

974.901

P153

C3

ANNUAL REPORT

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, 1984 - June 30, 1985



John P. Zerillo
Assistant Commissioner

Erich Kraus
Supervising Parole Officer

Fred B. Holley, Chief
Bureau of Parole

Victor R. D'Ilio
Assistant Chief

New Jersey State Library

CONTENTS

Mission	Page 1
Major Objectives.	Page 1
Performance	Page 2
Anticipated Needs and Issues.	Page 4
Major Units	Page 6
Highlights.	Page 7
Developments.	Page 9
Personnel	Page 11
Caseload.	Page 12
Discharge Prior to Expiration of Maximum.	Page 12
Probable Cause Hearings	Page 13
District Parole Supervisor's Decisions.	Page 13
Ratio of Field to Office Time	Page 14
Treatment	Page 14
Night Visits.	Page 14
Casebook Reviews.	Page 14
Job Training and Partnership Act.	Page 15
Furlough/Home Visit/Work/Study Program.	Page 15
Institutional Parole Program.	Page 16
Parole Advisory Committee	Page 17
Team Supervision.	Page 17
Parolee Earnings (Calendar 1984).	Page 18
Training.	Page 18
Revenue Program	Page 20
Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility	Page 26
Special Projects.	Page 32
Office of Interstate Services	Page 32
Volunteers in Parole Program.	Page 34
NCIC/SCIC Operations.	Page 36

Contents (continued)

County Assistance Unit/County Identification Team	Page 36
Public Relations.	Page 36
Note.	Page 38
Caseloads	Page 38
Return to Institutions.	Page 39
Missing Cases	Page 39
Supervision	Page 39
Conclusion.	Page 39
Charts and Tables follow	

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 Legislative and Administrative mandates regarding court assessed revenues (penalty, restitution, and fine).
4. To assure the proper and orderly movement of correctional clientele across state lines in accordance with the Juvenile Compact, the Parole and Probation Compact, the Corrections Compact, the Agreement on Detainers and the uniform extradition act.
5. 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, the reduction of caseloads substantially below the present 1:70 ratio being a priority.
2. To facilitate preparation of some 8000 state and county 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 of some 200 offenders 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 approximately 2000 parolees whose adjustment has deteriorated markedly in one or more serious aspects.
5. To provide a program for 20 additional 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 some \$400,00 in penalties, fines and restitutions 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.
7. To facilitate client movement through established compacts and agreements, to any area of the country which may be required to meet the needs of the larger criminal justice community and/or to provide a broader range of alternatives/opportunities to approximately 1000 offenders.

PERFORMANCE

In that nearly 90 percent of parolees complete the parole period successfully, parole officers are performing a highly cost-effective function. Further, the parole officers duties require their performance of a variety of other correctional field services beyond offender supervision.

Over the last five years, the Bureau's average daily casecount has grown from some 8700 to over 14,000. 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 to almost 20,000. 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 may not be 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-problemmed 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 with unique needs. The acquisition of new Bureau positions would be particularly welcome in that these youngest of the state's parolees can, with little or no advance notice, become involved in crisis 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. Presently, an experimental program of agency networking coordinated by a special parole officer is underway in one county. Should it prove successful, the Bureau will direct efforts to expand it into other jurisdictions.

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. Over a million dollars have been collected to date. Several millions list as collectibles.

Collections, record keeping, and the making of deposits are carried out 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" and "mini-grants" at the district office level for state and county 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 under certain circumstances has forced the 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 Office of Interstate Services is an operations component of the Central Office. It is charged with assuring the proper and orderly movement and the monitoring of corrections clientele across state lines. Over 800 New Jersey parolees reside out-of-state while some 500 individuals paroled from other jurisdictions reside in New Jersey. Other aspects of OIS responsibilities include initiating and following up action on various aspects of matters pertaining to inmates (both convicted and pending dispositions) across jurisdictional lines.

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 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 sixteen 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 in which he may have counsel. Some 2000 hearings are held yearly by senior parole officers from each of the 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 of the district parole offices. Originally, volunteers recruited were only from the legal profession, lawyers paired with parolees on an individual basis. Expansion of the volunteer's 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 continue to 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 a need for additional expansion to provide services to inmates housed in 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 structure 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. Penalty assessment on all commitments make collections a major program. Tracking recipients of revenue payments is complicated, particularly in regards to those slated to receive restitution.

Present staffing patterns in the Office of Interstate Services should be expanded to meet increased demands. Many New Jersey sentenced inmates are presently serving time in other states prior to return to commence service of sentence here. Certain case monitoring is essential. Each inmate paroled from a N.J. institution to another state leaves with a revenue obligation which requires certain efforts toward collection. A more elaborate involvement in the corrections compact might be to the state's advantage. Assuring backups in times of absence and during periods of peak work flow in this unit is essential.

The Central Office and district offices need bookkeepers to help assure that revenue collection, disbursement of gate money, mini-grants, 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 lookups, reduction of response time to law enforcement inquiries, and the tracking of parolee movement both within the state and among various states. The present system allows for the electronification of revenue records and reports. A fiscal control unit has been proposed consisting primarily of the needed bookkeepers and data entry operators to account for fiscal transactions and client movement.

Past staff increases have reduced officer caseload averages to approximately 70. 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, for which a specialized program is undergoing experimentation. Furlough and home visit programs are placing increasing demands upon Bureau services. Because the Parole Board no longer has any obligation regarding revenue collection in those cases whose time portion of sentences has expired, Bureau personnel is involved in time-consuming activities as they seek leverage from the courts, through the Office of the Attorney General 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 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 almost four 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, two assistant chiefs, three 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 visits to field sites in order to remain conversant with and assist in the resolving operational problems.

Office of Interstate Services

The Office of Interstate Services is an operations unit within the Central Office of the Bureau of Parole. It is charged with assuring that the movements of offenders across state lines is in accordance with various interstate compacts and agreements. It is staffed by the supervising interstate specialist with professional and clerical support. It monitors and coordinates activities between New Jersey and various other states paroling authorities, supervision agencies, the clientele, and the larger criminal justice system.

District Offices (12)

District offices are strategically located in the areas of heaviest population concentration for particular catchment zones. Each office has a supervisor, his/her 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 14,000 parolees from New Jersey penal and correctional institutions and certain county jail cases, training schools and from out of state institution 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 ten 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

Expansion of the number of district offices from nine to twelve became a reality during the fiscal year. District Office No. 10, Vineland began limited operations on January 21 and became fully operational as of April 29. On the latter date, District Office No. 11 in New Brunswick also began full operations. As the fiscal year drew to a close, District Office No. 12, Paterson was preparing to come "on line" as a full service field component. Bureau management has proposed a District Office No. 13 in efforts to equalize component unit workload, particularly in Essex County, where redistricting did little to relieve a burgeoning caseload.

In what Bureau management considers a demonstration project, a parole officer has been assigned to participate in a special program designed for Somerset County juvenile offenders. The parole officer works closely with the Somerset County Family Court and The County Youth Services Commission to establish individually tailored aftercare programs for juvenile commitments being paroled to the area. Pre-parole planning is accomplished in coordination with the Commission and the parole officer coordinates service delivery by the various community resources. The parole officer is also available for input at any Commission meeting.

Subsequent to meetings between Bureau management and other Departmental representatives, the Bureau has been advised of an agreement in principal to transfer the administration of the Departmental Gate Money Program to the district parole offices and PROOF. As presently conceptualized, a Financial Aid Program would replace the existing Mini-Grant and Gate Money Disbursements. District supervisors would be able to grant up to \$100 upon parole/max and up to an additional \$100 within the first thirty days subsequent to release. Beyond release assistance, any parolee would be

eligible for up to \$300 in any given twelve month period to meet demonstrated needs. A draft of the proposed Bureau procedures has been circulated to all interested parties for their input.

As a result of a series of circumstances and discussions during the year. Bureau management continues to urge the adoption of its proposal for a team of highly experienced, well paid, Bureau staff members to conduct Probable Cause Hearings, while the Office of the Attorney General prepares and delivers the State's case at both the Probable Cause and Final Revocation Hearings. The expertise which would be extended to the Hearing Process by such an experienced cadre of hearing officers along with some greater emphasis being placed on community protection via the participation of representatives of the Attorney General's Office would go a long way toward relieving a "Board bias" which might be now pervading the entire Revocation Procedure. A more equitable balance of influences is seen as critically required for greater objectivity.

