

901  
L431



# Applicants Guide 1977

**New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency**  
Dissemination Document No. 26

*New Jersey State Library*

# DEFINITIONS

**Act**—Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-351, 82 Stat. 197) as amended.

**Action Grant**—A specific project approach, utilizing block grant funds, aimed at controlling or reducing criminal behavior or improving and upgrading the criminal justice system and its personnel.

**Agency**—The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency (SLEPA).

**Calendar Year**—Refers to the standard calendar year, January 1 to December 31.

**Consultant**—A person, group or firm which provides professional advice or services for remuneration.

**Discretionary Grant**—A project funded with monies controlled exclusively by LEAA and used to advance national priorities, draw attention to programs not emphasized in State Plans, and provide special impetus for reform and experimentation within the system of criminal justice.

**Fiscal Year**—Refers to the federal fiscal year, October 1 of one year to September 30 of the next.

**Governing Board**—A body appointed by the Governor which has responsibility for reviewing, approving and maintaining general oversight of the State Plan and its implementation of action priorities, of subgrants or allocations to localities, and of other planning agency functions.

**Hard Cash Match**—Earmarked monies appropriated for the express purpose of matching federal funds.

**H.E.W.**—The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

**JJDP Act**—Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415, 88 Stat. 1109).

**JJDP Special Emphasis Grants**—Discretionary funds available to public and private agencies for specifically announced program objectives in juvenile justice and delinquency prevention.

**JJDP Funds**—Planning and Action funds available for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention.

**Law Enforcement**—Used to describe the entire criminal justice system (police, courts, corrections, prosecution and defense). The phrases "criminal justice" and "criminal justice system" are synonymous with "law enforcement".

**Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA)**—The division of the Justice Department that administers the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1968 as amended.

**LEEP**—The Law Enforcement Education Program is administered by LEAA. The purpose of LEEP is to upgrade the performance of those engaged in the administration of criminal justice by encouraging attendance at colleges offering courses generally related to their vocational development. Eligible institutions are awarded funds with which to provide grants and loans to both in-service and pre-service students.

**Local Units of Government**—Consists of the 21 counties, the 567 municipalities, and combinations of one or more the preceding.

**Negative Environmental Impact Statement**—Declaration required of all applicants in an effort to measure the environmental impact of potential subgrants as required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

**Part B Funds**—Applies to planning funds available to local planning units, and those monies used for the operation of the State Planning Agency.

**Part C Funds**—Action funds available for implementing projects throughout the criminal justice system.

**Part E Funds**—Action funds for use in corrections projects only.

**Planning Grant**—A specific project approach, utilizing Part B grant funds, designed to develop within eligible units of government a comprehensive criminal justice planning capability, promoting realistic and effective improvements in existing law enforcement and crime control systems.

**Program Year**—Refers to the approved period for operation of a project.

**Public Agency**—A duly elected political body or subdivision thereof. It includes any agency emanating from such political body or subdivision.

**State Agency**—A public agency having as its jurisdiction the entire State.

**State Buy-In**—Federal provision requiring the State to provide no less than one-half of the required non-federal funding of any Part C action program or project.

**Subgrantee**—Any local unit of government or state office or agency awarded funds by a State Planning Agency for planning programs under Part B of the Act or action programs under Part C or Part E of the omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act or the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

**Subgrantee Official File**—An accumulation of recommended data necessary for proper control of project records.

# CONTENTS

Definitions .....	(Inside Front Cover)
Organization of SLEPA .....	1
General Information for Applicants .....	2
Types of Grants	
Criteria	
Eligibility	
a. Planning	
b. Action	
Application Preparation Instructions .....	3
Attachment I Description of Project .....	3
a. Statement of Problem	
b. Goals	
c. Objectives	
d. Project Activities	
e. Project Management	
f. Personnel	
g. Brief Personnel Biographies or Job Specifications	
h. Participating Agencies/Relationship to Local Plan	
i. Project Evaluation	
j. Assumption of Costs	
k. Civil Rights Compliance	
Attachment II Budget Detail/Budget Explanation .....	5
Cash Match	
Allowable Costs	
Unallowable Costs	
Budget Categories	
a. Salaries and Wages	
b. Purchase of Services	
c. Travel, Transportation, Subsistence	
d. Consumable Supplies	
e. Facilities, Office Space, Utilities, Equipment Rental	
f. Equipment	
g. Indirect Costs	
1977 Action Program — Listing with page references .....	19
Provision for Evaluation .....	70
Forms — Listing of SLEPA Forms and Uses .....	71
SLEPA Staff .....	(Inside Back Cover)



# State of New Jersey

BRENDAN T. BYRNE  
*Governor*

## STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

### Governing Board

WILLIAM F. HYLAND  
*Chairman*

STANLEY C. VAN NESS  
*Vice Chairman*

RICHARD J. HUGHES

WILLIAM D. ANDERSON  
JOHN F. CRYAN  
CHRISTOPHER DIETZ  
KENNETH A. GIBSON  
GERALD GOLDMAN  
EDWARD HOFGESANG  
LAWRENCE HOUSTON

VINCENT J. INFINITO  
PAUL KIERNAN, SR.  
ANN KLEIN  
BENJAMIN H. MABIE  
RAYMOND MASS  
RAYMOND N. MACDONALD  
ROBERT E. MULCAHY

CARMEN A. ORECHIO  
CLINTON PAGANO  
BARRY T. PARKER  
MARGARET PERRYMAN  
CHARLES RIZZI  
ARTHUR SANTUCCI  
PATRICIA Q. SHEEHAN  
ARTHUR J. SIMPSON

JOHN J. MULLANEY  
*Executive Director*

(The 1977 Plan for Criminal Justice and this Guide were prepared entirely by the SLEPA staff. It contains procedures for applying for a grant, the annual action programs from the 1977 Criminal Justice Plan, SLEPA forms in use and valuable references for the administration of funds under the Crime Control Act. This document is published and disseminated under U.S. Department of Justice Grant No. 77PF02-0034 in accordance with the ongoing dissemination responsibility assigned to SLEPA by Public Law 93-83, 87 Stat. 197).

# ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTION OF THE STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency (SLEPA) was created by an executive order of the Governor of the State of New Jersey in August of 1968 in compliance with the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Actual operation of the agency began in early 1969 with the major task being the development of a comprehensive plan for the improvement of the criminal justice system. This planning phase continued through 1970 when the focus of the Agency turned toward the implementation of programs and the increased emphasis on monitoring and evaluating projects.

Organizationally, SLEPA is located in the Governor's Office and is administered by the Executive Director who reports to the Governing Board. The Deputy Director is responsible for the coordination of the overall operations of the three major units. The Board is appointed by the Governor to represent various components of the criminal justice system and the general public.

SLEPA is charged with three main responsibilities: The annual development and updating of the comprehensive plan, the review of applications from units of government; the fiscal and program monitoring of funded projects. To fulfill these functions, SLEPA is divided into three units, each administered by an Assistant Director.

The Planning Unit has the prime responsibility of collecting data, coordinating the local planning and State planning efforts, disseminating information to the public, the actual drafting of the comprehensive plan and the agency's evaluation effort.

Applicants for funds deal with the Operations Unit which provides technical assistance for the development of fundable projects, reviews applications, monitors and provides technical assistance to ongoing projects, evaluates projects for possible re-funding, and makes recommendations to the Governing Board for the final decision on funding.

Once a project has been funded, the Administration Unit prepares the necessary documents for the contract, releases funds after review of reports submitted by a subgrantee, coordinates the fiscal reporting to the State and federal governments, and conducts interim and final audits.

## **Technical Assistance**

Technical assistance to subgrantees is an ongoing activity of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. Since the planned delivery of technical assistance is an essential ingredient of effective plan implementation, this Agency offers a broad-based strategy encompassing 1) an explanation of

the Crime Control Act and State Law Enforcement Planning Agency programs; 2) assistance in the development of comprehensive planning techniques, including the creation of local criminal justice planning units; 3) the identification of effective crime control methods and programs within the prevention, police, court and corrections disciplines; 4) assistance in the preparation of requests for action funds; 5) an explanation of the various federal and State administrative regulations affecting program implementation; 6) a full range of post grant award services including financial monitoring, a review of project activities, site visits and project audit and evaluation and 7) a technical assistance plan designed to provide a formal and clearly defined mechanism for directing a resource to an identified point of need.

The Technical Assistance Plan can provide an agency or subgrantee with proven professional expertise, publications, training, existing equipment or guidance that will direct a client to the potential goods or services. The technical assistance process is designed to incorporate a wide range of Agency input while at the same time isolating administrative accountability to monitor activities for the delivery of services within reasonable time frames; and to evaluate the quality of the assistance rendered. The Plan's emphasis will utilize in-State resources where possible and apply past experience to present problems. Both proactive and reactive determinations of areas of need are within the context of the Plan and will be pursued as an integral and important component of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency service.

## **Administrative Mechanism — Technical Assistance Plan**

All requests for program related technical assistance should be directed to the Assistant Director — Operations. Requests for assistance in areas related to fiscal and contract matters should be addressed to the Assistant Director — Administration. Clients are requested to complete the SLEPA Form 110 when requesting technical assistance from the Agency.

The Technical Assistance Specialist will acknowledge receipt of a request, activate the evaluation process, follow-up and secure an assessment of the quality of the request. A technical assistance review panel will examine requests for technical assistance and assess the best means of response through identified resources. Applications will be studied to determine the need for and the availability of the

technical assistance requested. Requests that cannot be met through resources within the State will be endorsed by the Agency and forwarded to LEAA for action. If technical assistance is inappropriate or unavailable, the applicant will be so notified. Applicants receiving technical assistance will be required to complete a Technical Assistance Assessment

form upon completion of the technical assistance activity. The form is used to assess the quality of the assistance and to see if the assistance meets the needs of the client.

Copies of the complete Technical Assistance Plan are available from the Agency upon request.

# GENERAL INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS

## I. TYPES OF GRANTS:

### A. Grants administered directly by SLEPA

**Planning:** Federal funds provide support to local criminal justice planning units. No more than 90% of the total project will be paid for by federal funds.

