33	1.7%	116	6.2%	149	7.9%
5. Elizabeth	1,528	69	4.5%	112	7.3%	181	11.8%
6. Trenton	1,730	43	2.4%	107	6.1%	150	8.6%
7. Camden	1,632	31	1.8%	160	9.8%	191	11.7%
8. Atlantic City	1,791	56	3.1%	73	4.0%	129	7.2%
9. Newark	1,642	81	4.9%	72	4.3%	153	9.3%
10. Central Office (Special File)	633	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL MALE	16,938	513	3.0%	973	5.7%	1,486	8.7%

FEMALE

1. Clifton	95	4	4.2%	6	6.3%	10	10.5%
2. East Orange	78	1	1.2%	2	2.5%	3	3.8%
3. Red Bank	99	3	3.0%	7	7.0%	10	10.1%
4. Jersey City	73	2	2.7%	3	4.1%	5	6.8%
5. Elizabeth	67	2	2.9%	3	4.4%	5	7.4%
6. Trenton	103	3	2.9%	5	4.8%	8	7.7%
7. Camden	66	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
8. Atlantic City	49	2	4.0%	3	6.1%	5	10.2%
9. Newark	74	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
10. Central Office (Special File)	45	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL FEMALE	749	17	2.2%	29	3.8%	46	6.1%
GRAND TOTAL	17,687	530	2.9%	1,002	5.7%	1,532	8.6%

\*Figures include inter-office transfer of cases

TABLE 2A

## PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS

## BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED

## BY DISTRICT

1982-1983

District	1	2	3	4
	Total Number Supervised	Committed or Recommitted	Technical Violators	Total
1. Clifton	2,385	4.0%	4.1%	8.2%
2. East Orange	2,153	2.2%	4.2%	6.5%
3. Red Bank	1,852	3.3%	8.4%	11.8%
4. Jersey City	1,937	1.8%	6.1%	7.9%
5. Elizabeth	1,595	4.4%	7.2%	11.6%
6. Trenton	1,833	2.5%	6.1%	8.6%
7. Camden	1,698	1.8%	9.4%	11.2%
8. Atlantic City	1,840	3.15%	4.1%	7.2%
9. Newark	1,716	4.7%	4.1%	8.9%
10. Central Office (Special File)	678	0%	0%	0%
TOTAL	17,687	2.9%	5.7%	8.6%

TABLE 2B

## PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS

## BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED

## FIVE-YEAR COMPARISON

Committed or Recommitted					Technical Violators					Total				
1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
3.3%	2.4%	4.0%	4.0%	2.9%	7.9%	8.5%	6.0%	5.9%	5.7%	11.2%	11.4%	10.0%	9.9%	8.6%

TABLE #3

RECORD OF MISSING CASES  
BY INSTITUTION  
1982-1983

Institution	Total on Parole on 6/30/83	Missing as of 6/30/82	Became Missing Between 7/1/82 and 6/30/83	Total Missing	Accounted for Between 7/1/82 and 6/30/83	Total Missing 6/30/83	Net Difference	Percent of Missing in Relation to Caseload on 6/30/83
Training School for Girls	28	3	5	8	5	3	0	21.4%
Training School for Girls, Skillman	10	1	0	1	0	1	0	10.0%
Correctional Institute for Women	424	41	31	72	23	49	+8	11.5%
Training School for Boys	568	29	30	59	36	23	-6	4.0%
Training School for Boys, Skillman	170	1	4	5	3	2	+1	1.1%
Youth Correctional Institute, Annandale	1,733	188	131	319	128	191	+3	11.0%
Youth Correctional Institute, Bordentown	1,467	226	127	353	142	211	-15	14.3%
Youth Reception & Correction Center	1,435	141	94	235	81	154	+13	10.7%
State Prison	4,393	405	289	694	244	450	+45	10.2%
Adult Diagnostic & Treatment Center	69	2	1	3	2	1	-1	1.4%
Out-of-State: Male	507	13	17	30	15	15	+2	2.9%
Female	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
County: Male	742	3	20	23	13	10	+7	1.3%
Female	30	0	2	2	1	1	+1	3.3%
TOTAL (Excludes COSF)	11,601	1,053	751	1,804	693	1,111	+58	9.5%