Bureau and Division management met with representatives of the New York State Division of Parole. A comparative analysis of the sister-state systems quickly revealed a great diversity in philosophy, structure and function. The New York System is geared primarily toward community protection, its officers not only being armed but also having access to a special services Swat Team. Another significant difference is the availability of legal counsel to staff in hearing preparation and, at time, even during the hearing itself - a program N.J. Bureau management has proposed. As the meeting progressed, it became increasingly more obvious that drastic differences between the systems were further exacerbated by the Parole Act of 1979.

In a related matter, the September, 1984 issue of the New Jersey Corrections Quarterly was highlighted by an editorial written by the executive assistant, Division of Policy and Planning, in which the inability of parole staff to act in the face of a parolee's admission to guilt to a new offense, or despite the existence of a prima facie case against him, without the prosecutors intervention is analyzed. The fact that it was the Parole Act of 1979 which repealed provisions of the law which had previously permitted action in these matters was mentioned. A parallel article concerning the loss of arrest authority by parole personnel was not included in this issue. The assistant commissioners office has designated resources to research this matter.

During the year, Bureau management had the opportunity to interview a number of candidates for various senior parole officer positions. As an interesting observation to those interviewing the candidates was the consistency of answers to some of the questions posed. Most, if not all, felt that the Bureau should have arrest authority restored and should be able to commence revocation action against those who admit guilt to new offenses or those whose circumstances of arrest involve a prima facie case against them. Most indicated that a manageable caseload would approximate 50 with between 10 to 15 either missing, confined or on an advanced status, leaving some 35 cases to handle according to Bureau Standards. All indicated that given additional funding, priority should be placed upon acquisition of more staff and vehicles. Those interviewed, were not novitiates responding in theory, but for the most part, had at least seven or more years experience.

Bureau involvement with clientele afflicted with AIDS is increasing and their supervision has become more complicated, particularly in attempts to

place those victims who have no families and for all intents and purposes are considered to be placement cases. No hospice situations exist to place those who do not require hospitalization and certain regulations limiting their placement elsewhere makes some situations difficult, if not impossible, to handle. Bureau management has brought this situation to the attention of several parties which may be of some help in resolving the social problems which have developed as a result of the medical.

Figures compiled as of March 1, 1985 revealed that for the first time county parolees numbered over 1000. On that date, 923 males and 98 females were on parole as a result of sentences to county facilities. Special conditions and a fairly high percentage of mandated intensive supervision cases continue attendant to these parolees. A twenty to twenty five percent turnover in this particular caseload per month also creates quite a bit of time consuming activity to be met by field staff.

The Nash vs. Carchman matter was argued before the Supreme Court of the United State during April. This matter has particular relevance to the Department of Corrections and the Bureau of Parole in that its decision will direct whether or not final revocation action can be demanded by a New Jersey parolee confined out-of-state via the Interstate Agreement on Detainers or a similar vehicle. As the fiscal year closed, a decision was still awaited.

DEVELOPMENTS

District staff continue to formally advise D.Y.F.S. offices whenever inmates are paroled who have a history of abusing or exploiting children. Notification is given routinely, regardless of whether the residence contains children or if adults present raise no objection to having such offenders in residence. The procedure which was formally adopted almost three years ago has been further expanded to include both written and telephone communication. An Interagency Committee continues attempts to refine the process.

Supervising Parole Officer Susanne Nielsen-Pavelec was named by the Commissioner to the Special Classification Review Board of A.D.T.C. She replaced Mrs. Isabelle Levin, Supervising Parole Officer who retired effective October 1, 1984. Mrs. Nielsen-Pavelec's appointment will run through June 30, 1986.

The Bureau was shocked and saddened upon learning of the sudden demise of John McKernon, former ADPS, District Office No. 7. At age 53 he had been employed with the Bureau in excess of twenty five years. Death also took former parole officer William VanSant, District Office No. 9, in the spring of 1985.

A considerable number of Bureau employees received their Service Awards at a December presentation for those whose service years reached multiples of five during 1982 or 1983. Ceremonies were conducted by the Commissioner at the Training Academy for retirees and Central Office employees. Other awards were directed to each unit for presentation. Bureau awardees ranged from 40 years service down to five and included four or five retirees.

In accordance with Departmental Standard 391, a Safety and Accident Committee was established at each field site. Quarterly meetings are being held. During the course of the year, all units were provided with the prescribed first aid kits. Supervisors were required to respond to an

elaborate questionnaire dealing with hazardous substances, as required by the Department of Health.

Throughout the year, Central Office staff has maintained contact with the Bureau of Audits and Accounts in attempts to resolve various issues. As a result, a double entry system of bookkeeping has been proposed to replace the current revenue accounting system. The new method would allow for more accountability of receivables and resolve some of the current bookkeeping problems. Attempts are being made to assimilate as much of the current system as possible. It is anticipated that District Office No. 6 will experiment with the modified system, testing its comparability with Bureau needs. Plans are to begin experimentation with the onset of the new fiscal year, and run for the first quarter. If successful, the remainder of the Bureau will then be introduced to the system.

The Bureau's recipient of the Departmental Merit Award for the past year was Senior Parole Officer John Swayser, presently attached to District Office No. 6, Trenton. In so choosing, his peers recognized the variety of assignments capably handled by Mr. Swayser throughout his tenure with the Bureau. The award was presented during ceremonies at a Departmental banquet held in May.

Computer terminals have been installed in all operating district offices and PROOF. Field units now have the capacity to retrieve information in the OBCIS files and to enter minimum data dealing with caseload and team assignment. Bureau management hopes to expand programs and capabilities to field sites so that program updates can occur simultaneously with transactions and needed information is retrievable at the point of need. Lack of personnel to operate equipment continues to be a major problem in this regard.

The use of paid overtime allowed Bureau staff to complete assignments in a timely manner while awaiting additional staff. Originally designated for district use in completing work attendant to county cases, its availability was extended to all units whose staffing pattern and workload required extra manhours to complete. As the fiscal year entered its final quarter, and additional staffing began to be accomplished, approval for paid overtime diminished. However, it has served a valuable purpose during the year, when personnel shortages might have adversely affected work flow.

During the course of the year, efforts also continued toward changing the name of the Bureau to Correctional Field Services and the designation of all of its professional titles accordingly. Planning toward this end continues as does professional staff's activities toward affiliation of a Parole Officers Benevolent Association with the P.B.A. for purposes of representation. Various proposals for additional sorely needed programs and personnel remain in the process of review.

PERSONNEL

As of June 30, 1985, the total compliment of 380 staff members were distributed as follows:

Chief	1
Assistant Chiefs	2
Legal Analyst	1
Supervising Interstate Specialist	1
Supervising Parole Officers	3
Supervisor of Volunteers (Sr. P.O.)	1
Revenue Coordinator (Sr. P.O.)	1
County Classification Team (Sr. P.O.)	1
County Intensive Program (Sr. P.O.)	1
Statistics and Research (Sr. P.O.)	1
Interstate Specialist I	2
Interstate Specialist II	2
Supervising Interstate Escort Officer	1
Senior Interstate Escort Officer	1
District Parole Supervisor	12
Assistant District Parole Supervisor	15
Senior Parole Officer (Field)	46
Project Specialist (Community Resource)	3
Senior Parole Officer (Institution)	11
Residential Parole Supervisor (PROOF)	1
Residential Parole Officer (PROOF)	7
Parole Officer	161
Administrative Assistant	1
Clerical	<u>104</u>
 TOTAL	 <u>380</u>

The establishment of three additional district offices allowed for the creation of three additional district supervisors, three assistant district parole supervisors and three head clerk positions along with four additional senior parole officer positions, 36 parole officer and 17 clerical positions.

Three project specialist positions were created within the Bureau and act as community resource specialists in District Office Nos. 12, 6 and 9.

An additional senior parole officer was assigned to the institutional parole offices servicing the Training School complex. This allowed for more efficient coverage throughout the entire program.

A decision by the Department of Civil Service has allowed the movement between senior parole officer and residential parole officer titles, at least for the time being.

A Legal/Legislative Analyst title has been created and will be filled in the Central Office early in the coming fiscal year.

Although the senior parole officer position was removed from the County Identification Team, one was assigned to a newly created Departmental Unit which will service state cases housed in certain county jails in fulfillment of a state/county contract.

District Parole Supervisor James Joyce extended his year of detached service by two months to do research on the factors involved in parole success and failure with the National Institute of Justice.

Senior Investigator Vasquez had been attached to the Bureau during the year and was involved in developing a fugitive/surveillance component. As the year came to an end he was on special assignment, outside the Bureau.