**Action:** Program areas under which applications for action projects may be made are grouped under the following general categories:

A. Legislation, Support Services and Prevention — This category includes activities which are related to the legislative process; are related to the general process of program development, planning, evaluation and system "overhead"; are basically of a research nature; deal primarily with information systems and data collection; are aimed at crime prevention used in its broad context, whether undertaken by criminal justice or noncriminal justice agencies; or represent efforts aimed at the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

B. Detection, Deterrence and Apprehension — Included in this category are those activities involving direct law enforcement functions.

C. Diversion and Adjudication — Included here are activities designed primarily to divert persons from further processing within the criminal justice system following initial contact as well as efforts related to the adjudicative process.

D. Institutional and Non-Institutional Rehabilitation — This category includes programs which operate within an institutional setting as well as rehabilitative efforts which take place outside the conventional institutional setting.

For descriptions of specific programs under which application for funds may be made, refer to the "Annual Action Programs" section of this document.

**Local Block Grants:** Any jurisdiction or combination with a total of 250,000 population or more is eligible to apply for funds under a comprehensive Local Block Grant Plan. Detailed procedures have been established and may be requested by writing to the Agency.

**JJDP:** Federal funds are available for juvenile justice programming. Action projects as well as grants

for the criminal justice planning units may be supported by these funds. The planned use of JJDP action funds has been incorporated within selected program areas found in the "Annual Action Programs" section of this document.

### B. Other LEAA Programs

1. Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP)
2. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Discretionary Grants.
3. National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Research Grants.
4. National Institute for Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention.

## II. CRITERIA:

**Planning:** The intent of awarding planning grants in New Jersey is to develop and implement within local units of government a comprehensive planning capability for the entire criminal justice system and thereby serve as an input to the state comprehensive plan for criminal justice. In addition, the development of comprehensive plans at the local level will facilitate application for action funds by presenting needs, problems, and priorities in a rational manner.

**Action:** The intent of awarding action grants is to meet the needs and problems in law enforcement and the administration of justice encompassing the functional categories of prevention, apprehension, adjudication and rehabilitation.

## III. ELIGIBILITY:

**Planning:** The policy of the Agency Governing Board is to provide the broadest possible geographic coverage planning funds will permit. Consistent with this policy, has been the encouraged local assumption of planning unit operations within cities of under 250,000 population and the recent addition of several county level planning units. Specific local eligibility for planning funds is determined annually by the Governing Board based on such criteria as population, crime rate and law enforcement activity intensity.

To qualify for planning funds, an otherwise eligible

locality must complete the following:

1. The locality must form a Criminal Justice Planning Board.

2. The local unit of government must designate a full time Criminal Justice Planner.

3. The unit of government must designate a project director and fiscal officer.

4. The unit of local government must furnish the Agency with an application for funds in a form approved by the Governing Board.

5. The application itself must fully explain the methodology to be used in achieving the objectives of the planning program.

6. Three copies of the application should be prepared by the local unit of government and submitted to SLEPA.

**Action:** Any State agency or local unit of government eligible under the current year programs for action grants may apply for action funds if it meets the following:

1. Within the State comprehensive plan are program approaches aimed at controlling or reducing criminal behavior or improving and upgrading the criminal justice system and its personnel. Only applications for action funds designed to implement and carry out projects which fall within the objectives of these programs will be considered by SLEPA for funding.

2. The implementing agency, if not a State agency or local unit of government, must be represented and supported by a State agency or local unit of government before application for action funds can be submitted. The signature of the Mayor, Chief Executive or State Department Head is required on all applications as an endorsement and evidence of support for the projects.

3. The applicant must provide assurance that the legal matching requirement percentage of the total project cost will be supplied by the applicant.

#### **IV. APPLICATION PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS**

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act has been amended to require that State Planning Agencies complete their review process of applications within a 90-day period from the time an application is received. For purposes of this requirement, the 90-day review period will commence only when the application in question is in compliance with LEAA and SLEPA guidelines as set forth in the 1977 *Applicants Guide*.

Prior to the submission of a formal application, it is strongly advised that a letter of intent accompanied by a brief project description be filed with the appropriate desk (police, courts, corrections, JJDP) within the SLEPA Operations Unit.

No later than three months prior to the expiration of a grant period the applicant must submit a continuation application to SLEPA for the subsequent year if additional funds are being requested.

The required application format is outlined on page two of the application (SLEPA 101). Each of the five attachments presented therein must be completed as part of any formal application. Instructions for Attachment Three "Non-Supplanting Certification," Attachment Four "Negative Environmental Impact Statement" and Attachment Five "A-95 Clearinghouse Review Procedures" appear within the application itself and should need no further explanation. Attachments One and Two constitute the major components of the application. In an effort to promote a high level of consistency and as an aid in the development of applications by prospective subgrantees, the following instructions and guidelines are offered for the completion of each attachment. While content may vary by type of project, the format which follows must appear within every application.

#### **Attachment One: Description of Project**

Each of the following sections must be included as part of this attachment:

##### **A. Statement of Problem**

Define the problem or need as you see it. The following questions may be used as a guide:

1. What specific problem(s) will the project address? (Example: an increasing incidence of breaking and entering, a low clearance rate or mounting public complaints).
2. What is the *scope* of the problem?
  - a. Geographical
    - Is it concentrated in one neighborhood or several with similar characteristics?
    - Is it a region-wide problem, or does it appear in two or more adjacent towns?
    - Is it a statewide problem for which you may have a model solution?
  - b. Socio-cultural
    - What population group is affected by this problem or need?
    - In what way is this population group involved — as causing the problem, as victim, as responsible for providing a service?
  - c. Organizational
    - Are other agencies affected by the need or problem?
    - In what way do such agencies feel the impact of the stated problem?
3. What is the *magnitude* of the problem?
  - All available, pertinent statistical data (e.g. arrest rates, agency referrals, caseloads, clearance rates, etc.) should be included. Also, any other indicators that further define the problem should be described.
4. How has the municipality, county or State agency dealt with this problem in the past? What were the limitations in that approach? Describe factors which limited the unit of government's handling of the problem to date.

5. Why must the problem be addressed at this time?

### **B. Goals**

When the problem has been identified and the need documented, the particular proposal for attacking the problem(s) should be stated. This is the heart of the application, the content of which enables the reviewer to assess the probability that the measures proposed will produce the desired impact or results. The following framework may serve as a guide with regard to definition of terms and contents:

A **goal** may be defined as a general statement of an undesirable condition to be improved, or a desired state of affairs toward which to stride. Criminal justice goals can fall into broad types.

For example:

1. Crime specific—the reduction of property crime, and
2. System improvement—the provision of alternative diagnostic, treatment, and rehabilitation services for the first time juvenile offenders.

### **C. Objectives**

An **objective** is a **specific** statement of a **measurable** end condition to be achieved within a **stated** period of time. Examples:

1. Crime specific—The reduction of breaking and enterings in the 20-block South End neighborhood by 3% over the next 12 months; improvement of the apprehension rate by 2%.
2. System improvement—The diversion of 15 girls, aged 11-18, from institutionalization, by providing a community-based home with supportive diagnostic, treatment and vocational services.

### **D. Project Activities**

Having specified the Goals and Objectives, state the method of approach or Project Activities you propose to use. For example, having identified the problem of breaking and enterings, the causes might have been defined as a combination of poor patrol methods, slow response time, lack of coordination between patrol and detective divisions, and public apathy. The approach might be Team Policing (i.e., a multi-expertise group of patrol, investigative and community relations officers assigned to the problem neighborhood, fully responsible for all operations during the project period).

On the basis of progress to date (past progress, for prior funded or ongoing projects, preliminary arrangements for new projects), this section should address key project elements, such as: (1) sequence and time schedule involved, (2) resources required (i.e., staff, training, support services, public relations, etc.) and (3) the expected outcome or impact from the project in terms of explicit needs, goals and objectives.

Examples of the type of information sought would include but not be limited to the following:

1. A project schedule detailing what will be accomplished at each phase, including the division of labor and the estimated time intervals involved;

2. A description of criteria to be used in deciding when to advance from phase to phase;

3. A description of equipment to be purchased as a part of the project, including its proposed use and the manner in which it will enhance project capabilities;

4. A description of any special or technical assistance from outside the applicant agency which will be required to complete the actual work, including the manner in which this assistance is to be utilized;

5. An outline of available resources;

6. A description of the specific gains, benefits, improvements, increased efficiencies, changes or other planned impact on the existing problem area or operating system that are expected to occur as a direct result of the project (i.e., workloads to be handled, persons to be treated, type of clientele to be served, new services to be provided, new systems capabilities to be established).

While not a requirement, applicants may wish to consider the development of a detailed Work Plan. The purpose of a Work Plan is to help applicants pre-plan realistically by breaking down major elements and phases identified as Project Activities into more detailed steps or "milestones" within a specific time frame. Experience has shown that it is careful attention (or lack of it) to just such detailed operational procedures that has been a major factor in determining the smooth implementation or ongoing difficulties of a funded project. The Work Plan is designed to elicit the applicant's knowledge of local conditions and implementing agency procedures that might affect project implementation, particularly in the crucial start-up phase. Additionally, the Work Plan provides the applicant and the funding agency with a realistic basis for project monitoring and required progress reporting once the project is funded.

### **E. Project Management**

Describe the proposed duties and responsibilities of the Project Director (if appropriate). Indicate to whom the Director reports and the manner in which project accountability will be maintained.

### **F. Personnel**

If the project requires the employment of full or part-time personnel, indicate the positions to be filled and the duties or responsibilities of each. If training is involved, indicate the number of persons (by position) to be trained.

### **G. Brief Personnel Biographies or Job Specifications**

Include a detailed resumé or biography for each person selected to work on the project. If personnel are not selected at time of submission, describe position qualifications.

## H. Participating Agencies/Relationship to Local Plan

List all State or local jurisdictions, agencies or organizations directly participating in the project. Describe the responsibilities of each and include letters of intent.

