

974.901

P153

C.2

NEW JERSEY STATE LIBRARY

DEC 1 - 1976

185 W. State Street
Trenton, N. J.

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

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

BUREAU OF PAROLE

135 West Hanover Street, Trenton
(July 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976)

Nat R. Arluke, Chief
Bureau of Parole

Domenick Sparaino
Supervising Parole Officer

New Jersey State Library

I N D E X

Introduction	Page 1
Goals and Objectives	Page 1
Developments	Page 2
Personnel	Page 3
Budgetary Restrictions	Page 4
Training	Page 4
Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility	Page 6
Volunteers in Parole Program	Page 9
S.L.E.P.A. Grant Projects	Page 12
Parolee Earnings	Page 15
Discharged Prior to Expiration of Maximum	Page 15
Comprehensive Employment Training Act	Page 16
Casebook Reviews	Page 16
Probable Cause Hearings.....	Page 16
Public Relations	Page 17
Caseloads	Page 18
Returns to Institutions.....	Page 19
Missing Cases	Page 19
Supervision	Page 19
Institutional Parole Activities	Page 20

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Parole has the responsibility to conduct investigations for both parole and clemency matters, to provide supervision and submit reports concerning persons paroled from training schools, penal and correctional institutions in New Jersey, and persons paroled from similar institutions of other states to reside in New Jersey. In addition, the Bureau is responsible for periodical investigations and recording of inmates involved in the work release and furlough programs, and as a result of the Morrissey v. Brewer decision, for conducting the "Probable Cause" section of the revocation process.

In order to execute its responsibilities, the Bureau maintains a headquarters office in the State Capital, Trenton, nine district offices throughout the State, a parole office in each institution, and a community residential facility in Jersey City.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. Reduction of Caseload Size: Progress continues to be made in this area because of a continued lowering of intake of parolees, and by reason of the decision eliminating same sex supervision by parole officers thus equalizing caseloads (female caseloads were smaller), resulting in maintaining the ratio of parole officer to parolees of one to 55.
2. Improvement in Physical Facilities: All district office facilities remain under adequate lease contracts with the exception of the Atlantic City office, where negotiations for a new lease at a new location have been completed and a move to better quarters will be made in the very near future. Facilities at the Central Office will be improved by a proposed move to the Training School for Girls grounds in West Trenton in July, 1976.
3. Streamlining of Paper Work Processes continues at a rather slow pace. In order to accomplish our goal to expedite the process, to revitalize and update the many requirements, a full-time position should be created.
4. Improving Quality of Service to Clients and to the Community:
 - (a) Expansion of specialized caseloads from currently Federally funded nine caseloads to include special supervision based on specific parolee problems rather than geographical areas.
 - (b) Increase in parolee supervision span to include continued supervision during other than regular business hours.
 - (c) "Hotline" emergency communication arrangement.
 - (d) Inauguration of team supervision in each district (March, 1975).
5. Community Involvement:
 - (a) Increased utilization of current Volunteers in Parole Program.
 - (b) Expansion of community-based parole facility from the one in Jersey City to another, hopefully in Central Jersey when funds become available.
6. Staff selection and Retention:
 - (a) Continue efforts to upgrade salaries competitive with other agencies in related fields.
 - (b) Institute

personality testing programs to eliminate persons who are unsuited to this type of employment. (c) Provide increased promotional opportunities to retain personnel who now are accepting other outside opportunities. (d) Provide a program of professional development which will permit educational leave with full pay for up to two years, will provide a temporary replacement to cover the caseload of the person on leave, and then to offer a promotional opportunity in the Bureau following successful completion of the educational leave.

DEVELOPMENTS

Furlough Program and Work Release. On January 12, 1976, the furlough program employed by the various Youth Correctional Institutions and the Prison Complex of the State of New Jersey was suspended due to serious deficiencies in the process. The foremost criticisms addressed themselves to such areas as a lack of uniformity and consistency in operating procedures, a need for the verification of furlough destinations, and an absence of appropriate supervision for the inmates in the community.

Following an extensive investigation conducted by the Governor's office, it was recommended that explicit provisions be made to involve the Bureau of Parole in a revised program geared to correct the deficiencies of the past. Parole's involvement would guarantee an investigation of the proposed furlough destination, afford a higher degree of supervision to those persons participating in the program, and provide for the protection of the community.

Since the reinstatement of the furlough program under new guidelines, a grand total of 528 inmates have participated in 709 furloughs during the first reporting period which covers March 20, 1976, to September 30, 1976. In addition, a total of 357 furlough investigations were conducted by the nine district offices, uncovering four arrests, one escape and two detainees.

With the future implementation of Phases II and III of the furlough program in the current fiscal year, it is anticipated that the number of potential inmates eligible to participate will double.

With the Bureau of Parole assuming greater responsibility in the area of community pre-release services, it is anticipated that our future responsibilities will include work release and study release.

Team Supervision. Following a conference with the supervising parole officers and district parole supervisors in February, 1975, the team supervision concept was initiated in an attempt to provide better caseload management, more effective use of personnel, increased communications, and more thorough utilization of social casework processes. As of June 30, 1976, each of the nine district offices was actively involved in the process. In view of the policy of parole supervision without regard to the sex of parole officers or clients, the team supervision process has proven of value by the positive contributions of each member of the team toward the more efficient management of individual cases.

Bureau of Parole Employees' Credit Union. Over 60 percent of the employees are members of the Credit Union, which provides for payroll deduction savings at 6 percent. To date, 278 loans have been made to the members totaling over \$162,000.

Caseload Size remained constant with a slow steady increase. It is anticipated that the total caseload will begin to climb steadily as the result of increased admissions to most of the correctional institutions.

Realignment of District Offices to balance caseload overloads has been held in abeyance in view of the leveling and declining trend during this period of time.

Federally Funded Project was approved and operational covering the title of Community Resource Specialist (a senior parole officer in each of the nine district offices). In addition, one senior parole officer was funded for the short-term Community ReOrientation Project (assistance to those released without parole); however, this position is scheduled to be phased out.

Consideration is being given to the project development of Manpower Service Centers to provide intensive assistance to the gamut of employment in all of its phases for anyone in the correctional catchment area in addition to parolees.