The deaths of Messers John McKernan and William VanSant were mourned during the year.

Retirements from the Bureau during Fiscal '85 included James Coliz, Wilson Emmons, Helen Martelli, Mary Stankewitz, Margaret Eagen, Howard Forrest, Dorothy McClammy, Isabelle Levin, James Dooley, Hal Borgen, Muriel Noonan and Joseph Farina.

CASELOAD

As of June 30, 1985, a total of 14,350 cases were reported under the supervision of the Bureau of Parole by its various components. This represented a total increase of 1,033 cases during the course of the fiscal year. District caseloads as of June 30, 1985 were as follows:

DO #1 - 1915	DO #8 - 875
DO #2 - 1817	DO #9 - 1241
DO #3 - 993	DO #10 - 769
DO #4 - 1723	DO #11 - 919
DO #5 - 912	DO #12 - not fully operational
DO #6 - 1180	*OIS - 797
DO #7 - 1209	

Bureau Total - 14,350

*The Office of Interstate Services (OIS) caseload, as reported above, are those New Jersey cases being supervised by out of state jurisdictions and certain max cases residing out of state who have yet to fully amortize their revenue obligations.

Total Bureau casecount of 14,350 included 699 females under supervision in New Jersey.

DISCHARGE PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF MAXIMUM

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

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

Type of Commitment	Granted	Denied	Administrative Termination	Total
Prison	62	4	4	70
Young Adult	32	8	3	43
Juvenile	8	1	1	10
Total	102	13	8	123

PROBABLE CAUSE HEARINGS

This hearing, mandated by the Supreme Court Morrissey vs. Brewer Decision, was initiated under urgent requirements with the assignment of supervising parole officers (highest level under Chief and Assistant Chief) to formulate operating procedures, establish policy and to conduct the hearings. Having accomplished these goals, in January, 1978, a Probable Cause Hearing Unit composed of four senior parole officers was established. Under the supervision of a supervising parole officer, the senior parole officers were responsible for conducting all Probable Cause Hearings throughout the state.

As of September, 1979, due to vehicle and budgetary restraints, the Probable Cause Hearing Unit was disbanded and the hearings 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 1984:

a. Hearing requested and hearing held	1147
b. Hearing waived and hearing held	91
c. No response from parolee and hearing held	868
d. Hearing waived and no hearing held	428
e. Probable Cause found and formal revocation hearing to follow	2211
f. Continuation of parole recommended although valid violations determined	278
g. Continuation on parole - no valid violations determined	39
h. Other	6
Total Hearing Schedule (columns a+b+c+d)	2534
Probable Cause found and revocation hearing to follow	2211 (87.2%)

DISTRICT PAROLE SUPERVISOR'S DECISION

<u>DO#</u>	<u>Authorization to Continue on Parole</u>	<u>Continue on Bail</u>
1	148	400
2	126	194
3	305	274
4	271	313
5	194	195
6	123	224
7	268	246
8	120	271
9	75	151
10	30	85
11	25	34
12	0	0
Totals	1685	2387

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

RATIO OF FIELD TO OFFICE TIME

The following chart indicates the hours and percentage of officer's time spent in the office as compared to the field in Fiscal 1985.

<u>Month/Year</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Total</u>
July 1984	8,673	9,737	18,410
August	9,284	10,068	19,352
September	8,255	9,415	17,670
October	10,078	11,061	21,139
November	8,059	9,070	17,129
December	8,894	8,550	17,444
January 1985	11,317	9,700	21,017
February	9,527	9,613	19,140
March	10,904	11,174	22,078
April	10,770	10,753	21,523
May	11,972	10,924	22,896
June	10,570	10,322	20,892
Totals	118,303	120,387	238,690
Percent	49.6%	50.4%	100%

TREATMENT

As of June 30, 1985, the New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission indicated that it was servicing a total parole caseload in Newark of 128 cases of which 80 were on active status and 48 referred status. Although, at one time, specialized rehabilitation caseload covered the entire Essex County, funding cutbacks reduced service to only the city of Newark.

NIGHT VISITS

DO #1 - Staff made total of 1,818 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #2 - Staff made total of 313 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #3 - Staff made total of 433 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #4 - Staff made total of 00 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #5 - Staff made total of 62 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #6 - Staff made total of 231 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #7 - Staff made total of 1069 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #8 - Staff made total of 249 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #9 - Staff made total of 391 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #10 - Staff made total of 56 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #11 - Staff made total of 21 contacts after normal working hours.
DO #12 - Not operational.

Bureau staff made a grand total of 4,643 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 to entries.

During the year 89 reviews were completed, resulting in 8 (8.9%) unsatisfactory ratings. An unsatisfactory rating is to be followed by a 30 day period during which the opportunity will be provided to remedy the deficiencies with the ultimate resolution of termination of employment if the deficiencies are not corrected.

JOB TRAINING AND PARTNERSHIP ACT

C.E.T.A.'s phaseout has been followed by the implementation of the Job Training Partnership Act. Throughout the fiscal year, 1766 parolees were referred, accepted, or otherwise involved with the various agencies administering this program.

FURLOUGH/HOME VISIT/WORK/STUDY PROGRAM

Much of the credit for the continued success of the pre-parole temporary community release programs can be claimed by the Bureau of Parole, as the district offices maintain their role in the investigation and monitoring of adult furlough and juvenile home visit sites, initial investigation of employment sites for institutional work release programs as well as the work/study sites of inmates at "halfway houses" and sustaining liaison/contact with the appropriate police departments affected by these programs. The Bureau's contributions include: insuring uniformity and consistency in operating procedures, notifying law enforcement authorities, and providing feedback to Institutional Classification Committees.

Volume of activity in the Furlough Program was at approximately the same level during the past year as compared to Fiscal '84. In the most vital aspect, the initial investigation of furlough destinations, there was a slight increase over last year, with a total of 1677 completed contacts at the home and with appropriate police departments; 229 of these investigations were rejected during Fiscal '85. A total of 2415 followup investigations at furlough address or at local police departments showed an increase over Fiscal '84 totals.

Although temporary in nature, workload in connection with the Juvenile Home Visit Program decreased significantly during Fiscal '84. Of the 135 initial investigations completed for the home visit destinations, 19 were disapproved. Also, there were 295 followup contacts reported during Fiscal 1985.

All of the above activity in both the Adult Furlough Program and the Juvenile Home Visit Program during 1984-1985 required driving 24,502 miles and spending 3,695 work hours. This represents a decrease in both mileage and work hours for this reporting period.

The program which continued to demand greater time and effort from the district offices was the Work/Study Release Program. Improvement in the state's economy, expansion of institutional work release programs, and more complete compliance with Standards by the contract halfway houses, all combined to increase the number of work release site investigations which were sent to the district coordinators. With all of the districts involved to some degree: 417 initial investigations were completed, an increase over Fiscal '84; 56 of the work sites were found to be defective; 6216 miles were driven and 499 hours were expended to accomplish the work. As was noted in the last annual report, current program Standards do not provide for ongoing monitoring of work/study releases from either 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 continue to point to increased volume of activity for the Bureau in connection with these programs. In fact, some reporting figures for the past year (as in the case of the Furlough Program) would have shown greater increases if it had not been for an unusual amount of "carry-over" of pending investigations, received late in June and remaining to be completed.

As the number of State institutions and the inmate population increases, the number of furloughs and required investigations will likely increase, simply on the basis of a comparable increase in the number of eligible inmates. Standards for home visits from the juvenile community release centers and the Training School at Skillman are scheduled to go into effect during the early part of the new fiscal year and will most certainly involve three or four times the amount of time and effort currently expended on the juvenile programs by the district offices. Placements in the halfway houses are scheduled to increase, requiring additional furlough and work/study site investigations. Providing the privilege of work release for state sentenced inmates, housed in county facilities, remains a possibility; enlarging the scope of the program in this way would require additional initial investigations and could very well add the responsibility of ongoing monitoring in those counties having work release programs.

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

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 re-entry into the community by over 4,100 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.