Indicate the relationship between the proposed project and other components of the overall plan for criminal justice improvement within the applicant jurisdiction. Also indicate the ranking originally assigned to the proposed activity within the list of priority projects (if any) submitted by the local jurisdiction for inclusion into the Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey. If the project's priority ranking has changed since that time, explain how and why.

## I. Project Evaluation

Presented within this section should be the evaluation methodology to be used by the applicant in answering the following types of questions about the project: Did the project accomplish what it said it would? What impact, expected or unexpected, did it have? What were the key factors that made the project a success or failure? How should the project be modified?

The elements of the evaluation design which should be addressed in each application are outlined as follows:

1. **DEFINITION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**—The evaluation design should contain an explicit restatement of the end(s) for which the project is designed (e.g., effectively remove from further juvenile justice contact those youth whose problems could more appropriately be handled by direct 'social' service staff or other appropriate community resources).
2. **STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS**—Every program makes assumptions as to the nature of the problem it addresses (e.g., there are individual juvenile offenders who are unnecessarily processed through the juvenile justice system for whom referral to direct 'social' services would be more appropriate). These assumptions have significance for the mode in which the problem will be addressed.
3. **CRITERIA FOR GOAL ATTAINMENT**—Establish criteria (indicators or measures) that will demonstrate the degree to which stated goals and objects were achieved (e.g., an increase in the number of juvenile offenders removed from and/or provided alternatives to further juvenile justice involvement).
4. **DATA COLLECTION**—In view of the listed indicators, what records must be kept, for what period and by whom?
5. **DATA ANALYSIS**—Within this section, outline the methods of analyses which will be utilized to assess the extent of relationships between the variables (e.g., time series analysis, pre

and post comparisons and/or comparison groups).

The above outline may be used by the applicant for developing the evaluation component tailored specifically to the evaluation needs of the proposed project.

Certain program areas are selected for intensive evaluation by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. Projects funded under the program areas that are selected for evaluation will be expected to conform with the established evaluation design.

## J. Assumption of Costs

If the project will last more than one year, describe how the applicant agency plans to assume the total costs of the program (after a limited period of SLEPA assistance). The specific steps and plans to be taken to achieve the assumption should be included in the application.

## K. Civil Rights Compliance

If an Affirmative Action Plan is not complete or it is not required for the jurisdiction, provide the explanation in this section. Civil rights compliance and investigations will be conducted in the manner as outlined in the regulations covering "Nondiscrimination in Federally assisted Crime Control and Juvenile Delinquency Programs" and other appropriate regulations.

## Attachment Two: Budget Detail/ Budget Explanation

Estimated cost details of the project's budget should be itemized on Attachment Two. Additional pages should be used to provide narrative justification for all budget items. Costs should be broken down as indicated within the column headings appearing on Attachment Two. All projects funded with FY 75 LEAA funds and after will adhere to the following matching formula: 90% federal funds and 10% cash match. Note that particular items of cost may appear as 100% federal, while others may be funded with a combination of federal, State and/or local money.

## CASH MATCH

The Act includes two important fiscal conditions affecting subgrantee matching funds. These amendments became effective with FY 1974 funds and have been extended to subsequent block grant appropriations, as well.

The first of these is the "hard match" provision, of the Act, which states:

*"The non-federal funding of the cost of any program or project . . . shall be of money appropriated in the aggregate, by State or individual units of government for the purpose of the shared funding of such programs or projects."*

In essence, all requests for funds starting with the

FY 75 block grant appropriation must include cash as the required matching share. In-kind goods and services are not acceptable as a matching contribution.

In order to meet the "hard match" requirement, funds must be for the express purpose of matching federal LEAA funds. These new funds for law enforcement purposes must be specifically earmarked for the project in the budget of the jurisdiction being funded. Private or Model Cities fund sources may be used as hard cash match. Identification requires an earmarking in some document associated with the appropriation or budget process, which by local government law or practice binds local units to use the funds for the purposes of the Act. This cash must be supplied during the life of the project which may carry over into a new fiscal year.

The simplest way to follow this change is through a sample project funding. If the total project cost (non-construction project) is \$100,000, the following breakdown would be made:

\$ 90,000	LEAA funds	( 90%)
\$ 10,000	Cash match	( 10%)
<u>\$100,000</u>	Total project cost	<u>100%</u>

The second fiscal amendment is the State "buy-in" provision of the Act, which states:

*"With respect to such programs or projects the State will provide in the aggregate no less than one-half of the non-Federal funding."*

The New Jersey Legislature has appropriated sufficient funds in the budget to cover the "buy-in" provision. It is important to note that municipalities and counties benefit from the "buy-in" provision, since the State funds are used to meet part of the hard cash match requirement. Using the same example above, a non-construction project to a local unit of government would be as follows:

\$ 90,000	LEAA funds	( 90%)
5,000	State Buy-In	( 5%)
<u>5,000</u>	Local Cash	<u>( 5%)</u>
<u>\$100,000</u>	Total project cost	<u>100%</u>

Note that the cash match requirement of 10% of the total project cost is met in part through the State buy-in (5% of the total project cost or one-half of the matching share) leaving only 5% to be provided through local cash appropriation. Subgrantees applying for funds under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 will be required to put up a 10% match without any contribution through State Buy-In.

Local applicants should refer to Section XIII of this Guide for instructions issued by the N.J. Department of Community Affairs, Division of Local Government Services, outlining the proper procedures for budgeting and accounting for hard cash match monies.

#### ALLOWABLE COSTS

The allowability of charges made to funds granted

under the Act shall be determined in accordance with the general principles of allowability and standards for selected cost items set forth in General Services Administration Federal Management Circular FMC 74-4 entitled "Principles for Determining Costs Applicable to Grants and Contracts with State and Local Government;" Federal Management Circular FMC 74-7 entitled "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants In-Aid to State and Local Governments;" and the LEAA Financial Guide. These documents appear in previous editions of the *Applicants Guide* and are available upon request.

Costs allowable only with specific prior approval of LEAA include:

1. Automatic Data Processing—Prior approval is required only for the acquisition of equipment, whether by outright purchase, rental purchase agreement or other method of purchase.
2. Professional (including contract and consultant) services—Prior approval is required where costs for arrangements with individuals will exceed \$135 per day.
3. Confidential Expenditures—Prior approval is required. Confidential expenditures include payment to informants, purchase of materials as evidence (such as narcotics), or other uses as may be required by law enforcement personnel working in an undercover capacity.
4. Medical Research—Prior approval is required for any medical research not specifically documented in the *New Jersey Plan for Criminal Justice*.
5. Foreign Travel—Any travel outside of the United States and its territories and possessions or Canada must receive specific prior approval.
6. Sole Source Procurement—On all sole source procurements over \$2,500, a justification for the use of this method must be contained within the application. When the amount involved exceeds \$5,000 prior approval from LEAA is required.

#### UNALLOWABLE COSTS

1. Personnel Costs—Expenditure of more than one-third of the costs of any action grant for compensation of regular criminal justice personnel (police, prosecutors, public defenders, judges, probation officers, and all correctional personnel). The costs of consultants and/or private or educational institution contractors providing services to a subgrantee are excluded. Also, this limitation does not apply to Part B Planning grants.
2. Land Acquisition—Federal funds granted for renting, leasing, or constructing facilities may not include land acquisition. Land acquisition, if necessary, should be included within the subgrantee matching share.
3. Compensation of Federal Employees—Salary payments, consulting fees, and travel costs (in-

cluding subsistence and lodging) of full-time federal employees are unallowable.

4. Bonuses or Commissions—Payment to any individual for the purpose of obtaining approval of an application for federal assistance is unallowable.

All allowable items of cost will be reviewed by SLEPA to determine acceptability. Costs generally allowable, may be rejected if in SLEPA's determination such costs are deemed excessive or not integral to the success of the project for which said costs are requested.

## **BUDGET CATEGORIES**

Budget categories appearing on the application form are listed and explained below. Note that applicants should use only whole dollars when itemizing costs.

### **A. Salaries and Wages**

List each position for which funds are requested indicating the percentage of time to be spent on the project and the total annual salary of each. For continuation applications, list under "Current Annual Salary" the equivalent annual salary paid to the same individual on the immediate preceding grant. Employee benefits, such as retirement, FICA and health insurance should be shown separately.

The project must be divided into two categories. The first group would include all regular criminal justice personnel. The total cost of compensating this group out of federal (SLEPA) funds may not exceed one-third of the total SLEPA grant. (This requirement may be waived by SLEPA on a case-by-case basis).

The second group would include all other personnel costs "whose primary responsibility is to provide assistance, maintenance or auxiliary services or administrative support to the regular operational components". There is no limitation placed on the proportion of these salary costs.

To illustrate this requirement: Salaries for police and other regular law enforcement and criminal justice personnel on a project for which an applicant requests \$60,000 of SLEPA funds may not exceed \$20,000 (1/3 of \$60,000). However, salaries for other personnel may be in addition to the \$20,000.

With respect to ongoing SLEPA funded projects, federal funds may be used to provide no more than 50% of any salary increases from one grant period to another. The subgrantee is not required to apply this special matching requirement to new project personnel. To illustrate: a subgrant project conducted in a particular law enforcement agency involves an outlay of \$5,000 from federal funds to increase the compensation of existing project personnel and an outlay of \$20,000 for new project personnel. The special matching requirement will be deemed to have been met if subgrantee funds of at least \$5,000 are

provided during the project period to increase the compensation of existing project personnel.

It is essential that subgrantees adequately forecast salary requirements (including base salaries and anticipated increments) when submitting applications to SLEPA. All requests for salary increases, not provided within the approved project budget, will be reviewed on a case by case basis. Approval of such requests will be based upon reasonableness, consistency with local policy and availability of funds within the project budget. In no case will the amount of the original subgrant award be increased.

Line items appearing within the application under Category A, Salaries and Wages must be paid in accordance with established state or local employment procedures. Under no circumstances will payment of gross wages to project personnel be accepted.

### **B. Purchase of Services**

1. Individual Consultants. List by name or type the consultant to be selected, and show the total estimated costs. As a general rule, a maximum of \$135 per day (8-hour day) including fringe benefits may be charged.