PERSONNEL

At the end of the prior fiscal year, there were 306 staff members in the Bureau. No new budgeted positions were granted for 1975-76. The two parole officer trainee positions under C.E.T.A. program were abolished because of lack of funds.

We now have a total complement of 304 staff members as follows:

Chief	1
Supervising Parole Officers	7
Staff Director (VIPP)	1
Parole Coordinator (VIPP)	1
Analyst-Director (Community Resource Project).	1
District Parole Supervisors	9
Assistant District Parole Supervisors	12
Senior Parole Officers	31
Parole Officers	151
Clerical	90
	<u>304</u>

Twelve of the above 304 staff members are Federally funded positions as follows: Project-Analyst Director, nine senior parole officers - community resource specialists, one senior parole officer - community reorientation program, and one senior clerk-stenographer.

During the year there was one retirement, and 28 resignations were received from the professional staff for the following reasons,

Fourteen went to better paying positions in allied services agencies.

Four returned to graduate school.

Five resigned for personal reasons (two of whom were doing unsatisfactory work).

One accepted employment in private industry.

Two left when Federal funds were withdrawn.

Two moved out of State.

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

BUDGETARY RESTRICTIONS

Early in 1976 the Bureau was advised of a cut in the 1976-77 budget of almost a million dollars, thus reducing staff by over 90 positions. The effect on the morale of all employees was disastrous.

A plan to secure citizen and agency involvement was devised, a series of staff meetings were held, a coordinator appointed, and the plan was put into operation.

The results were amazing in that hundreds of written commitments were made by law enforcement agencies, social agencies, legislators, and private citizens. Personal contacts were made with key personnel in the budgetary process and attendance at budget hearings by staff members was accomplished.

Subsequently, the cut was reduced to \$500,000 thus eliminating 24 positions and reducing certain operating accounts. Restoration of the loss sustained is being requested in next year's budget.

TRAINING

Community Resource Specialist Program included the following specialized training courses:

Orientation, which included methods and procedures to implement the program, a review of the Volunteers in Parole Program, professional counseling and placement.

- a. Job Placement Development Workshop
- b. Training Course given by Mrs. Greta Singer, MS, ACSW.
- c. Group Counseling and Case Study Method - Community Resource Specialists James Joyce and Emma Bostic.

- d. A two-day seminar in Job Grooming and Job Development for parole clients - Dennis Brown, Gregory Dawson, Fred Quinn.
- e. Exceptional Educational Opportunity Program - Donald Tulease.
- f. Alcoholism Training Program - Department of Health and Administrative Office of the Courts.
- g. Behavior Modification Training was available to 15 selected staff members under the aegis of Dr. Frances Cheek.
- h. An Introductory Session on Behavior Modification was presented by Dr. Cheek to Supervising Parole Officers and District Parole Supervisors.

In-Service Training held on an area basis included the following topics and speakers:

- a. Mercer County Drug Clinic Program - Willie McCrary.
- b. Specialized handling, treatment, consideration for parole revocation re: sex offenders, the Dalonges Decision - Supervising Parole Officer Fred E. Haley.
- c. Garden State School District Program - Robert Walton.
- d. New Renaissance Inc. Program - Dr. Tony Hamerie and Larry Evans.
- e. Interstate Compact - Supervising Parole Officer Fred E. Haley.
- f. Gamblers Anonymous Program - Division of Civil Rights Program - Glen Barrett.
- g. Bail Program and Volunteers in Probation - Joseph Clark and Geoffrey Berrien.
- h. New Jersey Police Organized Crime Investigation Unit - Film: "Children of Violence" - Mr. Carlisle.
- i. Medium Security at Leesburg - program included:
 - Classification - Mr. Jenkins
 - Education - Mr. DiSantis
 - Alpha Meta - Mr. Veltrie
 - Work Release - Mr. Borek
 - Furloughs - Mr. Risi
- j. Body Language - Dr. Gwynn Nesor
- k. Techniques of Interviewing the Involuntary Client - Joseph Farina.
- l. White and Miller Decisions - Maureen O'Hagan.
- m. A Cooperative Approach Through Multiple Agencies for Involuntary Clients - Rita Lang.
- n. Furlough Program - Robert Makarski.
- o. Clerical In-Service program - committee: Principal Clerk Stenographers Dorothy McClammy, Lois Ranahan and Helen Martelli. Program speakers and topics included:

Telephone Techniques - Mrs. Winifred Chambers
 Transactional Analysis - Art Brown
 Institutional Clerical Procedures - Senior Institutional
 Parole Officer Russell Knight
 Personnel Problems - Charles Myers
 Office Procedures - Discussion Leader Lois Ranahan
 The Future of Parole - Chief Nat R. Arluke

Orientation for New Parole Officers - Chairmen: Senior Parole Officers Harry Segletes and David Bickert. This was a five-day session given only once in view of the fact that so few new positions were available.

Correction Officers Training was held on a regular schedule in the district offices on a one-day basis.

PAROLE RESOURCE OFFICE AND ORIENTATION FACILITY (PROOF)

The Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility is operated by the Bureau of Parole. It is located in a public housing project in Jersey City and houses persons already on parole who have experienced some major difficulty in parole adjustment. Instead of considering return to an institution, an opportunity is offered the parolee to reside at PROOF and participate in a program of 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week, social diagnosis. Hopefully, after a stay which varies from a few weeks to several months, the parolee can be returned to his home district for continuance of parole supervision. In prior years, up to two work releasees from State Prison, Rahway, were housed at PROOF. The program was discontinued by institutional authorities.

PROOF is staffed by seven professional parole staff members and one clerical person on-site, under the responsibility and general supervision of a Supervising Parole Officer of the Central Office in Trenton. The professional staff works on a 24-hour rotating shift coverage. During 1975, a senior parole officer was added to PROOF as the on-site supervisor and provides the necessary accountability of both casework and facility operation. The balance of professional staff consists of four residential parole officers and two parole officers.