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

	<u>Pre-Parole Interviews</u>	<u>Inmate Requested Interviews</u>	<u>Released On Parole</u>	<u>Parole Classes</u>	<u>Orientation Classes</u>
TSP	890	687	248	69	45
RSP	579	295	243	162	26
MSCF	582	425	155	169	42
LSP	1265	554	584	159	
SSCF	628	594	325	272	11
CIW	599	1473	228	189	1
YRCC	750	1592	585	192	53
YCIB	740	774	336	71	43
YCIA	1239	1578	856	161	15
TSB/J	760	1000	451	220	0
TSSK	456	265	122	97	1
Totals	8488	9237	4133	1761	237

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

	<u>Preparole Interviews</u>	<u>Parole Classes</u>	<u>Parole Releases</u>
DO #1	556	336	550
DO #2	811	563	554
DO #3	313	168	148
DO #4	704	524	575
DO #5	154	71	80
DO #6	921	621	612
DO #7	407	350	350
DO #8	472	343	343
DO #9	209	230	231
DO #10	101	54	55
DO #11	60	49	49
Totals	4691	2876	3091

District Office No. 12 is not operational.

PAROLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The original Parole Advisory Committee was conceptualized and implemented in the early months of 1977. It was composed of representatives of every operating component in the Bureau and drew its participants from all levels of staff. It was a forum of problem presentation and resolution. As other means of dealing with issues became available to staff, meetings were held less frequently.

Recently, the assistant commissioner has decided to modify and chair this committee. He will select staff membership and experiment with the concept in order to ascertain what value such a forum may have under present circumstances.

TEAM SUPERVISION

Team membership does not lessen a parole officer's individual caseload responsibilities. It does make his particular expertise - and that of other team members - available to the aggregate caseload. The caseload is comprised of service and hard-to-manage categories of parole supervision: no routine involvement of orientation cases. As of June 30, 1985, the districts reported the following team involvement:

- DO #1 - One team of two officers, two teams of three, two teams of four.
- DO #2 - One team of two, four teams of five each.
- DO #3 - One team of three, one team of four, one team of five.
- DO #4 - One team of three, one team of four, two teams of five each.
- DO #5 - Two teams of five, one team of four.
- DO #6 - One team of three, one team of six.
- DO #7 - Two teams of five, one team of six.
- DO #8 - One team of four.
- DO #9 - Two teams of six each, one team of five
- DO #10 - One team of four, one team of six.
- DO #11 - One team of seven.
- DO #12 - Not operational.

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 1984)

During Calendar Year 1984, 16,452 parolees were under supervision and those employed earned \$46,932,292., an increase of \$8,202,654 over earnings for Calendar Year 1983.

Forty-nine percent (7997) 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 thirty percent (4953) were unemployed throughout their entire period of supervision, although employable. The other twenty-one percent (3502) were classified and 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 is 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, 12, and PROOF
Region Metro:	Districts 2 and 9
Region Central:	Districts 3, 5, and 11
Region South:	Districts 6, 7, 8, and 10

Speakers for the training sessions are recruited from those sources which can best meet the needs of staff. Included are agency personnel, academia, and Bureau of Parole staff.

- B. Other Training Activities: District staff provided orientation to field services at least monthly, usually more frequently, to correction officers attending formal training at the academy.

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

Selected members of the Bureau's supervisory staff continued participation in a course of certified public management while other staff members began the course. It is sponsored by the Department of Civil Service in conjunction with Rutgers University.

The Bureau's managerial staff was 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 personnel attended the Annual Conference on the Middle Atlantic States Correctional Association, New Jersey Volunteers in Courts and Corrections, American Probation and Parole Association and the Annual Conference of the New Jersey Chapter of the American Correctional Association.

A Civil Service course in Defensive Driving was attended by certain Bureau personnel.

Selected clerical staff attended courses in Secretarial Stress Management which was presented at the Correction Officers Training Academy.

On two occasions parole staff interfaced with Probation officers in a three day training program dealing with alcohol abuse, sponsored by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Interested head clerks and principal clerk titles participated in a day long Secretarial Orientation Program given by the Correction Officers Training Academy.

Each operating unit designated two representatives to attend a program presented by the Legal Action Center of New York concerning employment discrimination in New Jersey.

Several of the Bureau's clerical staff attended a course in Management Skills for Women, which led to the awarding of college credits.

A number of Bureau clericals attended various Civil Service courses in shorthand and other clerical skills.

Parole Board staff was provided with an orientation to field services by district office personnel over a five month period.

A course in Narcotics and Narcotic Paraphernalia Familiarization was attended by all Bureau professional staff.

Interested clerical staff participated in a one day Writing Styles Workshop, another presentation of the Training Academy.

Selected Bureau staff attended a Parole Board Training Session concerning a Mutual Agreement Program and the Alcoholic Offender.

Several clerical staff members attended a three credit course in Business Organization and Communication, held at the Correction Officers Training Academy but presented by Mercer County Community College.

Interested personnel attended a C.O.T.A. offered program on Correctional Supervision.

Certain clerical employees attended a Training Academy sponsored course entitled Tele-tips and Techniques.

Selected personnel were involved in an orientation to Microcomputers presented by Micron Industries.

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 Revenue operation experienced continued growth in Fiscal 1985, despite an 8% decline in the Bureau's total receipts. The operation has a fine year cumulative total of \$1,089,013.37.

Central Office experienced a 10% increase in receipts over last year. Also, Central Office is responsible for 28% of the total Bureau's collections for Fiscal '85 and 27% of the five year cumulative total.

The caseload responsibility for Central Office increased 67% over last year to a total of 1,079 cases.

The recorded accounts receivable for the Bureau rose 32% over last year to a total of \$4,865,316.13. It is believed the actual accounts receivable is twice as much.

Also, four district offices increased their total collections from last year.

As previously mentioned, the revenue operation continues to grow. A major concern is the continually growing number of files being maintained at the Central level. Space requirements are an acute problem and one which will need to be resolved soon.

In company with space requirements, is the need to computerize the data being physically stored. With current legislative trends pressuring the operation, computerization is a must.

FY '84

FY '85

5 yr. Cumulative
YTD

DO 1	PENALTY	<u>\$ 12,886.00</u>	<u>\$ 13,687.20</u>	<u>\$ 37,800.70</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>3,652.01</u>	<u>4,056.68</u>	<u>8,927.69</u>
	FINE	<u>10,357.00</u>	<u>7,565.00</u>	<u>30,985.00</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 26,895.01</u>	<u>\$ 25,308.88</u>	<u>\$ 77,713.39</u>
DO 2	PENALTY	<u>\$ 9,386.20</u>	<u>\$ 12,496.80</u>	<u>\$ 28,759.00</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>904.00</u>	<u>2,023.10</u>	<u>2,947.10</u>
	FINE	<u>14,817.80</u>	<u>36,780.00</u>	<u>77,333.75</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 25,108.00</u>	<u>\$ 51,299.90</u>	<u>\$109,039.85</u>
DO 3	PENALTY	<u>\$ 17,222.46</u>	<u>\$ 14,049.00</u>	<u>\$ 44,387.96</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>3,595.56</u>	<u>4 612.79</u>	<u>11,383.35</u>
	FINE	<u>5,005.00</u>	<u>3,635.00</u>	<u>44,680.30</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 25,823.02</u>	<u>\$ 22,296.79</u>	<u>\$100,451.61</u>
DO 4	PENALTY	<u>\$ 9,681.00</u>	<u>\$ 9,485.00</u>	<u>\$ 24,766.50</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>590.00</u>	<u>925.00</u>	<u>1,665.00</u>
	FINE	<u>28,009.00</u>	<u>15,790.00</u>	<u>85,760.99</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 38,280.00</u>	<u>\$ 26,200.00</u>	<u>\$112,192.48</u>
DO 5	PENALTY	<u>\$ 13,864.25</u>	<u>\$ 14,156.60</u>	<u>\$ 37,348.15</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>2,027.00</u>	<u>5,481.48</u>	<u>8,514.48</u>
	FINE	<u>8,674.00</u>	<u>7,831.00</u>	<u>28,864.00</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 24,565.25</u>	<u>\$ 27,469.08</u>	<u>\$ 74,726.63</u>
DO 6	PENALTY	<u>\$ 9,628.50</u>	<u>\$ 7,906.50</u>	<u>\$ 26,240.00</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>2,582.29</u>	<u>2,850.70</u>	<u>6,397.47</u>
	FINE	<u>8,756.00</u>	<u>10,156.00</u>	<u>38,865.67</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 20,966.79</u>	<u>\$ 20,913.20</u>	<u>\$ 71,502.84</u>