SLEPA reserves the right to approve or disapprove consultant services prior to commitment for such services.

2. Contracting or Service Organizations and Associations. With respect to such services, the arrangement must be formal and consistent with Federal, State and Local procurement regulations. Selection of contractors should involve securing of competitive bids or proposals from a group of qualified organizations. On all sole source contracts over \$2,500, justification for use of this method must be included in the application.

A detailed cost estimate should be shown in the Budget Explanation, including the scope of services to be performed, professional qualifications, and the basis for calculating fees including the estimated number of man days required, rate travel, overhead, profit charges etc. Prior to obtaining the services of any organization, a copy of the proposed contract must be submitted to the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency for review and approval. The proposed contract will not be reviewed for legal sufficiency, but rather to insure that the scope of services to be provided is consistent with overall project goals and objectives. The proposed contract should be submitted along with the Consultant Report Form (SLEPA 109).

3. Costs incurred for outside professionals for staff training including costs for travel, transportation and subsistence for these professionals and will be included under Instructional Costs. Provide

details that show the basis for the amount requested.

Travel costs incurred for grant personnel to attend training seminars and or instructional sessions will be reflected in budget category C (travel). Also included in that budget category will be registration in the amount of \$10.00 or less. Registration fees exceeding \$10.00 will be reflected in Category B under Instructional Costs.

4. Other costs for professional services i.e., psychological/social services. Show rates and method for calculating budget request.

### **C. Travel, Transportation, Subsistence**

Show travel costs by estimating the number of trips, multiplied by the estimated cost per trip. Where possible, show the proposed destination and purpose of the trip(s). In the absence of a locally approved rate, costs for travel and subsistence should be budgeted in accordance with State regulations, e.g. \$.14 per mile, maximum of \$14.00 per day for three meals, maximum of \$28.00 per day room costs when engaged in regular official travel in the conduct of State business. When attending a convention or conference and when overnight lodging is necessary, the following rates apply: Maximum of \$36.00 for lodging, \$14 per day for three meals. (Full details should be obtained from the State of New Jersey Travel Regulations.)

Applicants desiring to use travel rates in excess of the State maximums must submit such requests in writing to SLEPA. Written approval from SLEPA must be received prior to the expenditure of funds for travel costs. Justification must include assurances that travel rates being requested are consistent with rates normally authorized by the applicant unit of government. Copies of any documentation outlining and authorizing local travel rates should be included in the request.

### **D. Consumable Supplies**

Estimate the cost of materials directly required by the project, such as office supplies, postage, printing and other expendable materials needed during the course of normal operation of the project.

### **E. Facilities, Office Space, Utilities, Equipment Rental**

Estimate the cost of construction, office space rental, furniture or equipment rental, maintenance costs, equipment maintenance contracts, utilities, telephone, etc. Show the cost per square foot for office space.

Note that rent may not be charged for the use of public buildings, however, actual costs that can be accounted for may be used.

Rental space, including space for file, conference, mail, supply, reproduction, and storage rooms should not exceed 150 square feet per employee.

Costs should be consistent with prevailing rates in the area and should not exceed \$7 annually per square foot.

Costs for rearrangements and alterations in excess of \$1,500 must be justified in the application to show that:

1. The building involved is in reasonably good condition with a life expectancy of five or more years,
2. The costs are true rearrangement or renovation costs as distinguished from new construction or expansion of an existing building,
3. Total costs do not exceed 25% of the current value of the building.

Any project or component thereof which involves the erection, acquisition, expansion or repair of new or existing buildings or other facilities is deemed a construction project subject to a special matching ratio of 50/50 (Part C funds) rather than 90/10. Refer to the LEAA Financial Guide, Chapter 4, Paragraph 5 for a complete description of the identification of construction costs.

### **F. Equipment**

**A condition of all LEAA grants including the purchase of equipment is that a search and examination of existing excess federal property be made prior to the issuance of purchase orders.** This action is required by the Federal Property Management Regulations. One or both of the forms shown in the Forms section of this document must be submitted, in accordance with the instructions included. Only if a negative reply results from the submission of ADM Form 5 or the equipment is unsuitable after inspection may orders be submitted to vendors. The above circumstances must be adequately documented in the subgrantee's records, with copies submitted to SLEPA.

SLEPA may approve the purchase of equipment deemed appropriate and essential to the successful operation of projects under the State Plan. Requests for equipment should contain adequate cost specifications, including equipment type, quantity and estimated cost.

In preparing requests for acquisition of equipment, the following general cost allowability principles should be kept in mind:

1. Federal Management Circular FMC 74-4 prohibits the purchase of automatic data processing equipment without specific approval by the grantor agency (LEAA).
2. Equipment should be requested only after determination by responsible officials that no other identical or similar equipment owned by the applicant is available for project use.
3. SLEPA funds will not be authorized to provide reimbursement for the purchase price of equipment already owned by the applicant.
4. If equipment purchased is used commonly for two or more Federal grant programs or for a

Federal grant program and a non-federally supported State or local government activity, appropriate proration of cost to each activity involved must be effected.

5. All equipment specifications, requests for proposals, and bid awards will be made no later than ninety (90) days after the release of initial grant funds. Failure to do so may result in termination of the grant award.
6. All contracts shall contain a performance clause fixing a specific date for work completion.

A detailed explanation of equipment utilization should be included in the application. If training in the use of equipment is necessary a schedule of training, including length of training, trainees and instructors should be presented.

Applicants should become familiar with Federal Management Circular FMC 74-7, Appendix N, Property Management Standards. This guideline outlines subgrantee responsibilities in developing and maintaining adequate property records, internal control systems and periodic physical inventory checks.

Further specific guidelines governing equipment purchases may be issued by the various desks within the Operations Unit. Applicants for radio communications equipment should follow the requirements available upon request.

#### **G. Indirect Costs**

These costs are limited to the applicant's match and are not chargeable to the SLEPA share. Refer to item "K", part 1 in Section B for a more complete discussion of limitations.

### **Application Authorization**

The final page of the application requires the signature of the applicant unit of government's chief executive officer or the individual authorized to enter the Unit of Government into a contractual agreement. Signature indicates that the information provided within the application is accurate and complete and that the applicant intends to comply with all conditions applicable to grants awarded pursuant to the Crime Control Act. An explanation of each guideline is offered below.

### **CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE**

Applicants are required to comply with the Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines issued by LEAA and appearing in the Federal Register, 28 C.F.R. 42.301 et seq., Subpart E. These guidelines provide recognition of the fact that "full and equal participation of women and minority individuals in employment opportunities in the criminal justice system is a necessary component of the Safe Street Act's program to reduce crime and delinquency in the United States."

In accordance with LEAA guidelines development of an Equal Employment Opportunity Program is re-

quired of all applicants meeting the following criteria:

Each recipient of LEAA assistance within the criminal justice system (project implementing agency not overall unit of government) which has 50 or more employees *and* which has received subgrants of \$25,000 or more since enactment of the Safe Streets Act in 1968 *and* which has a service population with a minority representation of three percent or more.

Where a recipient has 50 or more employees, and has received subgrants of \$25,000 or more, and has a service population with a minority representation of less than three percent, such recipient must develop an equal employment opportunity program relating to employment practices affecting women.

Applicants affected by these guidelines will be required to formulate, implement and maintain a written Equal Employment Opportunity Program (Affirmative Action Plan) relating to employment practices affecting minority persons and women. "Minority persons" shall include persons who are Negro, Oriental, American-Indian, or Spanish-surnamed Americans. "Spanish-surnamed Americans" means those of Latin American, Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican or Spanish origin. In developing the Equal Employment Opportunity Program in accordance with LEAA Guidelines the applicant must take into consideration the relevant labor market as a basis to provide for full and equal participation of women and minority individuals.

Equal Employment Opportunity Programs should include as a minimum:

1. An evaluation of the following factors cross classified by race, ethnicity and sex:
  - a. Analysis of present representation of women and minority persons in all job categories;
  - b. Analysis of all recruitment and employment selection procedures;
  - c. Analysis of seniority, promotion and transfer procedures;
  - d. Analysis of external factors such as available housing and transportation which may inhibit minority employment.
2. A written Program which includes:
  - a. A job classification table indicating numbers of employees, numbers of employees in each classification cross classified by race, ethnicity and sex including rates of pay;
  - b. Disciplinary actions by race, ethnicity and sex, including sanctions imposed;
  - c. Number of entrance applicants by race, ethnicity and sex and resulting new hires by race, ethnicity and sex;
  - d. Number of transfer or promotion applicants by race, ethnicity and sex and number promoted or transferred by race, ethnicity and sex;
  - e. Number of employees terminated by race, ethnicity and sex and identification of volun-

- tary or involuntary terminations;
- f. Available labor market characteristics;
- g. Detailed narrative of existing employment policies, including:
  - (1) Necessary steps needed to be taken to assure full and equal employment opportunity.
  - (2) Recruitment program, if necessary.
- h. Plan for dissemination of EEO program;
- i. Designation of personnel for implementation and maintenance of the program.

Affected applicants must file a certificate with SLEPA indicating the existence of such an EEO program. The written EEO program need not be filed with SLEPA but must be made available for subsequent review and audit. The certification format is shown below.

**CERTIFICATION OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM**

I, \_\_\_\_\_ (Mayor, Chief Executive, State Department Head) certify that the \_\_\_\_\_ (criminal justice agency) has formulated an equal employment opportunity program in accordance with 28 CFR 42.301, et seq., subpart E, and that it is on file in the office of \_\_\_\_\_ (name), \_\_\_\_\_ (address), \_\_\_\_\_ (title), for review or audit by officials of the cognizant state planning agency or the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, as required by relevant laws and regulations.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(signed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

**A-95 CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW**

In accordance with the provisions of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, applicants are required to comply with Project Notification and Review System as outlined in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95, and the LEAA Regulations. Prospective applicants for SLEPA funds are required to notify both the State and areawide planning and development clearinghouses, utilizing the multi-purpose federal form SF424 prior to their submission to the funding agency. However, concurrent submission of an application to the clearinghouses and the funding agency is permissible if the appropriate clearinghouses agree to concurrent review, documentation must be submitted with the application indicating such agreement. Applications for continuation grants are subject to review upon request of the clearinghouses. Documentation must be submitted indicating that the applicant has notified the

clearinghouse in accordance with A-95 Revised and that the clearinghouse did not request review.