During the fiscal year 1976, 4,021 man days were spent by residents at PROOF or an average of 73.24 percent of capacity. This was an increase of 5.14 percent over 1975 and 16.54 percent over 1974. One hundred and forty-six residents were housed at PROOF, an average of 27.6 days. Institutional breakdown of residents was:

Training School for Boys - 6; Youth Correctional Institution at Annandale - 25; Youth Correctional Institution at Bordentown - 43; Youth Correctional Institution at Yardville - 44; State Prison Complex - 24, and Out-of-State Parolees - 4. District office breakdown was as follows: DO#1, Clifton - 12; DO#2, East Orange - 26; DO#3, Red Bank - 8; DO#4, Jersey City - 56; DO#5, Elizabeth - 14; DO#6, Trenton - 2; DO#7, Camden - 8; DO#8, Atlantic City - 2; DO#9, Newark - 16.

During the year staff used various community resources in their attempts to service our clients. The goal of the program is to assist the residents in developing self-sufficiency so that they can maintain themselves in the community. For most residents this means obtaining full-time employment. To assist them in this endeavor, various residents were referred to the Vocational Counseling Service, New Jersey Employment Service, New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission, the Urban League, The United States Armed Forces, and to various temporary employment agencies such as Labor Pool or Manpower. Staff also worked to the best of their abilities in developing direct employment referrals for the residents. Despite a depression in the economy, and the local unemployment rate which is the highest in the State, staff have had remarkably good success in placing most residents who sincerely wanted to work on a job.

Most residents upon entering the facility are in a state of financial poverty. They come in with only the clothes on their backs and in most cases no more than a few dollars in their pockets. Clothing and transportation needs present a difficult problem. To assist them financially, the resources of the Jersey City Municipal Welfare Department have been utilized, Gate Money funds from the institutions, Health Services Funds from Central Office, and the Mini-Grant Fund administered under the Community Resource Specialist Project. Eighty-six mini-grants totaling \$655 were made to the residents during the course of the year.

Health care needs also have presented a problem for the residents. To provide them with adequate health care services, the resources of Dr. McGovern's office have been utilized for routine medical examinations at the Jersey City Medical Center, and the Jersey City Medical Center Emergency Room for acute illness. The resources of the Community Mental Health Center and the Salvation Army Counseling Services Program have been used for the mental health care of the residents. Many residents experience problems in coping with alcohol and drug abuse. The resources of the Patrick House Drug and Alcohol Abuse Clinic have been utilized to help residents deal with these addiction problems.

New Eyes for the Needy has cooperated in several instances in providing residents with new eye glasses. State Rehabilitation Commission also has provided dental care and other types of restorative health services. The Health Services Fund and Mini-Grant have been used to purchase prescriptions and other related types of health care needs for residents.

The recreational facilities of the local YMCA have been made available to PROOF residents by special arrangements with no cost to the residents.

One hundred and thirty-nine residents were terminated from the program for the following reasons: 56 residents were able to successfully relocate in the community without need for further assistance; 13 residents were placed in other programs more suited to their problems and needs; 46 residents were terminated for failing to adjust to the program (this included residents who went AWOL and never returned, as well as overtly adjustment problems); 8 residents were arrested by staff as parole

violators for serious violations of facility regulations; 14 residents are known to have been arrested in the community on new charges; two residents who had been involved in the work release program were terminated on the decision of the Superintendent of the New Jersey State Prison at Rahway.

By far the most important aspect of the PROOF program is the counseling available to the residents by professional staff. An intensive in-depth intake interview enables the staff to evaluate the resident's current situation and problems. The treatment program is then developed which is individually designed to help meet the resident's needs and problems.

The Team approach continues to be effectively used. This approach assures that a sympathetic and knowledgeable staff member is always available when the resident most needs and wants to discuss what is on his mind.

Countless counseling sessions during the early hours of the morning have enabled the resident to gain insight into his situation.

During the course of the year, a program was implemented whereby individual residents were assigned to individual staff members who acted as primary counselors. The function of the primary counselor was to periodically review with the resident his progress, his strength, his weaknesses, his plans, goals, termination date, and infraction of the rules, etc. One of the objectives was to assign to staff the responsibility for specific monitoring of resident progress goal attainment and development. Previously, some staff members were able to sit back and let others assume the burden of the counseling load. It was hoped that by assigning primary counselors the responsibility and work load would be more accurately distributed. We also hoped that this would help to draw the resident into purposeful counseling sessions. Rather than have staff simply react to the resident's problems, staff would take the offensive in dealing with the resident's behavior. The program has achieved partial success in obtaining its objectives. However, due to the varied schedules of the staff members, it frequently occurred that the assigned staff member would not see his counselee for several weeks at a time. Other staff members were reluctant to infringe upon their colleague's cases; and residents utilized the assignment of a counselor as a means to avoid interaction with all other staff members. They would argue that they wanted to discuss matters such as termination only with their counselor and not with whoever happened to be on duty at the time. Because of these problems we are now in the process of re-evaluating the concept and more than likely will make adjustments as they seem advisable.

Hotline. The hotline was established at PROOF on October 1, 1974. All parolees upon their release, many police departments, and other community agencies have been informed of this number. In its first nine months of operation, 58 hotline calls were logged, approximately six per month. In the twelve months of the fiscal year just ended, a total of 107 hotline calls were recorded, or approximately nine per month.

This represents a 50 percent increase in use during the period. Of the 107 calls received this past year, 65 were from parolees, and 42 were from wives, relatives, friends, and other community agencies. All calls are dealt with appropriately and brought to the attention of the district office for follow-up.

Two unusual cases may serve to illustrate the value of the hotline program. One case involved a female parolee who called late at night. She had been evicted from her apartment, had no money, no friends, and claimed no place to go. She was advised to come to the facility and thereafter arrangements were made for her to be housed in a local hotel for the night until the district office could be contacted and service her more adequately. If the hotline had not been available to her, we can envision her having had to roam the streets all night with no place to sleep. The second call involved the institutional parole officer at Clinton concerning the husband of a parolee who had been threatened by his wife. Ultimately, the Chairman of the State Parole Board became involved and at his request PROOF staff filed a warrant for the arrest of the parolee.

Furloughs. Quite unexpectedly, as far as PROOF was concerned, a new furlough procedure requiring furloughees to report to the parole office was instituted. On that day, eight telephone calls from furloughees were received reporting that they had arrived at their destinations. During the course of the remainder of the fiscal year, a total of 63 such telephone calls were received. All calls were fully recorded with pertinent information and were referred to the furlough coordinator in the district office for follow-up.