	FY '84	FY '85	5 yr. Cumulative YTD
DO 7 PENALTY	\$ 11,566.50	\$ 10,424.00	\$ 31,771.50
RESTITUTION	1,141.50	1,146.65	3,680.31
FINE	5,486.00	4,433.10	16,587.10
TOTAL	\$ 18,194.00	\$ 16,003.75	\$ 52,038.91
DO 8 PENALTY	\$ 21,098.60	\$ 17,557.37	\$ 54,736.49
RESTITUTION	3,787.69	4,540.50	13,754.22
FINE	60,897.00	6,650.00	85,713.00
TOTAL	\$ 85,783.29	\$ 28,747.87	\$ 154,203.71
DO 9 PENALTY	\$ 6,248.50	\$ 7,161.50	\$ 16,515.70
RESTITUTION	0	230.00	230.00
FINE	4,620.00	5,408.00	16,608.00
TOTAL	\$ 10,868.50	\$ 12,799.50	\$ 33,353.20
DO 10 PENALTY	\$ 0	\$ 3,418.00	\$ 3,418.00
RESTITUTION	0	565.00	565.00
FINE	0	2,389.00	2,389.00
TOTAL	\$ 0	\$ 6,372.00	\$ 6,372.00
DO 11 PENALTY	\$ 0	\$ 1,140.00	\$ 1,140.00
RESTITUTION	0	847.00	847.00
FINE	0	905.00	905.00
TOTAL	\$ 0	\$ 2,892.00	\$ 2,892.00
DO 12 PENALTY	\$	\$	\$
RESTITUTION			
FINE			
TOTAL	\$	\$	\$

FY '84

FY '85

5 yr. Cumulative

-24-

YTD

CO	PENALTY	<u>\$ 45,483.18</u>	<u>\$ 66,780.54</u>	<u>\$154,700.94</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>2,704.91</u>	<u>8,546.10</u>	<u>13,108.01</u>
	FINE	<u>35,807.00</u>	<u>17,119.80</u>	<u>126,717.80</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 83,995.09</u>	<u>\$ 92,446.44</u>	<u>\$294,526.75</u>

BUREAU	PENALTY	<u>\$ 157,065.19</u>	<u>\$ 178,262.51</u>	<u>\$ 461,584.44</u>
	RESTITUTION	<u>20,984.96</u>	<u>35,825.00</u>	<u>72,019.33</u>
	FINE	<u>182,428.80</u>	<u>118,661.90</u>	<u>555,409.60</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$ 360,478.95</u>	<u>\$ 332,749.41</u>	<u>\$1,089,013.37</u>

FY '83— \$200,472.48

FY '82— \$139,253.03

FY '81— \$ 56,059.50

BOOKKEEPING ACTIVITY FOR EACH DISTRICT OFFICE
ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF JOURNAL PAGES PROCESSED

	'81	'82	'83	'84	'85	TOTAL PAGES
DO #1	8	22	54	75	97	256
DO #2	10	20	40	70	85	225
DO #3	9	28	34	54	51	176
DO #4	10	20	33	53	49	165
DO #5	11	21	41	73	80	226
DO #6	11	18	37	43	37	146
DO #7	10	18	42	56	58	184
DO #8	11	24	54	81	72	242
DO #9	7	15	21	50	48	141
DO#10	0	0	0	0	25	25
DO#11	0	0	0	0	22	22
DO#12	0	0	0	0	0	0
C.O.	74	20	122	109	164	489
TOTAL	161	206	478	664	788	2,297

PAROLE RESOURCE OFFICE AND ORIENTATION FACILITY

I. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility (P.R.O.O.F.) 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 twelve district offices statewide, which provide 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 similar 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 effort to reorganize or reiterate 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 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 institution furlough program. All furloughees are required to notify the district parole office upon arrival at their destination. Many furloughees arrive at their destination after normal business hours or their furlough 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 2nd of that year. Fifteen and one half years later, on June 25, 1985, we admitted the 2098th resident.

B. Utilization Rate

From July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985, there were a total of 5475 resident days available. (15 beds x 365 days). Of this total, 3616 days were utilized. The Average Daily Population was 9.9 residents for an operating average 66.15. For the same period last year the facility operated at 67.1% of capacity with an Average Daily Population of 10.2.

C. Admissions

On 6/30/84 there were fourteen parolees in residence at PROOF. From 7/1/84 to 6/30/85 there were one hundred fifty-three (153) admissions. In FY 84 there were one hundred seventy (170) admissions. The fourteen in residence plus the one hundred fifty-three (153) admitted made a total of one hundred sixty-seven (167) residents serviced during the year.

D. Terminations

During the year, there were one hundred fifty-nine (159) terminations of residency leaving eighty (8) parolees in residence as of 6/30/85. The 159 cases spent a total of 3683 days in residence for an Average Length of Stay 23.2 days. This is the same as last years Average Length of Stay.

One hundred eighteen (74.2) of the terminations were by reasons of relocation in the community. Thirteen (8.2%) were AWOL, failed to return and are presumed to have relocated in the community. Eleven (6.9%) had been admitted on an emergency basis for the night only and were referred to the district office for further assistance. Seven (4.4%) entered other residential programs more suited to their needs (drug, alcohol, or hospital). Seven (4.4%) were asked to leave for various infractions of house rules ranging from curfew violation to assaulting staff members. Three (1.9%) were known to be arrested on new charges in the community.

E. Referrals

We received 254 referrals during the year which resulted in the above noted 153 admissions. The breakdown of admissions according to referring district office and commitment status parole is shown on Table I which is appended to the end of this report. District Office No. 4 provided the most admissions with forty eight (28.7%).

III. CASEWORK

A. One of the major goals of the program is to assist residents in developing self-sufficiency so that they can maintain themselves in the community. For most residents this means obtaining full time employment. To this end, we have employed the services of various community resources such as New Jersey State Employment Services, New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission, CET, 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 Personnel Source, Olsten's, Starbell, Staff Builders and Manpower.

Staff also works to the best of its ability in developing direct employment referrals for the residents. At the time of their termination, ninety-seven (61.0%) residents were employed.

We conducted a study of the earnings record of all residents during Calendar Year 1984. We found that 60% of all admissions obtained some type of employment during their stay. Those who did obtain employment earned an average of \$365 while in residence.

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

B. Many of the residents have taken advantage of the education and training programs 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 CET 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 we have utilized the resources of the Jersey City Municipal Welfare Department, Gate Money funds from the institution, Health Services funds from Central Office, and the Mini-Grant Account.

During the year, we were able to provide financial assistance through Mini-Grant totalling \$482.25. A total of 78 grants were made. Most grants were for transportation expenses. Some were for toilet articles and clothing. A few were for medical prescription.

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 dental clinic and the Venereal Disease Clinic.

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

E. Counselling remains one of the most basic services which we provide the residents. The intensive, indepth intake interview enables the staff to evaluate the resident's current situation and problems. A plan for return to the community which is the 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 weekly house meetings is required of all residents. Under the direction of RPO Serge 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. During the year, we have continued Pre-Employment Preparation (P.E.P.) 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. Unfortunately due to staff shortages, we were able to hold only six workshops all year.

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 our number. Over the past year we received a total of six hundred ninety-six (696) calls. The number is 72 more calls than received last year and represents an average of 58 calls per month. Since the start of the hotline service we have received a total of 3535 calls.

Effective 1/28/82, 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 we have responded to a total of 174 NCIC inquiries.

B. During the year, we received 1195 furlough calls. All calls are recorded and are held for verification by the district furlough coordinator.

V. PERSONNEL

A. There are a total of nine staff positions assigned to PROOF. These include one supervisor, Parole Residential Facility, seven residential parole officers, and one senior clerk typist.

B. At the beginning of the Fiscal Year we had one RPO position vacant.

C. Mr. George Lawaich, Sr. P.O., DO #4 was appointed as an RPO effective 2/4/85.

D. Mr. Michael Brunner, RPO was appointed as a Sr. P.O., DO #4 effective 2/18/85.

E. Mr. Brunner returned to PROOF as an RPO from DO #4 effective 5/11/85 and Mr. John Jordan, RPO transferred to DO #4 as a Sr. P.O. effective the same date.

F. Mr. John Stephenson, P.O., DO #4, was promoted provisionally to RPO effective 6/22/85.

G. At the end of FY 85, all positions were filled.

VI. MANAGEMENT

A. The combination of a vacant position for all but 3 weeks during the year and the extended sick leave of four staff members, including the

senior clerk typist, resulted in the need of the remaining staff to assume extra heavy workloads just to keep the facility operational. Program activities, such as PEP Workshops, employment development, house meetings and staff meetings were severely curtailed.

B. An agreement on lease renewal has been reached with Jersey City Housing Authority which requires the lessor to complete extensive renovations and remodeling particularly in the bathrooms and kitchen. In the last week of the Fiscal Year, some work has begun on these renovations.