Executive Order No. 35 issued by Governor Cahill created the following clearinghouse system:

- A. **State Clearinghouse:** Division of State and Regional Planning of the Department of Community Affairs, P.O. Box 2768, Trenton, N.J. 08625.
- B. **Metropolitan Clearinghouses:**
  - 1. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, 1 World Trade Center South, 82nd Floor, New York 10048—Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Passaic, Somerset and Union Counties.
  - 2. Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, 1819 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Penn Towers Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103—Burlington, Camden, Gloucester and Mercer Counties.
  - 3. Wilmington Metropolitan Area Planning Coordinating Council, 2062 New Castle Avenue, New Castle, Delaware 19720—Salem County.
  - 4. Atlantic County Planning Board, 25 Dolphin Avenue, Northfield, New Jersey 08225—Atlantic County.
  - 5. Cumberland County Planning Board, 800 Commerce Street, Bridgeton, New Jersey 08302—Cumberland County.
- C. **Non-Metropolitan Clearinghouses:**
  - 1. Cape May County Planning Board, County Court House, Cape May Court House, New Jersey 08210—Cape May County.
  - 2. Hunterdon County Planning Board, Flemington, New Jersey 08822—Hunterdon County.
  - 3. Ocean County Planning Board, 119 Hooper Avenue, Toms River, New Jersey 08753—Ocean County.
  - 4. Sussex County Planning Board, Administration Building, 39 High Street, Newton, New Jersey 07860—Sussex County.
  - 5. Warren County Planning Board, Oxford and Hardwick Streets, Belvidere, New Jersey 07823—Warren County.

The responsibilities of these clearinghouses are:

- a. to receive from prospective applicants within their jurisdiction all notices of intent to apply for federal aid under programs covered by OMB Circular A-95;
- b. to determine the State, regional or local interests in the project in light of the comprehensive development plans and policies of the agencies represented by the clearinghouse;
- c. to arrange conferences between the applicant and the appropriate agencies to identify and resolve conflicts pursuant to the application;
- d. to prepare evaluative comments to be submitted with the final applications; and
- e. to issue letters of clearance attesting that the applicant has complied with the provisions of the A-95 Project Notification and Review System.

State, metropolitan and non-metropolitan clearinghouses may have a period of thirty days after receipt of the project notification in which to distribute the notification to their respective reviewing agencies. Within this thirty-day period, the clearinghouses will solicit the comments of the reviewing agencies. Based on these comments, they will notify the applicant that (a) the project does not apparently conflict with the development programs and policies of the agencies within the clearinghouse's jurisdiction, in which case the applicant may complete and submit the application directly to SLEPA; or (b) issues or conflicts have arisen pursuant to the application which will require additional review and discussion.

In cases where conflicts arise, the application will enter an indeterminate period, during which time the clearinghouse will attempt to resolve the conflict, either through informal meetings with the applicant or through formal conferences. If the conflicts cannot be resolved through discussions during the indeterminate period, a clearinghouse may exercise its option to review the applicant's formal application for thirty days. During this final review period, the clearinghouse will prepare formal comments to be returned to the applicant for submission with the application to SLEPA.

Applicants must complete Attachment Five included in the application to indicate full compliance with the A-95 review process.

SLEPA staff will give due consideration to all clearinghouse comments submitted with applications. Also, SLEPA will notify the appropriate clearinghouse of substantive action—approvals, amendments, rejections—taken on applications. These notifications of action taken will be channeled through the Central Receiving House (New Jersey Bureau of the Budget).

## **V. STAFF SCREENING:**

A. Funding decisions for all grants will be made solely on the basis of the formal application submission prepared on the official agency forms (SLEPA 101).

B. A formal application consists of the following:

1. Three copies of the application (SLEPA 101), all with original signatures presented in the proper format and including Attachments One through Five and the Application Authorization page.
2. Two certified copies of a resolution of the local governing body (illustrated on SLEPA 102), duly signed and sealed, approving the applicant's participation with the State of New Jersey in the SLEPA programs. All resolutions must be submitted in the form as indicated in this Guide.
3. In the case of State agencies, all applications must be reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget as outlined in Budget Circular 74-5. Applications will be handstamped by the Budget Bu-

reau as evidence that this review has been completed. Budget Circular 74-5 is reprinted as Section XIV of this Guide.

C. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act has been amended to require that State Planning Agencies complete their review process of applications within a 90-day period from the time an application is received. For purposes of this requirement, the 90-day review period will commence only when the application in question is in compliance with LEAA and SLEPA guidelines as set forth in the *Applicants Guide*.

Any submission that does not comply with LEAA and SLEPA application requirements as set forth in this Applicants Guide will not be accepted as an application for purposes of the 90-day review requirement. An application filed in compliance with these guidelines will be acted upon within 90 days.

D. Every application received will be dated and logged into the incoming mail book. Action grant applications will then be referred to the Operations Unit of SLEPA; Planning Grant Applications to the Planning Unit.

E. The project controller assigns each application a project number and this number is logged in the project control log. Two copies of the application are filed in the Administration file, and two copies are referred to the Assistant Director.

F. The Assistant Director completes a preliminary screening process, and if the application is not within the purview of the comprehensive plan, the applicant is so advised in a letter of acknowledgement. Any deficiencies are itemized and the application is assigned to a unit staff member to follow through with the applicant until the application is technically correct.

G. A technically correct application is then forwarded to the Application Review Committee composed of the Executive Director, Deputy Director, the Assistant Director-Planning, the Assistant Director-Operations, and the Assistant Director-Administration. The Committee meets for the final review of the application to determine the staff recommendations to the SLEPA Governing Board.

H. Staff recommendations will be based upon the relative merits of applications, within any one program category, in contributing to the goal under which submitted, and with due regard for a distribution of funds that will assist those jurisdictions with the most serious crime problems.

## **VI. APPLICATION REVIEW AND AWARD:**

A. Applications for projects specifically outlined in an approved plan will be reviewed and acted upon by the Application Review Committee, and will not require Governing Board approval.

B. The Governing Board will review all other action grant applications which have been recommended for funding.

C. The Board will approve action grants at a regularly scheduled meeting based on the following criteria:

1. Conformity to the purposes of the Act and its regulations and guidelines, i.e. LEAA Financial Guide, federal circulars.
2. Compliance and coordination with New Jersey's current comprehensive law enforcement plan.
3. The estimated impact on the support of the State's priority programs.
4. The degree of probable constructive contribution to the improvement of the State of New Jersey's criminal justice system.
5. The likelihood of achieving stated grant objectives.
6. The amount of estimated benefit derived versus the cost incurred as compared to similar projects and to those other action grant applications being considered.
7. The degree of innovation displayed.

D. When a decision is reached, the applicant is so notified by letter. If the decision is favorable, a subgrant award (SLEPA 103) form is executed. The applicant for the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or the individual authorized to enter the unit of government into a contractual agreement.

#### **VII. APPEAL PROCEDURES:**

Upon receipt of notification of denial, the applicant has twenty (20) days after receipt to request in writing that an appeal be held on the denial. SLEPA Form 104 (Notice of Appeal) is forwarded to the applicant for the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or the individual authorized to enter the unit of government into a contractual agreement.

The Board Chairman of SLEPA or any authorized officer thereof, will convene the Governing Board to hold a hearing at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting providing at least thirty (30) days have elapsed after the SLEPA Form 104 has been returned to the SLEPA offices. Such hearings or investigations will be held at such times and places as designated following appropriate written notice to such applicant or subgrantee.

The hearing shall not be bound by the rules of evidence whether statutory, common law, or adopted by Rules of Court. The Governing Board may in their discretion exclude any evidence if they find that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the risk that its admission will either (1) necessitate undue consumption of time, or (2) create substantial danger or undue prejudice or confusion. In that event, they will accept for filing a written offer or proof which may also argue relevancy to the issue at hand.

The Governing Board will render its decision and so inform the appellant immediately following the

hearing. There shall be ten (10) days after the hearing to file written exceptions, objections and replies to the findings of the Governing Board.

The findings of fact and determinations made by the Governing Board of SLEPA shall be final and conclusive, unless the Governor shall, within thirty (30) days of the Governing Board decision, reverse that decision.

#### **VIII. SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF GRANT:**

Determination for suspension or termination of funds will initiate with SLEPA and will be based upon the subgrantee's inability to perform in accordance with the conditions of the grant award; upon the unsatisfactory or non-filing of cost statements and/or the unsatisfactory or non-filing of quarterly reports as required under the grant conditions.

SLEPA will notify the subgrantee by letter advising of SLEPA's initial determination and citing the reasons for such termination or suspension of funds. This will be followed immediately by a letter to the subgrantee, with copies to the Project Director and the Financial Officer, detailing the exact discrepancies with regard to the grant award.

Reinstatement of funding may be approved by SLEPA after satisfactory compliance by the subgrantee.

#### **IX. SUBGRANTEE OFFICIAL FILE:**

Subgrantees are required to combine all files into a manageable holding system, to assure that the following documents are included and are available for review by Agency Program Analysts and Auditors.