Public Relations. Good public relations continue to be essential to the operation of the facility. PROOF is a community-based treatment program which endeavors to reintegrate the parolee into his environment. To achieve this, the cooperation and assistance of the community is vital.

The staff is in almost daily contact with various employment placement agencies, social service agencies, medical facilities, private citizens, and of course, most importantly, private employers. Every effort is made to maintain the continued good rapport which has been developed with these agencies and citizens over the course of years.

PROOF residents were the recipients of special Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners served to them at the facility through the courtesy and generosity of the Meals-on-Wheels Program; also participation in the WOR Christmas Gift Program continued. Eighty gift-wrapped packages and 50 records were distributed to the neighborhood children.

VOLUNTEERS IN PAROLE PROGRAM

Fiscal year 1976 was the most productive in the history of the Volunteers in Parole Program. More volunteers participated in the program during this year than in any prior year, and the number of

parolees assisted equalled the program's previous high. Moreover, fiscal year 1976 was the first year in which VIPP volunteers provided substantial assistance not only to individual parolees but also the Bureau of Parole itself.

Assistance to Parolees. A total of 327 volunteers were available for assignment at some time in fiscal year 1976. Of these, 82 were new participants who joined during the year. As the new volunteers were joining, other volunteers were withdrawing, so that the total number active at any one time increased only gradually. Most of the volunteers were attorneys. However, a growing number of non-attorneys also participated in the program.

The volunteers assisted a total of 230 parolees during the year, an increase of 22 over the number assisted in fiscal year 1975. As in the past, the parolees came from the State Prison complex, the Youth Correctional Institution complex, the Training School for Girls/Boys at Jamesburg, and the Correctional Institution for Women.

The monthly statistics compiled during fiscal year 1976 showed a steady climb in the number of volunteers participating in the program ("aides available"), the number of volunteers actively working with parolees ("aides assigned"), and the number of volunteers agreeing to supervise specific inmates scheduled to be released on parole in the near future ("cases pending assignment"). A comparison of the June 30, 1976, figures with those for June 30, 1975, reveals significant improvement in each of the three areas of program activity:

	<u>Aides Available</u>	<u>Aides Assigned</u>	<u>Cases Pending Assignment</u>
June 30, 1975	250	131	27
June 30, 1976	291	148	45

Assistance in the Bureau's Funding Crisis. One of the primary benefits of the Volunteers in Parole Program is that it educates an influential segment of the public about the realities of the parole system. Attorneys and other citizens who have had little previous contact with correction and parole obtain first-hand knowledge about the importance and difficulties of a parole officer's job.

The vast majority of volunteers have concluded from their experiences in the program that high quality parole supervision is absolutely essential, both to give parolees a realistic opportunity to lead crime-free lives and to give the community the protection it deserves. In this era when many government officials are questioning the need for the parole system, the existence of a body of influential persons who are well informed about the need for the Parole Bureau can prove to be very advantageous.

The funding crisis which threatened the Bureau during fiscal year 1976 is a case in point. Immediately after Governor Byrne released his proposed budget which would have cut 93 parole positions, the VIPP staff

notified all volunteers about the emergency and requested that they contact key members of the State legislature. This campaign successfully educated a number of legislators about the serious consequences which the proposed cuts would have, and impressed upon the legislators the fact that important constituents of theirs were very concerned about this issue. This public relations effort was an important component of the Bureau's total campaign to get the proposed cuts restored.

"Volunteer of the Year." In fiscal year 1975 the VIPP staff initiated the practice of honoring one participant in the program each year as the "Volunteer of the Year." The purpose of the award is to express appreciation to the selected volunteer and to focus public attention on the valuable services which volunteers perform.

The 1975 "Volunteer of the Year" award was presented during fiscal year 1976 to Theodore L. VanWinkle, a Rutherford attorney working in the Clifton area. Van Winkle was singled out for the honor because he not only served as a parole aide but also recruited volunteers for the program. He became actively involved in VIPP soon after the program was begun, and initially worked with a young parolee who benefitted from his guidance. That assignment came to an end in December, 1974, when Van Winkle was appointed Judge of the Rutherford Municipal Court, a position which he felt precluded him from continuing to provide direct assistance to individual parolees.

However, Van Winkle remained keenly interested in VIPP, and began to assist the program in an even more significant fashion. As a member of the Lions Club, he had been involved in numerous activities which the Lions had sponsored for inmates of the Training School for Boys, Jamesburg. After his meaningful experiences in VIPP, Van Winkle concluded that other Lions Club members might want to establish similar personal relationships with boys from that Training School. So he singlehandedly undertook a recruitment campaign, travelling throughout the state to tell Lions Clubs about the benefits of VIPP and urging them to support the program. As a result, a number of Lions have begun participating in the program.

Feature articles about Van Winkle's activities appeared in the Bergen Record, the New Jersey Law Journal, the Lions Club magazine, and a number of other publications.

State Parole Board Requirements of VIPP Participation as a Special Condition of Parole. During the fiscal year 1976, the Chairman of the State Parole Board, Christopher Dietz, began requiring certain inmates to agree to participate in VIPP as a condition of parole. The inmates selected were the ones which appeared to have the least chance of success on parole. The Chairman explained that he used the Volunteers in Parole Program as a "court of last resort" to provide assistance to the parolees who have little else going for them.

Despite having deep reservations about the policy, the VIPP staff adopted a cooperative approach and assumed a "wait and see" attitude, admitting that there might be some merit in the Chairman's position.

At the same time, however, the VIPP staff decided that most parolees who participate in VIPP as a condition of parole will be required to report regularly not only to their volunteers, but also to their regular parole officers (i.e. "dual supervision"). This policy was deemed necessary to provide adequate supervision for the very difficult cases.

It is still too early to judge the value of the compulsory requirement. The VIPP staff will continue to closely monitor these matchups.

Orientation of Inmates. During fiscal year 1976, the Parole Coordinator began conducting a portion of the weekly orientation program for incoming inmates at Yardville and Bordentown. During his presentations, he tells the inmates about VIPP and invites them to contact him if they wish to participate. This has proved to be a very valuable way of giving the inmates accurate information about the program.