C. We were inspected twice during the year by the State Department of Health. Both times we were given evaluations of Conditionally Satisfactory. Almost all violations cite structural problems which hopefully will be corrected as a result of the lease renovations.

VII. PUBLIC RELATIONS

A. The reintegration of the parolee within the 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 we are in frequent contact with various employment placement agencies, social services agencies, medical facilities and private citizens. We believe we are fortunate in enjoying a good working relationship with the people most helpful and vital to our operations.

B. RPO Roger Bedford has represented the facility at meetings throughout the year at the N.J. Coalition for the Homeless.

Residents by Commitment Status and District Office

	TSB JMSF JUVENILE	YCIA YCIB YRCC YOUTHFUL	NJSP SOCC MIDSTATE CIW ADULT	OUT OF STATE	COUNTY JAIL	TOTAL
DO #1	2	10	9	1	0	22
DO #2	0	15	15	1	0	31
DO #3	5	11	10	0	1	27
DO #4	1	21	18	2	6	48
DO #5	2	2	1	0	0	5
DO #6	3	2	1	0	0	6
DO #7	0	0	1	0	0	1
DO #8	0	0	1	0	0	1
DO #9	2	9	13	1	0	25
DO #10	0	0	0	0	0	0
DO #11	0	1	0	0	0	1
DO #12	0	0	0	0	0	0
total	15	71	69	5	7	167

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Reduced availability of federal funding continues to diminish Bureau involvement in Special Projects.

Grant application has been made to fund a Juvenile Aftercare Program to provide intensive supervision and agency networking to small caseloads by specially qualified workers. Application remains under consideration.

Grant application has been made to fund a program of Intensive Supervision for selected adults requiring Mental Health Treatment. Small caseloads would allow maximum service/surveillance contacts to assure required treatment programs are being attended and needs are being adequately met. Application remains under consideration.

District Parole Supervisor James Joyce completed 14 months of detached service from the Bureau completing research on the factors involved in parole success vs. parole failure. The sponsor of the Project was the National Institute of Justice.

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 have not otherwise been afforded the opportunity.

The Bureau continues to monitor the contract existing between the Department and the Vocational Services Unit of the Joint Connection. Client referrals for job placement are made from District Parole Office Nos. 2, 7, and 9. The Vocational Service Unit is responsible for applicant testing, job development and placement.

OFFICE OF INTERSTATE SERVICES

The Department currently has 26 contracts with other states to exchange respective inmates. A contract with the State of New York was negotiated and pending final approval.

Plans were underway by the end of the fiscal year to design a program of tracking contract renewals, inmate exchanges and a time bank. The Compact Unit has met with computer program representatives to discuss the feasibility of this program.

Corrections Compact standards were reviewed and renewed during the year. Various forms were updated and amended.

There are currently 12 inmates assigned to the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Various litigation remains pending on the transfer of high risk inmates into the Federal System.

A new federal statute governing the Witness Protection Program became effective this year. Upon parole, total legal jurisdiction is assigned to the Federal Parole Commission and Federal Probation. In order for our clients to maintain protection in this program after parole, the State Parole Board may have to relinquish their jurisdiction. Currently no such cases are being paroled by the Board pending the attorney general's clarification.

The Federal District Court and the Third Circuit of Appeals held that the IAD is applicable to probation violation detainers. Upon request of OIS and approval of this Department, the attorney general's office intervened in the case due to our interest in parole violators and warrants filed out of state. The Supreme Court overturned the Nash case indicating that probation violation warrants did not constitute an outstanding indictment, information or complaint.

The STOS Process was resumed during the year. Problems remain unresolved. A proposal has been presented to PPCAA to draft uniform legislation.

All executive agreements have been accomplished via procedure established by OIS with the Governor's Office, our institutions and our local prosecutor's office.

Meetings were held with the Governor's Council which resulted in the removal of the deputy attorney general's review. This has assisted us in meeting extradition deadlines.

The State of New Jersey cannot process our inmates under various U.S. treaties as we lack enabling legislation to accomplish the transfer legally. The supervisor was requested by the Commission to research this matter and present findings for resolution. A proposal was submitted for passage of enabling legislation to accomplish this. The matter is pending.

The supervisor and staff continue efforts of technical assistance to various prosecutorial agencies especially Mercer County who during the year has made a concerted effort to use the Juvenile Compact in all matters under their jurisdiction. A number of manuals have been distributed.

Surveillance of youths at various airports continued without incident.

Technical assistance and consultation has been ongoing with various staff members to better effectuate compact terms. Reference materials, compact/contract terms have been forwarded and consultation continues as needed.

The Adult Compact continues operation without any major legal problems. No litigation has been filed by New Jersey clients under the terms of this compact.

The supervisor has been nominated to the position of Secretary, PPCAA, an in line progressive position to the "87" Presidency. Executive council decisions include:

1. Misdemeanor cases shall be without exception supervised when a referral is made and the case meets compact criteria.
2. Supervision fees can only be enforced by the sending state.
3. Third party waivers are legal and effort must be directed by all administrators to push their use via consultation and education of judges and prosecutors.

The supervisor was appointed by PPCAA executive officer to the National Commission to update compact policy, procedure and statute.

New autos and police package equipment were received during the year.

The escort expenditures during the year did not exceed \$100,000.00 as projected. The unit spent approximately \$98,500.00 on transportation and overtime.

During the year, OIS trained three (3) Interstate Specialist II's, two Interstate Specialist I's, two Principal Clerk Typists and two file clerks due to various employee promotions. Overtime was utilized to audit caseloads and to review and implement new file systems. Overtime also assisted in eliminating an enormous work backlog which resulted from staff shortages over a two (2) year period.

Various problems have arisen and are pending clarification:

1. Board processing of hearings for parole have been done selectively over this office's objections.
2. Board file request and more importantly, their inability to service OIS have created workload problems.
3. Untimely receipt of Declaration of Delinquencies have resulted in case loss of fugitives.
4. Corrections Compact procedures have been ignored.
5. What stops time (warrant vs. inabsentia revocation) on parole violation cases under old Board of Trustee's jurisdiction. The matter has been referred to the attorney general's office for resolution.

VOLUNTEERS IN PAROLE PROGRAM

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

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

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

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

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

Student interns are also recruited from New Jersey colleges, thus offering the student the chance to personally experience the workings of the criminal justice system while earning college credits.

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

SCATTER AND TYPES OF VOLUNTEERS
1984-1985

DO#	ASSIGNED	UNASSIGNED	INACTIVE	SPECIAL SERVICE	TOTAL ASSIGNED	TOTAL AVAILABLE	TOTAL VOLUNTEERS	PERCENT ASSIGNED
1	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0%
2	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	100%
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
5	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	100%
6	0	5	12	1	1	6	18	17%
7	0	0	3	1	-	0	4	0%
8	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0%
9	0	0	4	0	1	1	5	100%
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
11	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	100%
12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	2	7	21	3	5	13	34	38%

NCIC/SCIC OPERATIONS

The VIPP Central Office coordinator is also responsible for operation of the Central Office NCIC/SCIC computer terminal. In previous years, there were two positions assigned to the VIPP/NCIC section, however, one position was "lost" and it now remains the function of the VIPP coordinator to execute the duties of both positions.

The primary responsibilities of the NCIC/SCIC operator is to enter all "wants", supplemental wants, modifications and cancellations as well as to obtain administrative inquiries, criminal histories and process all "hits/locates" received by the computer, from both in and out of state. In addition, all entries (wants) and cancellations are relayed to PROOF daily where a "mirror file" is kept so as to provide 24 hour a day, 365 day a year verification of the status of wanted persons for requesting agencies.

Also as a prerequisite for staying in the system, a validation of all records must be completed every six months for the State Police.