- a. Copy of approved Application for Subgrant
- b. Copy of award letter
- c. Copies of all Project Modification Requests and related written approvals from the SLEPA
- d. Copies of all Fiscal Reports
- e. Copies of all Subgrant Progress Reports
- f. Copies of any required prior approvals
- g. Personnel information
  - Copies of all necessary payroll evidence
  - Copies of all necessary staff assignment forms
  - Copies of all necessary time reports and certifications
- h. Consultants and Contract Services
  - Copies of all necessary contracts and bid documents where appropriate
  - Copies of all necessary prior approvals
  - Copies of all invoices
  - Copies of all payments
- i. Equipment
  - Copies of all purchase orders
  - Copies of all receiving documents
  - Copies of all invoices
  - Copies of all bid or competitive quotations information

- Copies of all paid vouchers
- Copies of all inventory data
- Copies of all in-kind certification forms
- j. Supplies & Operating Expenses
  - Copies of all space contracts and/or certificates
  - Copies of all bid information
  - Copies of all purchase orders
  - Copies of all invoices
  - Copies of all payments
- k. Renovation and Alteration and Construction
  - Copies of all necessary approvals
  - Copies of all bids
  - Copies of all contracts
  - Copies of all records of project completion
  - Copies of all payments
- l. Travel
  - Copies of all travel authorization
  - Copies of all travel vouchers
  - Copies of all payments
- m. Banking information
  - Cash verification
  - Receipts documentation
  - Check register
  - Cancelled checks
  - Bank statements

#### **X. REPORTING PROCEDURES:**

**A. Quarterly Narrative Reports:** Subgrantees are required to submit quarterly narrative reports (SLEPA 106) for the duration of the project period to SLEPA, describing the project activities and progress made during the reporting period. Quarterly narratives are required on a calendar year basis (i.e. January 1-March 31, April 1-June 30, July 1-September 30, and October 1-December 31) for all subgrants.

If a subgrant begins less than one month before termination of a calendar quarter, a narrative report is not due for that quarter. Activities for this shortened period should be accounted for in the subsequent quarterly report. (e.g. Contract date is March 2, 1977, quarterly narrative due June 30, 1977, covering all activities from March 2 to June 30).

Two copies of all quarterly narrative reports should be submitted to SLEPA within 30 days of the end of the calendar quarter.

**B. Final Narrative Reports:** Upon termination or completion of a subgrant, a final narrative report (SLEPA 106), in addition to the scheduled quarterly report, will be required by SLEPA and will be submitted within 30 days of the termination or completion date of the project. This report should contain a complete description of the project including goals, problems, results, recommendations, and an evaluation of effectiveness. If a publication results from the grant and contains an overview of the projects goals and objectives, then this report could be accepted as the final narrative report. Subgrantees should remember that this report will be one of the

criteria upon which any application for an action grant, based on or related to the planning grant, will be judged.

Two copies of all final narrative reports should be submitted to SLEPA.

#### **XI. TIMING OF STATE AND/OR LOCAL CONTRIBUTIONS:**

State and local contributions need not be made in exact proportion with and time concurrence of withdrawal and expenditure of federal funds. During the first months of program or project operation, for example, the subgrantee may spend a greater proportion of its matching funds to meet program expenses than may be required by the applicable statutory ratio, or it may spend a larger proportion of federal funds. However, the full subgrantee matching share must be contributed by the end of the period that federal funds are available for obligation or expenditure under a given subgrant and in no event later than the date at which the complete federal award has been expended.

#### **XII. SUBGRANTEE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY:**

The subgrantee shall be responsible for maintaining a bookkeeping system, records and files to account for all grant monies spent and all matching funds contributed to the project.

SLEPA is in no way specifying a definite system, but it will expect subgrantees to develop one that conforms to good accounting practices.

SLEPA has members of its staff with fiscal responsibility who will be available to subgrantees to provide technical assistance with respect to fiscal administration of the subgrants.

A. Special consideration should be given to the following general conditions pertaining to the administration of subgrants:

1. Fiscal Control and Fund Accounting. Procedures will be established which assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for grant funds and required non-federal expenditures.
2. Accounting Procedures. Accounting procedures must provide for an accurate and timely recording of receipt of funds by source of expenditures made from such funds, and of unexpended balances. Controls will be established which are adequate to ensure that expenditures charged to subgrant activities are for allowable purposes and that documentation is readily available to verify that such charges are accurate.
3. Retention of Records. Financial records of the grantee and its subgrantees and contractors, including books of original entry, source documents supporting accounting transactions, the general ledger, subsidiary ledgers, personnel and payroll records, cancelled checks, and

related documents and records must be retained for a period of at least three years. The retention period starts from the date of the receipt of the final expenditure report.

Records must be retained beyond the three year period if an audit is in progress and/or findings of a completed audit have not been resolved satisfactorily. If an audit is completed and the findings are resolved prior to the three year period, records will be retained until the end of the three year period. If the three year period has passed and no audit has been initiated, the records will be retained in accordance with other State and local law. If State or local law requires a longer period of record retention, the subgrantee must abide by the most restrictive regulations.

If after the three year period no audit has been initiated and State or local law does not require record retention beyond the three year period, subgrantees must receive prior approval from SLEPA before disposing of any grant records.

4. **Fund Payment.** All payments made to the subgrantee under this grant will be recorded by the subgrantee in accounting records separate from all other fund accounts, including funds derived from other grant awards. Amounts paid shall be available for expenditure by the subgrantee in accordance with the provisions of the subgrant throughout the project period subject to such conditions as the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency may prescribe.
5. **Use of Grant Funds.** Funds granted may be used only for the purposes required to carry out the approved project and identified in the approved project budget. Any deviation in the total project budget of \$100 or more within or between budget categories requires prior written approval of SLEPA.

Subgrantees may, without prior SLEPA approval deviate from a budget category when the change, either between or within the category does not exceed \$100. The subgrantee is required to notify agency bookkeeping staff of this change on the remarks section of the *Cash Request Report*. Deviations from the approved project budget within a budget category exceeding \$100 must be requested in letter form prior to the expenditure of funds. When the deviations exceed \$100 and are between budget categories, the SLEPA form #108 (Budget Revision/Grant Extension Request) must be submitted requesting prior approval.

Once approval is granted to deviate from the approved project budget in excess of \$100, the requested operating budget becomes a new

base against which the \$100 flexibility can be applied.

6. **Project Income.** All interest or other income earned by the grantee with respect to grant funds or as a result of conduct of the grant project (sale or publications, registration fees, service charges on fees, etc.) must be accounted for.
7. **Obligation of Grant Funds.** Grant funds may not, without advance written approval by SLEPA, be obligated prior to the effective date or subsequent to the termination date of the grant period. Obligations outstanding as of the termination date must be liquidated within 90 days. Such obligations must be related to services provided within the grant period or to goods as specified in the approved project budget. Subgrantees will be required to submit additional monthly Detailed Cost Statements during the time period in which obligated funds are being liquidated.
8. **Return of Unobligated Funds.** Funds that remain unobligated at the end of the fiscal budget period shall be returned to SLEPA within sixty (60) days after the end of such budget period.
  - B. Consideration should also be given to the following Agency policies concerning budgetary and payment procedures.
    1. Grants are awarded for a one-year period or a part thereof.
    2. The starting date for the grant period is established by SLEPA at the time of approval of the application.
  - C. **Cost Allowability—**Refer to Federal Management Circular FMC 74-4.
  - D. **Fiscal Reporting Requirements.** The grantee must maintain a generally accepted accounting system which provides, as a minimum:
    1. A separate account for the grant project (this means a separate appropriation account for State agencies) with separate accountability of receipts, expenditures, and balances for each Fiscal Budget Period.
    2. Itemization of all supporting records of grant receipts, expenditures and State/local contributions in sufficient detail to show exact nature for each Fiscal Budget Period.
    3. Provision of data and information for each expenditure and State/local contributions with proper reference to a supporting voucher or bill properly approved.
    4. Maintenance of payroll authorizations and vouchers.
    5. Maintenance of a time-reporting system for personnel charged to the grant and also covering State/local contributed services. (If your present system of reporting does not adequately provide for this, obtain copies of SLEPA Form 105 from the Agency.)

6. Maintenance of adequate records supporting charges for fringe benefits.
7. Maintenance of adequate inventory records for equipment bought, rented and contributed.
8. Provisions for payment by check.

E. In accordance with LEAA, the subgrantee prior to the obligation of funds for property (furniture, equipment, vehicles, etc.) will make a determination, appropriately documented on forms provided by SLEPA, that all excess federal property has been solicited and will be utilized if available and not in need of substantial repairs.

Procedures for Excess Property—When the location and identification numbers for excess personal property are not known, a general request to the General Services Administration to search their catalogs is made via ADM Form 5 “Request For Location Of Excess Personal Property”. The quantity unit description (each, dozen, etc.), and a description sufficiently detailed to enable GSA to identify the equipment desired are entered on the form. Four copies of the form, with a narrative explaining the relevance of each requested item, are submitted to the program analyst.

Any request for excess property will be made through SLEPA on Form ADM5 with assurance that the unit of government will accept responsibility for the cost of transportation, accountability, insurance where applicable, proper care and maintenance, and return of property on request of the Federal Government.

In making this request for federal excess personal property on the Transfer Order Form SF-122, it is understood that the following conditions apply and that there will be compliance with all other applicable regulations, both current and future, as established by the federal government and the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency:

Title to all personal property shall remain with the cognizant federal agency, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The property will be surrendered on demand.

The subgrantee is responsible for accountability, management maintenance, and protection from loss, damage, theft, and unauthorized use. The subgrantee is also responsible for making shipping arrangements and the costs required for initial acquisition, maintenance, and storage pending final disposition. If the property is transferred to another agency, it will be the next recipient’s responsibility for the cost of such shipment and he may be charged only for actual packing and loading costs.

Upon receipt of the property, the subgrantee will complete the Property Transaction Document, LEAA 1825/1 and submit five (5) copies to the program analyst at SLEPA. Property identification labels provided by LEAA will be affixed to each item received for identification and to facilitate the annual physical

inventory required of each recipient subgrantee.

In the event of damage, theft, or loss, the subgrantee will complete the Property Transaction Document, LEAA 1825/1 and submit three (3) copies to the program analyst at SLEPA.

When vehicles are acquired for use on public streets, the subgrantee will provide evidence of liability insurance in the following minimum accounts: \$200,000/\$500,000 personal injury and \$100,000 property damage. Three (3) copies must be submitted to the program analyst at SLEPA.

The subgrantee covenants and agrees to save harmless the federal government and its agencies from all liabilities and costs resulting from suits related to the use of property acquired under this program.