Other Activities. In addition to being involved in the noteworthy developments described previously, the VIPP staff continued its ongoing activities in the areas of recruitment, training, matching, monitoring, and evaluation.

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

Community Resource Specialist Project. This project was implemented on July 1, 1975, with a SLEPA grant. The specific goal of this project is the provision of basic emergency support such as food, shelter, clothing, medical, dental, psychiatric and psychological services to at least 2,000 of the 8,000 clients presently under parole supervision.

In addition to providing basic necessities as specified above, the project is also intended to assist the client with immediate and long-range assistance in the form of employment, educational and vocational counseling, and appropriate placement. This program is not designed to displace any existing programs in this area. Rather, its intent is to give priority to the needs of the client over the convenience of the agencies that provide services for the client.

A supplemental goal is the establishment of the Community Resource Specialist as a liaison with the community and its various facets including the business, industrial, vocational, and academic sectors. This area will be developed for the purpose of making agencies aware of our mission and how their cooperation will be of direct benefit by reducing crime and keeping the client from becoming a public charge either as a welfare client or an institutional inmate.

The total amount of funds made available for the issuance of mini-grants (up to a maximum of \$25) for such purposes as emergency food, shelter, clothing and transportation was \$15,000. This sum also provides for purchase of food, shelter, clothing, etc., on an extended basis where such services are not readily available from existing agencies. Neither the mini-grant nor the purchase of services account is intended to be

welfare. Rather, these helping efforts are intended to meet emergency needs while the client's real problem is addressed by the community resource specialist and the parole officer.

Twenty-four thousand dollars was made available to purchase vocational and educational training for parole clients. As indicated above, it is the project's intention that these funds be spent only where such training is not readily available from existing sources. It is also intended that the community resource specialist and the parole officer exercise a reasonable screening process in selecting clients for training.

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

<u>Presenting Problems</u>	<u>Services Rendered</u>
Employment1361	Employment320
Financial 917	Financial618
Food 362	Food312
Shelter 508	Shelter268
Medical 131	Medical 53
Dental 38	Dental 7
Mental Health 135	Mental Health 43
Educational 277	Educational 55
Vocational 205	Vocational 33
Substance Abuse ... 69	Substance Abuse .. 59
Other <u>346</u>	Other <u>177</u>
Total <u>4349</u>	Total <u>1945</u>

The following figures represent the amount of money spent by district offices in partial fulfillment of the problems resolved from December, 1975, to June 30, 1976. (Many of the problems resolved were without the expenditure of funds).

DO#1 \$1493.50	*DO#6\$3375.10
DO#2 2112.00	DO#7 3061.00
DO#3 1980.75	DO#8 2044.63
DO#4 1440.00	DO#9 3408.76
DO#5 713.00	PROOF 538.84
Total <u>\$20,167.58**</u>	

*\$2,000 was refunded by the Division of Correction and Parole.

** Amounts in excess of \$15,000 were transferred from Community ReOrientation Program.

The following figures represent the amount of money spent on vocational and educational assistance for clients by district offices from January, 1976, to June 30, 1976:

DO#1 \$ 332.50	DO#6 \$ 185.00
DO#2 1805.12	DO#7 2360.30

DO#3	\$2480.23	DO#8	\$1780.80
DO#4	1220.00	DO#9	1836.31
DO#5	345.00		
Total	\$12,345.36		

The community resource specialists made the following contacts during the course of assisting their clients in securing the above:

Office Visits	4312
Home Visits	216
Collaterals	1714
Telephone Contacts	2660
Employment Contacts	677
School Contacts	85
Client Interviews	2987
Reviews with Supervisors or Parole Officers..	6196
Sources Investigated (re: Employment, Education, etc.)	442
Time Spent: Office	6154
Field	4961½
Total Mileage	42055

At this time, a complete follow-up study is being made to determine the Community Resource Specialist Project's efficacy. It is hoped that this data will support the continuation of this program in the future. Preliminary follow-up studies on employment placements is encouraging. However, preliminary follow-up on vocational and educational assistance rendered to clients is discouraging. Because of these results, more stringent procedures for vocational and educational placement will be instituted during the coming year.

Our Rutgers Graduate School of Social Work student is in the process of conducting an in-depth research project on the program's impact in reducing crime. It is hoped that this study will be completed by January 1, 1977.

Community ReOrientation Program. This Program, instituted in June, 1973, completed its third year of operation.

The goal of this program is to provide total supportive services for inmates who have reached their maximum term in custody and who, in the past, had been released without supportive services. Supportive services include counseling, assistance in securing housing, employment, limited funds for purchasing medical, dental and psychological services. In addition, clothing, tools, and equipment to secure employment have been made available. Participation by the inmate is entirely voluntary.

Due to the reduced number of clients being held until the completion of their maximum term in custody, the function of the Community ReOrientation Program will be assumed by the community resource specialists. This will enable the client to avail himself or herself of services on a state-wide basis. During the fiscal year a total of \$994.15 was spent to assist

maximum term releasees for the following:

Food	2
Shelter	3
Clothing	3
Transportation	1
Medical	6
Other	4

From July 1, 1975, to June 30, 1976, 151 prospective clients were interviewed and/or referred to the community resource specialists. Of the population seen, the following represents services rendered to the clients at no cost to the project:

Counseling	151
Employment	7
Transportation	13
Financial	4
Shelter	1
Food	1
Clothing	1
Other	11

This program represents an attempt by the State Of New Jersey to fulfill a moral obligation to the client who has served his maximum term in custody and who, in the past, has been released without being offered any organized supportive services needed at a critical period in his or her life.

PAROLEE EARNINGS

During the calendar year 1975, 10,540 parolees under supervision earned \$17,169,322.00, a decrease of about 3½ million dollars over last year's earnings. Forty-five percent (4,776) of the parolees under supervision during the year were classified as "employed," i.e. worked all or part of the period under supervision, which could be from one week to one year. Thirty percent (3,164) were unemployed throughout their entire period of supervision, although considered "employable." The remaining 25 percent (2,600) were classified as "unemployable" by reason of being missing or in custody, attending school, being engaged in homemaking, or being incapacitated.