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

The yearly computer activity was as follows:

Entries	717
Supplementals	275
Modifications	78
Inquiries	246
Cancellations	542
Criminal Histories	738
Hits Processed	637

COUNTY ASSISTANCE UNIT/COUNTY IDENTIFICATION TEAM

Bureau participation in the Departmental County Identification Team ceased mid-way during the fiscal year. However, as the year drew to a close, a senior parole officer was appointed to a new Departmental Unit whose purpose it is to properly process the anticipated 700 plus state inmates who are to be housed in County facilities on a contractual basis. This senior parole officer will be responsible for coordinating field activities relative to the pre and post release needs of the state prisoners so housed.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

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

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

Bayshore Detectives Association
Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Association
Tri-State Association of Criminal Investigators
Rutgers University
Hispanic Health and Mental Health Association of Camden
The Joint Connection
Mercer County Chiefs of Police Association
Salvation Army
H.O.P.E.
Hispanic Coalition on Alcohol and Drug Abuse
Essex County Mental Health Association
N.J. Association for Ex-Offender Employment Services
Passaic County College
Hispanic Coalition of Substance Abuse of Passaic County
Gloucester County Investigators Association
N.J. Chapter of the ACA
U.S. Immigration Service
Camden County Business & Professional Womens Association
Urban Business Coalition of Newark
Burlington County Detectives Association
Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America
Municipal Investigators Association of Union County
Somerset County Youth Services Commission
Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company
N.A.A.C.P.
William Patterson College
Union County Criminal Investigators Association
Trenton State College
N.J. Association on Corrections
Monmouth County Police Academy
New York University School of Business Administration
Violent Crimes Compensation Board
Camden County Detectives Association

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

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

District Office No. 1's Parole Officer Bernal continued as vice-chairman of the Hispanic Coalition of Alcohol and Drug Abuse.

District Office No. 2's DPS Joyce continued as vice president and a member of the Board of Trustees of the Ex-Offenders Employment Services.

District Office No. 2's ADPS Paparozzi has joined the publication staff of the N.J. Chapter of the ACA. He has been appointed associate editor for their annual journal.

District Office No. 2's Senior Parole Officers Walter LoBue and John Mullaney along with senior investigator Vasquez received a commendation from the Newark Police Department.

District Office No. 4's Parole Officer Stephenson has been sworn into the N.J. Bar Association.

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

District Office No. 5's Parole Officer Cooper was nominated by Orange Police Captain Wactor as an outstanding young man of America, an honor that recognizes young men throughout the nation for professional achievement and community services.

District Office No. 6's Parole Officer Scott is a member of the Board of Directors of the Burlington County Chapter of Big Brother/Big Sisters of America.

District Office No. 6's Senior Parole Officer Swayser has been elected Treasurer of the Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Association.

District Office No. 8's DPS Cook and Supervising Parole Officer Levin were guests on the Pinky Kravitz Talk Show broadcasting on radio station WOND.

District Office No. 9's DPS Patterson is vice president and a member of the Board of Trustees of the N.J. Association on Corrections. He is also the chairman of the Personnel/Affirmative Action Committees and a member of the nominating committee.

District Office No. 10's Senior Parole Officer Lampe was elected as second vice president of the Tri-State Investigators Association.

District Office Nos. 10, 11, and 12 staffs have begun making that variety of public relations contacts essential to community service agencies.

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 now been defined to include only those New Jersey inmates who are making payments on their revenue obligations. Because of their inmate status, they have been removed as an integral part of the Parole count, and will not appear in the following charts and tables as it has in previous year.

Some statistical data concerning the Office of Interstate Services is available and is reported herein. Other information could not be tabulated for this reporting period but it is hoped that in the coming years, increasing amounts of data will be available for inclusion.

CASELOADS (See Table I)

On June 30, 1985, the Bureau of Parole was responsible for the supervision of 13,553 cases in New Jersey and 797 cases residing out of state, for a grand total of 14,350. During the fiscal year, 22,021 cases were actively supervised by the Bureau in New Jersey 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 1984-1985 fiscal year totalled 7.9 percent of the Bureau's entire caseload. The court commitment/recommitment equalled 2.2 percent while the technical violations rate equalled 5.7 percent of the total rate cited above. These figures represent a .9 percent decrease in commitment/recommitments over the prior fiscal year and an increase of .1 percent in technical violation rate. The overall rate drifted downward from 8.7 percent in Fiscal 1984 to 7.9 percent in Fiscal 1985, an overall decrease of .8 percent.

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

The percentage of missing cases, in relation to total Bureau caseload, totalled 8.7 percent. Parolees from the Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown had the largest percentage of missing cases (13.7 percent); however, the caseload from Clinton was close behind with 12.6 percent. Figures relative to Training School for Girls, Skillman are not large enough to present appropriate comparison.

SUPERVISION (See Table 4)

In the course of supervising the Bureau's caseload during Fiscal 1985, Bureau field staff made a grand total of 291,402 contacts. An additional 30,330 investigation contacts were made. State vehicles assigned to districts were driven a total of 1,001,686 miles in spite of difficulties encountered, in many instances, with service, repairs, and car shortages. A total of 127,746 hours or 51.7 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 presently reliant solely on its components for manual submission of information to compile statistical data. Statistics on numbers and activities of New Jersey cases paroled out of state are again being compiled, at least, to a limited extent. Attempts to further refine our statistics have not been completely successful; with manual data gathering, and turnover in personnel, a margin of error still exists. Hope for the future is bright: Terminals are being installed at field sites and updating of electronic files will eventually be done daily.

mps

TABLE #1

TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - FISCAL YEAR 1984-1985 (BY INSTITUTIONS)

Institutions	IN NEW JERSEY				OFFICE OF INTERSTATE SERVICES				TOTAL Under Super- vision 6/30/85
	Under Super- vision 7/1/84	*Total Cases Added	*Total No. Super- vised 1984-85	Under Super- vision 6/30/85	Under Super- vision 7/1/84	*Total Cases Added	*Total No. Super- vised 1984-85	Under Super- vision 6/30/85	
Training School for Girls	41	21	62	38	0	0	0	0	38
Training School for Girls, Skillman	22	15	37	17	0	0	0	0	17
Correctional Institution for Women	468	277	745	514	31	28	59	37	551
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	684	593	1277	726	22	16	38	22	748
Training School for Boys, Skillman	161	125	286	148	6	6	12	5	153
Juvenile Medium Security Facility	34	104	138	106	1	2	3	3	109
Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale	1874	1184	3058	2118	59	42	101	45	2163
Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown	1396	589	1985	1277	105	54	159	76	1353
Youth Reception and Correction Center	1421	720	2141	1363	184	90	274	126	1489
State Prison	4949	2910	7859	5534	388	251	639	390	5924
Adult Diagnostic & Treatment Center	74	34	108	80	5	4	9	6	86
Out-of-State Cases in New Jersey (Male)	599	423	1022	624	0	0	0	0	624
Out-of-State Cases in New Jersey (Female)	21	26	47	28	0	0	0	0	28
County (Male)	666	2322	2988	902	0	12	12	6	908
County (Female)	59	209	268	78	1	0	1	0	78
**Other	0	0	0	0	47	55	102	81	81
TOTAL	12469	9552	22021	13553	849	560	1409	797	14350
Under Supervision (1984)	<u>12469</u>				<u>849</u>				13318
Total Cases Added *		<u>9552</u>				<u>560</u>			10112
Total Number Supervised			<u>22021</u>				<u>1409</u>		23430
Under Supervision (1985)				<u>13553</u>				<u>797</u>	<u>14350</u>

*Figures include cases involving transfers between district.

**Revenue cases, residing out-of-state, maximum time portion of sentence expired.

TABLE #2
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF VIOLATORS
BY DISTRICT AND SEX
BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
FISCAL 1984-85

MALE

Districts	Total Number Supervised During Year*	Number and Percent of Violators				TOTAL	
		Committed or Recommended		Returned as Technical Vio.		Number	Percent
1. Clifton	2700	97	3.5%	169	6.2%	266	9.8%
2. East Orange	2449	66	2.7%	138	5.6%	204	8.3%
3. Red Bank	1899	42	2.2%	153	8.0%	195	10.2%
4. Jersey City	2485	33	1.3%	128	5.1%	161	6.4%
5. Elizabeth	1725	38	2.2%	139	8.0%	177	10.2%
6. Trenton	1954	27	1.3%	134	6.8%	161	8.1%
7. Camden	1986	55	2.7%	132	6.6%	187	9.3%
8. Atlantic City	1984	51	2.5%	119	6.0%	170	8.5%
9. Newark	1749	65	3.7%	90	5.1%	155	8.8%
10. Vineland	926	8	.86%	44	4.7%	52	5.6%
11. New Brunswick	1013	6	.59%	14	1.3%	20	1.9%
12. Paterson **							
13. Office of Inter-state Services	1349	1	.07%	30	2.2%	31	2.3%
TOTAL MALE	22219	489	2.2%	1290	5.8%	1779	8.0%

FEMALE

1. Clifton	143	2	1.3%	3	2.0%	5	3.3%
2. East Orange	163	1	.61%	8	4.9%	9	5.5%
3. Red Bank	138	1	.72%	10	7.2%	11	7.9%
4. Jersey City	128	4	3.1%	4	3.1%	8	6.2%
5. Elizabeth	83	0	0%	3	3.6%	3	3.6%
6. Trenton	118	1	.84%	2	1.6%	3	2.5%
7. Camden	104	4	3.8%	7	6.7%	11	10.5%
8. Atlantic City	95	1	1.0%	1	1.0%	2	2.0%
9. Newark	89	3	3.3%	1	1.1%	4	4.4%
10. Vineland	37	0	0%	2	5.4%	2	5.4%
11. New Brunswick	53	1	1.8%	2	3.7%	3	5.5%
12. Paterson **							
13. Office of Inter-state Services	60	0	0%	2	3.3%	2	3.3%
TOTAL FEMALE	1211	18	1.5%	45	3.7%	63	5.2%
GRAND TOTAL	23430	507	2.2%	1335	5.7%	1842	7.9%

*Figures include inter-office transfer of cases.