TABLE #3A

RECORD OF MISSING CASES  
BY DISTRICT--(Including COSF)  
1982-83

District	Caseload on 6/30/83	Missing as of 6/30/82	Became Missing Between 7/1/82 and 6/30/83	Total Missing	Accounted for Between 7/1/81 and 6/30/83	Total Missing on 6/30/83	Net Difference	Percent of Missing Relation to Caseload on 6/30/83
1. Clifton	1,629	181	79	260	67	193	+12	11.8%
2. East Orange	1,460	108	109	217	90	127	+19	8.6%
3. Red Bank	1,258	127	73	200	73	127	0	10.0%
4. Jersey City	1,379	150	131	281	133	148	-2	10.7%
5. Elizabeth	1,076	96	95	191	88	103	+7	9.5%
6. Trenton	1,267	106	75	181	70	111	+5	8.7%
7. Camden	1,175	75	36	111	44	67	-8	5.7%
8. Atlantic City	1,206	87	54	141	46	95	+8	7.8%
9. Newark	1,151	123	99	222	82	140	+17	12.1%
10. Central Office (Special Files*)	298	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
TOTAL	11,899	1,053	751	1,804	693	1,111	+58	9.3%

TABLE #3B

PERCENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO TOTAL CASELOAD  
5 YEAR COMPARISON

1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
10.9%	9.3%			

\* See Note on page 36 regarding redefinition of C.O.S.F. and resulting effects.



TABLE #4

SUMMARY OF DAILY RECORDS OF ACTIVITIES  
1982-1983

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	PCN	RH	P	PO	R	P	N	F-19	F-21	AR	PP	SR	DR	OA	TR	TS	OFFICE	FIELD	STATE	PER- SONAL
DO# 1	7893	365	9138	1904	9808	39	138	71	14448	16545	14920	2504	621	2490	2914	--	1343	75	21	--	113	276	12857	14111	135472	5542
DO# 2	6370	98	4754	3089	8114	--	85	40	11491	11437	663	1408	726	3015	2661	--	1110	299	12	39	143	312	10174	11930	38656	1088
DO# 3	13130	370	7216	1658	9951	42	99	102	13980	15388	1353	2448	446	1876	2140	--	838	160	19	16	146	194	10168	12865	119320	104
DO# 4	16092	341	5689	2268	8577	16	168	115	14145	17343	3033	1948	667	2036	3424	--	1237	326	24	80	129	274	11806	12314	64056	10
DO# 5	5635	147	6632	1253	6651	14	97	61	9581	11562	686	1349	890	1532	2546	1	819	153	20	50	139	158	10085	9906	66414	494
DO# 6	10152	470	7604	1649	8031	39	110	104	12318	14699	1773	3081	376	1833	2439	--	977	337	14	47	164	230	9426	11552	116262	697
DO# 7	9884	189	4283	1232	15348	16	174	63	11732	16947	2385	1496	435	1639	3739	--	1124	70	11	55	86	217	10665	10292	88493	--
DO# 8	8641	404	6445	1884	10660	43	147	35	11094	14006	5255	3296	558	2251	2802	45	1324	562	27	330	150	143	8632	12525	229762	116
DO# 9	6695	602	11454	1100	8816	140	78	29	12324	17021	456	1368	370	2326	2417	--	1035	188	2	2	83	112	9680	13355	42436	3857
TOTAL	84492	2986	63209	16037	85959	399	1096	620	111113	134948	30524	18898	5089	18998	25082	46	9807	2170	150	619	1153	1918	93493	108850	900871	11908
GRAND TOTAL	254,798								276,585				23,987		44,580		12,023		3,840				202,343		912,779	

## 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  
 PCN - 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) AR - Admission Report  
 Supplemental  
 PP - Preparole Report  
 SR - Special Report

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

**END**