DISCHARGED PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF MAXIMUM

The following number of parolees were discharged from parole prior to the expiration of their maximum sentences as the result of recommendations to the Paroling Authorities by the Bureau of Parole:

State Prison Complex	16
Youth Correctional Complex - Yardville	135

e. "Probable Cause" found and formal revocation hearing to follow	1768
f. Continuation on parole recommended although valid violation(s) determined	465
g. Continued on parole - no valid violation(s) determined	18
h. Other	26
Total hearings scheduled (column a+b+c+d) ..	2397
Probable Cause found (column e)	1768 (73.7%)

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public relations continue to become a more important function of each member of the Bureau in view of the fact that in general the news media concentrates on the occasional failure of parole or a parolee vis-a-vis the many successes (most of whom are not interested or desirous of publicizing their specific situations).

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

Princeton Borough Police
Hudson County Vocational Service
Project Resource, Essex County
Garden State School District
Princeton Rotary Club
Seton Hall University, Union College, Burlington Community College, Trenton State College, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Glassboro State College, Brookdale Community College.
New Jersey Association of Ex-Offender Placement Services
Newark Services Corp.
Mercer County Guidance Clinic
Monmouth County Jail Council
Trenton Parent Teachers Association
South Jersey Personnel Directors Association
Municipal Welfare Association Conference
Monmouth County Inmate Jail Council
Essex and Hudson Counties Criminal Justice Council
Open Door Society
Gloucester County Criminal Investigators Association, South Jersey Investigators Association, Delaware Valley Law Enforcement Agency, Hunterdon County Detective Association, Tri-State Criminal Investigators Association
State Manpower Services Council
Women in Government Service
Citizens Advocacy Association

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

A long established trend of increasing caseloads in New Jersey was broken in fiscal year 1974 for the first time since 1968. In 1975 there was another substantial reduction, greater than any other year on record. This year, however, the caseload increased from 7,464 to 7,562 for a net gain of 98 cases, attributable mostly, if not entirely, to the increase in the number of cases that were released from Yardville. Significantly, all of the other State correctional institutions released fewer individuals on parole than in the previous year.

On June 30, 1976, the Bureau of Parole was responsible for the supervision of 7,562 cases in New Jersey, 481 cases in other states, and 138 cases in the Central Office Special File for a grand total of 8,181 cases.

The total number of parolees supervised during the fiscal year 1976 decreased from 13,061 (last year) to 12,421, the second successive drop of major proportions when compared to the steadily increasing caseloads of previous years, (10.2 percent increase in fiscal year 1971, 12.2 percent in fiscal year 1972, 10.0 percent in fiscal year 1973, and 5.8 percent increase in fiscal year 1974). If all of the factors influencing size of caseload remain equal, this result would appear to suggest a statistical lag that will predictably leave a burdensome impact on exploding caseloads in the near future.

Under Supervision in New Jersey. At the end of 1974-75 fiscal year, there were 7,464 cases under supervision in New Jersey. During 1975-76, 4,027 cases were added, making a total of 11,491 cases supervised throughout the year, (an increase of 1.3 percent).

New Jersey Cases Being Supervised in Other States. During the fiscal year 1975-76, 243 cases were added to the 490 being supervised in other states for a total of 733 cases supervised during the year. At the close of the year there were 481 parolees from New Jersey under supervision in other states, or 1.8 percent less than a year ago.

Central Office Special File. This category was composed of cases not the responsibility of any New Jersey district office or any other state. The responsibility, therefore, is assumed by Central Office. This group is composed of cases paroled to other states who subsequently absconded, persons paroled to out-of-state warrants, cases incarcerated in out-of-state and Federal institutions with no parole plan in New Jersey, and deportable cases. There were 126 cases in Central Office Special File at the beginning of the fiscal year 1975-76. An additional 71 cases were handled throughout the year and 59 were removed, resulting in a total increase of 9.5 percent over the previous year. As of June 30, 1976, there were 138 cases remaining in this category of which 69 (50.0 percent) were missing cases.

RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS (See tables #2, #2a, and #3B)

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during the 1975-76 fiscal year decreased 0.9 percent in relation to the total caseload (12.6 percent as compared to 13.5 percent in 1974-75).

The number returned by court commitment decreased significantly from 5.0 to 4.2 percent, whereas the number returned by the paroling authority remained essentially unchanged from 8.5 to 8.4 percent. During the five-year period under study, court commitments ranged from a high of 6.7 percent in 1972 to a consistently declining rate of commitment in each year down to the 1976 low of 4.2 percent. As a result, the combined total returns decreased from 13.5 percent in 1975 to 12.6 percent in 1976. (See table #2B).

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

Although the total number of missing cases increased slightly from 911 to 934, there was a substantial decrease in the number of parolees that became missing between July 1, 1975, and June 30, 1976, (898 in fiscal year 1975 vs. 764 in 1976). As shown in table #3A, this seemingly paradoxical result was due to the fact that there were fewer missing cases accounted for between 1975 and 1976, than in the previous year under study, (922 in 1975 vs. 741 in 1976). (See tables #3A and #3B).

Parolees from the Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown accounted for the largest percent of missing cases (17.2 percent) in relation to respective caseloads, followed by the Correction Institution for Women, Clinton (12.9 percent). In descending order, the other institutions show the following: Psychiatric Hospitals - sex offenders (12.5 percent); Youth Reception and Correction Center, Yardville (10.8 percent); State Prison (10.7 percent); Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale (9.0 percent); Training School for Boys, Jamesburg (7.7 percent); Training School for Girls, Jamesburg (5.2 percent). (Table #3).

SUPERVISION (See table #4)

In the performance of their assignment in 1975-76, parole officers made 313,873 supervisory contacts and 15,950 investigatory contacts. This was a 5.4 percent decrease from the total number of contacts made in the previous year. On the basis of the number of field parole officers in service, each officer made an average of 2,425 contacts as compared to an average of 2,565 contacts in the previous year.

Included in the total figure of contacts from 1975-76, there were 58,532 home visits (compared to 62,554 in 1974-75), 84,433 community contacts, other than employment or school contacts, as compared to 87,166 last year; 4,451 employment visits (4,178 last year); 534 school checks (506 in 1974-75).