**District Office No. 12 was not operational as of June 30, 1985.

TABLE #2A

PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
 BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
 BY DISTRICT
 1984-1985

	1	2	3	4
Districts	Total Number Supervised	Committed or Recommitted	Technical Violators	Total
1. Clifton	2843	3.5%	6.0%	9.5%
2. East Orange	2612	2.6%	5.5%	8.1%
3. Red Bank	2037	2.1%	8.0%	10.1%
4. Jersey City	2613	1.4%	5.0%	6.4%
5. Elizabeth	1808	2.1%	7.9%	10.0%
6. Trenton	2072	1.3%	6.5%	7.8%
7. Camden	2090	2.8%	6.6%	9.4%
8. Atlantic City	2079	2.5%	5.7%	8.2%
9. Newark	1838	3.7%	4.9%	8.6%
10. Vineland	963	.83%	4.7%	5.5%
11. New Brunswick	1066	.65%	1.5%	2.2%
12. Paterson *				
13. Office of Interstate Services	1409	.07%	2.3%	2.4%
TOTAL	23430	2.2%	5.7%	7.9%

TABLE #2B

PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
 BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED
 FIVE-YEAR COMPARISON

Committed or Recommited					Technical Violators					Total				
1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
4.0%	4.0%	2.9%	3.1%	2.2%	6.0%	5.9%	5.7%	5.6%	5.7%	10%	9.9%	8.6%	8.7%	7.9%

*District Office No. 12 was not operational as of June 30, 1985.

TABLE #3

RECORD OF MISSING CASES
BY INSTITUTION
1984-1985

Institutions	Total on Parole on 6/30/85	Missing as of 6/30/84	Became Missing Between 7/1/84 and 6/30/85	Total Missing	Accounted for Between 7/1/84 and 6/30/85	Total Missing 6/30/85	Net Difference	Percent of Missing in Relation to Caseload on 6/30/85
Training School for Girls	38	3	2	5	2	3	0	7.9%
Training School for Girls, Skillman	17	1	3	4	1	3	+2	17.6%
Correctional Institution for Women	514	55	42	97	32	65	+10	12.6%
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	726	20	36	56	24	32	+12	4.4%
Training School for Boys, Skillman	148	2	7	9	8	1	-1	.7%
Juvenile Medium Security Facility	106	0	4	4	3	1	+1	.9%
Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale	2118	158	158	316	134	182	+24	8.6%
Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown	1277	181	91	272	97	175	- 6	13.7%
Youth Reception & Correction Center	1363	123	85	208	74	134	+11	9.8%
State Prison	5534	532	371	903	340	563	+31	10.2%
Adult Diagnostic & Treatment Center	80	2	1	3	1	2	0	2.5%
Out-of-State: Male	624	6	16	22	21	1	-5	.2%
Female	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Male	902	16	5	21	10	11	-5	1.2%
Female	78	1	1	2	1	1	0	1.3%
TOTAL (In New Jersey)	13553	1100	822	1922	748	1174	+74	8.7%

TABLE #3A

RECORD OF MISSING CASES
BY DISTRICT
1984-1985

Districts	*Caseload on 6/30/85	Missing as of 6/30/84	Became Missing Between 7/1/84 and 6/30/85	Total Missing	Accounted for Between 7/1/84 and 6/30/85	Total Missing on 6/30/85	Net Difference	Percent of Missing in Relation to Caseload on 6/30/85
1. Clifton	1915	158	88	246	66	180	+22	9.4%
2. East Orange	1817	126	130	256	134	122	- 4	6.7%
3. Red Bank	993	103	31	134	38	96	- 7	9.7%
4. Jersey City	1723	177	130	307	114	193	+16	11.2%
5. Elizabeth	912	126	87	213	119	94	-32	10.3%
6. Trenton	1180	90	67	157	47	110	+20	9.3%
7. Camden	1209	80	34	114	48	66	-14	5.4%
8. Atlantic City	875	106	68	174	93	81	-25	9.2%
9. Newark	1241	134	42	176	62	114	-20	9.2%
10. Vineland	769	0	63	63	21	42	+42	5.4%
11. New Brunswick	919	0	82	82	6	76	+76	8.3%
12. Paterson **								
TOTAL	13553	1100	822	1922	748	1174	+74	8.7%

TABLE #3B

PERCENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO TOTAL CASELOAD
5 YEAR COMPARISON

1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
10.9%	9.3%	8.8%	8.7%	

*In New Jersey

**District Office No. 12 was not operational as of June 30, 1985.

TABLE #4

SUMMARY OF DAILY RECORDS OF ACTIVITIES

1984-1985

District Offices	FIELD AND OFFICE CONTACTS												REPORTS SUBMITTED						SUMMARIES SUBMITTED (6)				HOURS		MILEAGE	
	TYPE OF CONTACT (1)								SUPERVISION (2)			INVESTI- GATION (3)		SUPERVISION (4)		INVESTI- GATION (5)										
	C	E	H	N	O	S	PCH	RH	P	PO	R	P	N	F-19	F-21	AR	PP	SR	DR	OA	TR	TS	(8) OFFICE	(9) FIELD	STATE	PER- SONAL
DO# 1	7670	530	11964	3074	10150	185	198	139	16731	16919	2050	3001	789	2506	3075		1162	221	18		82	527	13969.5	25831.5	162401	4041
DO# 2	7443	127	5969	3732	10603		142	71	15010	14572	1375	2092	1244	2784	3703	22	1391	483	4	7	125	468	17505	11618.5	57326.5	793
DO# 3	12392	334	7371	1933	10847	16	128	119	14594	16011	1413	1839	639	1716	1780	34	886	313	34	35	160	324	12253.5	13788	103828	264
DO# 4	17451	479	6299	2798	9489	32	136	99	17465	16693	3014	3027	1287	2318	3281	140	1479	415	7	42	113	518	15649.5	14340.5	94031	115
DO# 5	6029	168	6180	1834	7673	23	175	67	10018	11469	1030	1635	495	1543	2220		833	261	8	64	124	206	11475	9760	65848	291
DO# 6	10112	534	5737	1684	9487	65	147	114	12848	12077	1502	4032	348	1519	2218	9	1201	161	1	59	110	210	12395	11466	101644	
DO# 7	11279	456	5323	1814	20715	25	139	78	15560	21573	3575	2593	873	1885	3659	2	1479	630	16	497	124	464	12422.5	12038	109519	106
DO# 8	7897	315	6727	1788	12296	31	367	82	11634	14784	2953	2786	687	1802	2740	73	1184	904	10	507	117	271	9326	10499	211624	60
DO# 9	6095	521	10324	1923	7376	94	143	44	13080	14599	513	1594	873	2331	2033		797	29	11		99	331	11062.5	15050	44523.5	1469
DO# 10	1788	64	1809	549	2460	1	41	27	2465	3331	509	266	67	468	894		228	34	2	28	26	39	2189.5	2726	43410	
DO# 11	592	6	329	99	579	4	8	5	921	1002	112	131	32	100	105		45	59	1	5	7	21	811.5	628.5	7531	255
TOTAL	88748	3534	68032	21228	101975	476	1624	845	130326	143030	18046	22996	7334	18972	25708	280	10885	3510	112	1244	1087	3379	119059.5	127746	1001686	7394
GRAND TOTAL	286,462								291,402			30,330		44,680		14,675		5,822				246,805.5		1,009,080		

Legend:

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

District Office Nos. 10 and 11 became fully operational toward the end of the fiscal year.

District Office No. 12 has not as yet become operational.