The subgrantee will prepare the Report of Excess Personal Property, SF120 when there is no longer a need for any property item and submit three (3) copies to the program analyst at SLEPA.

The narrative attached to each form SF122 explains in detail the relevance of each item requested to the goals of the subgrant.

### **XIII. BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING REGULATIONS FOR LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATING IN THE STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY PROGRAM:**

The following memorandum issued by the Director, Division of Local Government Services, Department of Community Affairs should be adhered to when budgeting funds received through grant awards from SLEPA.

*After meeting with officials of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, the Director of Local Government Services hereby prescribes the following budgeting and accounting regulations for grants allocated to counties and municipalities by the above-named agency.*

1. *All State Law Enforcement Planning Agency grants shall be processed through the budget of the local unit at the time of the adoption of the budget or by a budget amendment utilizing N.J.S. 40A:4-87. No such grants shall be accounted for through the “Trust Fund” as a dedication by rider.*
2. *All such grants shall be designated in the budget as follows:*

**REVENUE:** State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Grant—Subgrant No.

**APPROPRIATION:** Unclassified: State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Grant—Subgrant No.

3. *The appropriation shall be a separate line item without a designation as to "Salaries and Wages" and "Other Expenses" and shall not be made a part of any existing appropriation.*
4. *The revenue when anticipated at the time that the budget of the local unit is introduced, shall be a "Special Item of Revenue with Prior Written Consent of the Director of Local Government services."*
5. *Commencing with the 1974 budget, all SLEPA grants will require a 5% "hard cash match." This 5% cash requirement of the local unit cannot be taken from any other appropriation but must be "new" money.*

*It is hereby recommended to all local units of government considering submission of applications to the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency for a 1974 grant to provide an appropriation entitled, "Matching Funds for Grants" in the 1974 budget under the classification of "Unclassified."*

6. *In the event that a local unit has not provided an appropriation and did not consider applying for any SLEPA grant, but now has an opportunity to do so, then the local unit will, by necessity, have to provide for the hard cash match by the adoption of an emergency resolution.*
7. *When a local unit has provided for the "hard cash match" in the budget and an application is approved by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency which was not included in the budget, as adopted, the local unit must adopt an amending resolution to include the revenue and offsetting appropriation and also denote that the hard cash match is available. (See attached sample resolution).*
8. *Since the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency grants in most instances cover a fiscal year other than as provided by statute for New Jersey local units, the Division is allowing the appropriation as budgeted to be set up as a "Reserve" from which commitments and charges can be made beyond the calendar year. The revenue anticipated can be fully realized with any amount not received set up as a receivable and pledged to surplus. However, it is the determination of the Director that the portion of non-cash surplus attributed to the receivable will not be allowed to be anticipated in the following year's budget as surplus with prior written consent of the Director of Local Government Services.*

**XIV. BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING REGULATIONS FOR STATE AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN THE STATE LAW**

**ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY PROGRAM:**

The following memorandum issued by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, should be adhered to when budgeting funds received through grant awards from SLEPA.

*Effective July 1, 1973, the following procedures shall be followed in accounting for Federal and State funds transferred for Federal Law Enforcement Projects.*

1. *The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency (SLEPA) will prepare the Annual Plan in accordance with and at times required by directives issued by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). The completed Plan along with a Budget Bureau Form BB-4 (Application for Non-State Funds) will be submitted to the SLEPA Governing Board for review and approval.*
2. *The Plan and Form BB-4 as approved by the Governing Board will be forwarded to the Budget Bureau for review and approval.*
3. *The Budget Bureau will return a copy of the approved Form BB-4 to SLEPA with an authorization for SLEPA to submit the Plan to the Federal Government for approval.*
4. *After notice of Plan approval is received from the Federal Government, SLEPA is thereby authorized to administer the Plan, not to exceed the limitations set forth in the approved Plan and Form BB-4.*
5. *Each Sub-grantee agency shall submit to the Budget Bureau for approval a Grant Application (SLEPA Form #101 with Attachments One and Two) for each sub-grant request. The Budget Bureau will review and forward approved Grant Applications to SLEPA.*
6. *After review and approval of individual sub-grant requests by SLEPA and its Governing Board, the applicant agency will be notified of such approval by SLEPA.*
7. *Upon receipt of notification of approval of a sub-grant, the recipient agency shall:*
  - (a) *Submit to Division of Budget and Accounting, Accounting Bureau, a written request to establish two separate accounts for each sub-grant which involves both Federal and State funds. If only Federal funds are involved, one account will be requested for each sub-grant. The account structure shall be as follows:*

	Program Agencies	Non-Program Agencies
For Federal Funds	XXXXX-XXX-2XX-0XX or XXXXX-XXX-2XX-5XX	XXX-2XX-0XX or XXX-2XX-5XX

**FORM OF RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE INSERTION OF ANY SPECIAL  
ITEM OF REVENUE IN THE BUDGET OF ANY COUNTY OR MUNICIPALITY  
PURSUANT TO N.J.S. 40A:4-87 (CHAPTER 159, P. L. 1948)**

WHEREAS, N.J.S. 40A:4-87 provides that the Director of the Division of Local Government Services may approve the insertion of any special item of revenue in the budget of any county or municipality when such item shall have been made available by law and the amount thereof was not determined at the time of the adoption of the budget, and

WHEREAS, said Director may also approve the insertion of an item of appropriation for equal amount.

**Section 1**

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the *jurisdiction* hereby requests the Director of the Division of Local Government Services to approve the insertion of an item of revenue in the budget of the year 19\_\_ in the sum of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ which item is now available as a revenue from *State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Subgrant No.* \_\_\_\_\_ pursuant to the provisions of statute, and

**Section 2**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a like sum of ..... \$ \_\_\_\_\_ be and the same is hereby appropriated under the caption of

**State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Subgrant No.**

(In some cases where there is appropriate provision for the municipality's share of any amounts made available to existing statutes, the following Section 3 must be adopted as part of the resolution. In some cases where no appropriation for the municipality's share has been provided, the resolution captioned 3a will be required:)

**Section 3**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the sum of ..... \$ \_\_\_\_\_ representing the amount required for the municipality's share of the aforementioned undertaking appears in the budget of the year 19\_\_ under the caption of *Matching Funds for Grants* \_\_\_\_\_, and is hereby appropriated under the caption of *State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Subgrant No.*

**Section 3a**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the sum of ..... \$ \_\_\_\_\_ be anticipated from the proceeds of an emergency resolution heretofore adopted providing for the municipality's share of the said project or undertaking and the appropriation of the last named sum shall be added to and be supplementary to the appropriation provided in Section 2 hereof.

Adopted this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_  
and certified as a true copy of an original.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk

Approved \_\_\_\_\_, 19 \_\_\_\_

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Note: — This form must be filed in duplicate where special items of revenue are made available by any statute or authorization. In cases where Section 3 is used the "caption" on the last line must be the same as the "caption" on the last line of Section 2. 3a will apply where no appropriation is provided for the municipal share and the emergency resolution must accompany this resolution.

For State Funds	XXXXX-XXX-1XX-0XX or XXXXX-XXX-1XX-5XX	XX-1XXX-0XX or XXX-1XX-5XX
--------------------	--	----------------------------------

or a portion of matching funds for the recipient agency are to be provided from State funds appropriated in account 190-1XX-000.

- (b) Upon receipt of account number(s), transmit the following to SLEPA for the Federal share of the grant: a Request for Transfer of Appropriation, Form AA-5 ("Transfer from" section left blank) and a SLEPA Form #107 (Detailed Cost Statement, Cash Report/Cash Request Form) prepared in accordance with SLEPA instructions.
  - (c) If all or a portion of matching funds for the sub-grantee Agency are to be provided from the State funds appropriated in account 190-1XX-000, prepare a Request for Transfer of Appropriation to cover the amount required for either the grant period or fiscal year, whichever is less. The sub-grantee will forward the Request for Transfer of Appropriation (unsigned) to SLEPA.
8. Upon receipt of the Request(s) for Transfer of Appropriation, SLEPA shall:
    - (a) Complete the "Transfer from" section and approve the Request for Transfer of Appropriation involving Federal funds for the grant request.
    - (b) When required, review and approve a Request for Transfer of Appropriation if all
  9. The Budget Bureau shall review and process all documents received, obtain necessary approvals and provide approved copies of related documents to the affected organizations—in accordance with established procedures.
  10. Each sub-grantee agency, upon receipt of SLEPA Funds, should administer those funds in accordance with Circular Letter #74-4, "Administration of Projects Funded by State and Non-State Fund Sources."
  11. Upon receipt of Federal funds, SLEPA will prepare a Transmittal of Income Form and forward it to the Department of the Treasury; thus reducing the account receivable on the appropriation ledger sheets.
  12. Unexpended or unencumbered State matching funds at the end of the fiscal year will be transferred back to account 190-1XX-000 by the recipient agency. Any continuation of a project into the new fiscal year will necessitate the re-establishment of funds in the project account as outlined in steps 7 and 8.

# THE ANNUAL ACTION PROGRAMS

The chart below is a cross-reference of the 1977 Action Programs to the 1976 Programs. Assignments by Operations Unit desks follow this listing.

Descriptions of the individual programs include **only** the objectives, strategy for implementation, subgrant data, budget and evaluation and monitoring. Sections entitled relationship to problem analysis and multi-year budget forecast and relationship to standards and goals have not been printed this year.