The efforts of the parole officers resulted in the submission of 55,315 written reports including 48,133 supervision reports and 7,182 investigation reports in 1975-76, as contrasted to 59,254 total reports, 51,519 supervision reports, and 7,735 investigation reports in 1974-75.

The districts reported travelling 794,940 miles in the performance of their duties as compared to 873,730 miles in 1974-75.

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE ACTIVITIES

Parole staff members are assigned on a permanent basis to each of the penal and correctional institutions and the training schools to act as liaison between the incarcerated client and the community. During the past year, problems were evident due to the shortage of staff. An institutional parole officer position was replaced by the position of Furlough Coordinator and a senior clerk-stenographer position was assigned to the Revocation Hearing Officers. The following listing by institutions reflects major activities of the staff exclusive of such items as training, staff conferences, maximum release interviews, etc.:

	<u>Preparole</u>	<u>Inmate</u>	<u>Released</u>	<u>Parole</u>	<u>Violation</u>
	<u>Interviews</u>	<u>Requested</u>	<u>On Parole</u>	<u>Classes</u>	<u>Summaries</u>
		<u>Interviews</u>			
NJSP	2947	1537	1110	493	426
YRCC	1903	1903	701	66	---
YCIB	1305	1750	720	90	---
YCIA	1099	--	914	29	---
TSB-J)	103	221	103	31	---
TSG-J)					
CIW	<u>271</u>	<u>966</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>---</u>
Totals	<u>7631</u>	<u>6377</u>	<u>3729</u>	<u>771</u>	<u>426</u>

jm
October 27, 1976

TABLE # 1

TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - 1975-1976 (By Institutions)

	IN NEW JERSEY				IN OTHER STATES				CENTRAL OFFICE SPECIAL FILE				TOTAL
	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/75	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1975-1976	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/76	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/75	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1975-1976	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/76	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/75	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1975-1976	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/76	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/76
Training School for Girls	32	7	39	17	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	19
Correctional Institution for Women	319	129	448	309	24	6	30	18	6	3	9	5	332
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	232	107	339	193	3	1	4	1	1	0	1	1	195
Youth Correctional Institution Complex													
Annandale	1,450	922	2,372	1,542	56	15	71	46	8	5	13	10	1,598
Bordentown	1,811	853	2,664	1,770	116	58	174	122	25	17	42	28	1,920
Youth Reception & Correction Ctr.	1,305	706	2,011	1,315	98	54	152	102	23	10	33	25	1,442
State Prison	1,855	1,060	2,915	1,943	189	107	296	186	62	36	98	68	2,197
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	35	4	39	35	3	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	40
Out-of-State Cases in N.J.													
Female	20	17	37	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Male	405	222	627	418	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	418
Total	7,464	4,027	11,491	7,562	490	243	733	481	126	71	197	138	8,181
Under Supervision 7/1/75	7,464				490				126				8,080
Total Cases Added		4,027				243				71			4,341
Total No. Supervised 1975-1976			11,491				733				197		12,421
Under Supervision 6/30/76				7,562				481				138	8,181

TABLE # 1A

NUMBER OF PAROLEES SUPERVISED
5 Year Comparison - (1972-1976)

1971 - 1972	1972 - 1973	1973 - 1974	1974 - 1975	1975 - 1976
11,684	12,852	13,609	13,061	12,421
+12.2%	+10.0%	+ 5.8%	-4.0%	-4.9%
+ 6.3%				

TABLE #2
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS
BY DISTRICT AND SEX
Based on Total Number Supervised
1975 - 1976

Male

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED DURING YEAR*	NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS				TOTALS	
		COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED		RETURNED AS TECHNICAL VIOLATOR		NUMBER	PER CENT
1. Clifton	1,479	137	9.3%	55	3.7%	192	12.9%
2. East Orange	1,240	53	4.3%	76	6.1%	129	10.4%
3. Red Bank	1,590	62	3.9%	130	8.2%	192	12.1%
4. Jersey City	1,465	67	4.6%	191	13.0%	258	17.6%
5. Elizabeth	1,080	40	3.7%	139	12.9%	179	16.6%
6. Trenton	1,064	34	3.2%	109	10.3%	143	13.4%
7. Camden	1,168	50	4.3%	132	11.3%	182	15.6%
8. Atlantic City	800	26	3.3%	97	12.1%	123	15.4%
9. Newark	1,276	51	4.0%	85	6.7%	136	10.7%
10. In Other States	702	2	.3%	11	1.6%	13	1.9%
11. Central Office (Special File)	187	2	1.1%	11	5.9%	13	7.0%
TOTAL MALE	12,051	524	4.4%	1,036	8.6%	1,560	12.9%

Female

1. Clifton	86	2	2.3%	6	7.0%	8	9.3%
2. East Orange	67	0	0	5	7.5%	5	7.5%
3. Red Bank	86	2	2.3%	6	7.0%	8	9.3%
4. Jersey City	29	0	0	1	3.4%	1	3.4%
5. Elizabeth	55	1	1.8%	2	3.6%	3	5.5%
6. Trenton	62	1	1.6%	4	6.5%	5	8.1%
7. Camden	40	1	2.5%	4	10.0%	5	12.5%
8. Atlantic City	27	0	0	1	3.7%	1	3.7%
9. Newark	99	0	0	6	6.1%	6	6.1%
10. In Other States	31	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Central Office (Special File)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FEMALE	592	7	1.2%	35	5.9%	42	7.1%
GRAND TOTAL	12,643	531	4.2%	1,071	8.4%	1,602	12.6%

*Figures include inter-office transfers of cases.

TABLE # 2 A

**PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED**

**By District
1975 - 1976**

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED	COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED	TECHNICAL VIOLATORS	TOTAL
1. Clifton	1,565	8.8%	3.9%	12.7%
2. East Orange	1,307	4.0%	6.2%	10.2%
3. Red Bank	1,676	3.8%	8.1%	11.9%
4. Jersey City	1,494	4.4%	12.9%	17.3%
5. Elizabeth	1,135	3.6%	12.4%	16.0%
6. Trenton	1,126	3.1%	10.0%	13.1%
7. Camden	1,208	4.2%	11.2%	15.3%
8. Atlantic City	827	3.1%	11.8%	14.9%
9. Newark	1,375	3.7%	6.6%	10.3%
10. In Other States	733	.2%	1.5%	1.7%
11. Central Office (Special File)	197	1.0%	5.6%	6.5%
TOTAL	12,643	4.2%	8.4%	12.6%

TABLE # 2 B

**PERCENTAGE OF RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS
BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED**

**5 Year Comparison
1972 - 1976**

COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED					TECHNICAL VIOLATORS					TOTAL				
1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
6.7	6.5	5.9	5.0	4.2	8.5	6.1	7.3	8.5	8.4	15.2	12.6	13.2	13.5	12.6

TABLE # 3
RECORD OF MISSING CASES
By Institution
1975 - 1976

INSTITUTION	TOTAL ON PAROLE ON 6/30/76	MISSING AS OF 6/30/75	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/75 AND 6/30/76	TOTAL MISSING	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/75 AND 6/30/76	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/76	PER CENT OF DIFFERENCE	PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/76
Training School for Girls	19	4	2	6	5	1	- 75.0%	5.2%
Correctional Institution for Women	332	50	37	87	44	43	- 14.0%	12.9%
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	195	22	16	38	23	15	- 31.8%	7.7%
Youth Correctional Institution Complex								
Annandale	1,598	150	173	323	178	145	- 3.3%	9.0%
Bordentown	1,920	304	258	562	231	331	+ 8.8%	17.2%
Youth Reception & Correction Ctr.	1,442	159	160	319	163	156	- 1.8%	10.8%
State Prison	2,197	215	108	323	87	236	+ 9.7%	10.7%
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	40	4	1	5	0	5	+ 25.0%	12.5%
Out-of-State								
Female	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	418	3	9	12	10	2	- 33.3%	.4%
TOTAL	8,181	911	764	1,675	741	934	+ 2.5%	11.4%

TABLE # 3A
RECORD OF MISSING CASES
By District
1975 - 1976

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	
DISTRICT	CASELOAD ON 6/30/76	MISSING AS OF 6/30/75	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/75 AND 6/30/76	TOTAL MISSING	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/75 AND 6/30/76	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/76	PER CENT OF DIFFERENCE	PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/76
1. Clifton	999	114	129	243	126	117	+ 2.6%	11.7%
2. East Orange	878	100	118	218	121	97	-3.0%	11.0%
3. Red Bank	1,066	91	49	140	63	77	-15.3%	7.2%
4. Jersey City	875	123	124	247	122	125	+ 1.6%	14.2%
5. Elizabeth	723	78	44	122	40	82	+ 5.1%	11.3%
6. Trenton	729	91	79	170	78	92	+ 1.0%	12.6%
7. Camden	770	93	74	167	85	82	-11.8%	10.6%
8. Atlantic City	527	54	54	108	40	68	+ 25.9%	12.9%
9. Newark	995	102	72	174	49	125	+ 22.5%	12.5%
10. Central Office (Special File)	138	65	21	86	17	69	+ 6.1%	50.0%
11. Central Office (N.J. Cases Out-of-State)	481	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,181	911	764	1,675	741	934	+ 2.5%	11.4%

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

1971-1972	1972-1973	1973-1974	1974-1975	1975-1976
9.8%	9.1%	10.8%	11.3%	11.4%

STATE OF NEW JERSEY - BUREAU OF PAROLE
TABLE #4
SUMMARY DAILY RECORD OF ACTIVITIES
Fiscal Year 1975 - 1976

DISTRICT NUMBER	FIELD AND OFFICE CONTACTS												REPORTS SUBMITTED					SUMMARIES SUBMITTED					HOURS		MILEAGE	
	TYPE OF CONTACT (1)							SUPERVISION (2)			INVESTIGATION (3)		SUPERVISION (4)		INVESTIGATION (5)			(6)					OFFICE	FIELD	STATE	PER- SONAL
	C	E	H	N	O	S	T	P	PO	R	P	N	F-19	F-21	AR	PP	SR	DR	OA	PV	TR	TS				
DO 1	7573	221	5965	1994	6398	1	7789	11565	16141	1816	1129	453	2492	3666	-	684	198	93	6	26	98	160	13498	15075	100929	2966
DO 2	6795	315	5600	2194	4998	19	7995	11021	14708	1175	986	316	2764	2351	-	547	126	56	10	32	142	133	19572	10824	39903	1471
DO 3	11851	294	7921	2034	9945	43	11070	15985	23099	1744	2337	615	2827	3129	97	684	366	88	14	26	145	157	13837	15470	162335	-
DO 4	10710	274	6487	3545	7397	89	13787	16943	22327	2317	744	509	2385	3355	-	576	218	62	13	114	81	122	14096	15636	59296	515
DO 5	8038	384	6165	1783	5076	50	6941	9563	15050	887	1517	1311	1714	2727	29	396	113	39	19	21	106	95	8665	9597	60720	287
DO 6	10465	850	7094	1942	6245	98	10174	12072	38927	1776	828	343	1981	2284	-	496	109	30	18	26	149	101	9568	12071	93828	70
DO 7	15359	1109	5716	3451	7424	96	15675	13164	31723	4316	1145	363	2330	5983	4	627	175	18	5	140	92	182	10082	12973	122910	1577
DO 8	5660	589	4015	1117	6258	74	3711	6908	10920	1706	1240	398	1053	1289	9	424	118	20	86	123	59	66	5896	8813	108745	-
DO 9	7982	415	9569	1713	9162	64	6105	12427	19090	1249	1345	371	2722	3091	18	532	636	30	13	37	109	100	10214	13864	38312	1086
TOTAL	84433	4451	58532	19773	62903	534	83247	109648	191985	16986	11271	4679	20268	27865	157	4966	2059	436	184	545	981	1116	105428	114323	786978	7962
GRAND TOTAL	313873							318619			15950		48133		7182			3262					219751		794940	

Legend:

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

Nat R. Arluke,
Chief, Bureau of Parole

By Domenick Sparaino
Supervising Parole Officer