## CROSS REFERENCE OF 1977 PROGRAMS WITH 1976 PLAN

1977 Program Number	Program Title	1976 Program Number	1977 Program Number	Program Title	1976 Program Number
A-1	Continuation of State Level Program, Monitoring & Evaluation Capability	A-1	B-5	Establishment of Regionalized Narcotic & Organized Crime Investigation/Prosecution Units	B-10
A-2	In-Service Training for Police Officers	A-3	B-6	Increase Police Efficiency by Improved Communication Methods	B-7
A-3	Educational & Professional Development for Criminal Justice Personnel	A-4	B-7	Mass Transportation Crime Target Hardening Demonstration Project	A-2
A-4	Recruitment, Selection & Upgrading of Criminal Justice Personnel	A-5	B-8	Statewide Expanded Specialized Investigation of Organized Crime	B-11
A-5	Specialized Training of Court Professionals & Supporting Judicial Personnel	A-6	B-9	Increased Crime Laboratory Services	B-12
A-6	State Advisory & Training Services for Local Corrections	A-7	B-10	Major Crime Fugitive Squad	NEW
A-7	Therapeutic Retention of Students in Local Public Schools	A-10	C-1	Improvement of Police Services to Juveniles	C-1
A-8	Community Youth Services Programs	A-8	C-2	Community Resource Systems for Treatment of Adult Drug & Alcohol Offenders	C-2
A-9	Residential Facilities for Juveniles in Need of Supervision & Community Treatment Facilities for Juvenile Delinquency	A-9	C-3	Improvement & Expansion of Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court Intake Screening	C-3
B-1	Increase Police Patrol Effectiveness	B-1	C-4	Municipal Court Management & Improvement Program	C-4
B-2	Crime Specific Priority Targets	B-6	C-5	Improvement of Services & Information Programs for Victims, Witnesses & Jurors	C-5
B-3	Establishment & Continuation of Public Housing Security Units	B-3	C-6	Pre-Trial Service Program	C-6
B-4	Prevention of Crime Through Improvement of Combined Police Community Efforts	B-4	C-7	Improvement of Juvenile Probation Services	C-7
			C-8	Prosecutor's Office Management Improvement	C-8

1977 Program Number	Program Title	1976 Program Number	1977 Program Number	Program Title	1976 Program Number
C-9	Utilization of Technological Resources within the State Court System	C-9	D-5	State Correctional Treatment Programs	D-5
C-10	Office of Public Advocate	C-10	D-6	Development of Programs to Improve Assistance to Adult Offenders Released to the Community	D-6
C-11	Continued Support of Statewide Court Activities	C-11			
C-12	Improved Appellate Capability	NEW	D-7	Community Based Adult Residential Facilities & Programs as Alternatives to Incarceration	D-7
D-1	Local Correctional Institution Rehabilitation System Management & Service Delivery	D-1	D-8	Improvement of Parole Decision-making	D-8
D-2	Improvement of Juvenile Detention & Shelter Care Practices	D-2	D-9	Alternatives to Enable Separation of Juvenile from Adult Offenders in State Correctional Institutions and to Insure Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders	D-9
D-3	State Correctional Support Program	D-3			
D-4	State Correctional Education Programs	D-4			

### PROGRAM ASSIGNMENT BY OPERATIONS DESK

Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation	Courts & Ancillary Services	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention	Police
A-6	A-3	A-7	A-2
C-2	A-4	A-8	B-1
C-6	A-5	A-9	B-2
D-1	C-4	C-1	B-3
D-3	C-5	C-3	B-4
D-4	C-8	C-7	B-5
D-5	C-9	D-2	B-6
D-6	C-10	D-9	B-7
D-7	C-11		B-8
D-8	C-12		B-9
			B-10

Program A-1 is administered by the Planning Unit.

# A. LEGISLATION, SUPPORT SERVICES AND PREVENTION

## Program A-1: Continuation of State Level Program Monitoring and Evaluation Capability

**Objectives:**

To provide a capability within major State criminal justice agencies to assess the effectiveness of operational components for purposes of modifications to achieve efficiency and to justify objectively budget requests for State and federal support.

To incorporate within major State criminal justice agencies the administrative capability to account for expenditures of funds for diverse federal grants effectively and expeditiously and to initiate the required reports for maintenance of accountability.

To establish the staff expertise required to plan for long term operational change unencumbered by the pressures of immediate crises reactions.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

Criminal justice agencies have long had a need to build their capacity to evaluate and monitor their operations and programs. Criminal justice management has often lacked the resources to collect data, engage in systematic analysis, improve program development and measure program effectiveness.

Funds will be made available to create units within the criminal justice sub-systems, to formulate long-term objectives and to design management systems to achieve these objectives. These units will engage in coordinated planning. Their functions will include gathering and analyzing data, setting priorities and analyzing needs and problems for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan of action for the participating agencies within departments, evaluating alternative programs, making staffing recommendations and conducting monitoring activities.

An advantage of this type of capacity building is the decreasing dependence on outside expertise. Management objectives should be reached more effectively if the planning is done by individuals directly responsible to management and who are intimately acquainted with the specific problems within a given sub-system.

Applicants will document their needs in terms of scope of their activity, general resources available, number and types of projects currently administered, research contemplated and planned; monitoring and evaluation objectives to be attained.

The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency will provide technical assistance in the area of application preparation and program development.

**Subgrant Data:**

State agencies will be the only eligible applicants. Proposals for initial or continuation funding will be considered on the basis of demonstrated need. Subgrants will range between \$25,000 and \$40,000 with smaller grants possible to supplement ongoing efforts. Initially, carryover funds from 1976 will be utilized to develop these projects. The carryover funds will be supplemented with the 1977 funds from this current plan to support projected continuation needs, contingent on successful completion of the initial grants.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$105,000	\$11,667	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Sources researched in developing this program include State agency annual reports and prior years submissions to SLEPA in the area of needs and problem analysis. Also consulted were monitoring reports of related planning grants.

Projects funded within this program area will be specifically evaluated against the following criteria:

A. The degree to which formal evaluation instruments are developed that will define the data elements needed to measure agency program effectiveness. It is expected that grants begun in 1976 and continued in 1977 will have completed specific evaluation plans.

B. The effectiveness of grant management as evidenced by timeliness and accuracy of required reports, as well as completeness and clarity in the substance of reports.

C. Evidence of the formulation of structured, long range planning systems that can project modifications based on evaluation data.

## Program A-2: In-service Training for Police Officers

### Objective:

To improve the performance of 1,000 patrol officers by providing 40 hours of annual in-service training within four selected agencies.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

Under the first approach for this Program Area, the training will consist of one week (40 hours) of full-time training for as many patrol officers, including superior officers, as possible. Hopefully, the project will be able to provide training to all patrol officers in the selected communities. The training should be designed to meet the current needs arising from changes in policy, the introduction of new techniques and the noticeable weaknesses of the particular class of students.

Some subjects to be considered in the in-service training course are: Criminal Law, Ethics, Field Reporting, Community Relations, Crime Prevention; Arrest, Search and Seizure, Investigative Procedures, Patrol Procedures, Proper Use of Force, Safety in Pursuit Driving, Court Presentations, Juvenile Offenders, Crisis Intervention and Unusual Events.

### Subgrant Data:

Five in-service training projects will be implemented. The maximum for each subgrant will be \$50,000. Priority considerations will be given to regional projects, particularly countywide efforts. Applications will be reviewed from other police agencies that demonstrate the ability to provide the type of training required.

Grant funds may be used for the following purposes:

A. Direct training costs—This includes the cost of books, supplies, films or other items justified as needed for training. Funds may also be used for instruction where it does not supplant existing staff assigned for this purpose.

B. Indirect training costs—Grant funds may be used to help defray the per diem cost of replacing a duty officer on training. The use of funds for this purpose will be on a straight salary basis (no overtime rate) and will be completely documented with time and attendance records showing the trainee's attendance in training and the substitute covering the trainee's post. It is anticipated that training grants will be for one year only.

### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$250,000	\$27,778	10%

### Evaluation and Monitoring:

Participating agencies will be required to maintain a record of all police officers participating in the training program.

The participating officers' performance ratings for 1976 will be compared with their 1975 records to determine what effect the training has on their performance.

Grant effectiveness will also be assessed by the number of agencies that institutionalize continuing in-service training following the grant period; and by the formulation of training curricula that will have long term value with periodic minor updating.

## Program A-3: Educational and Professional Development for Criminal Justice Personnel

### Objectives:

To continue upgrading the performance of criminal justice personnel by providing specialized training experiences. Base on prior years experience, it is estimated that 5,000 members of the criminal justice system will receive some form of training.

To provide training for criminal justice specialists where previous training efforts have been minimal or non-existent.

To develop at least 25 programs focusing on areas of operation requiring current knowledge and highly developed skills.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

Applications for projects submitted under this program area will be assigned to the particular SLEPA program unit that is relevant to the training subject matter. That unit (Police, Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, or Courts and Ancillary Services) will be responsible for technical completeness of the application and for monitoring projects that are funded.

As part of the application, agencies seeking training and professional development funds will be

required to detail their plans for long-range, comprehensive training programs. They must demonstrate that the proposed training function is part of a coordinated, planned effort. They will be required to outline how the proposed training interfaces with other training projects which may be available.

SLEPA will encourage the development of interdisciplinary training councils to establish priorities and to begin structuring comprehensive criminal justice training.

Emphasis will be given to the development of executive and organizational skills at the management and supervisory level.

A system of training "trainers" to provide in-service training to other members of their departments will be encouraged.

There will be four basic areas of funding:

**I. POLICE.** Funds will be provided for the continuation of Police Training Commission activities, as well as State Police organized crime, narcotics and sex crime training. Specific skill training at the local level will also be supported.

**II. ADULT CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION.** Local and State training projects for correctional personnel will be funded. Types of training programs may include but will not be limited to supervision, management and administrative development and specific skills improvement.

**III. COURTS.** Program area A-5 addresses the training need of the judiciary and supporting judicial personnel. This section will concentrate on professional development for prosecutors and public defenders. Applications may include but will not be limited to advanced prosecutors training, child abuse seminars, homicide seminars, financial transaction seminars, sex crime prosecution, public defender professional development and training for public defender support personnel.

**IV. JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.** Numerous training conferences have been held in the past for individuals responsible for assisting juveniles. These seminars, workshops and conferences have reached juvenile aid officers, juvenile conference committee members, juvenile shelter workers, and others. Funds will be provided to continue to upgrade skills at a regional or State-wide level. It is possible that these in-service training activities can be developed and implemented by a four year college, serving as a central resource.

**SUBGRANT DATA:**

Carryover funds will be available to support programs to some extent, in all four areas.

Police training projects will be allocated \$180,000. Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation local/state projects will be allocated \$50,000.

Prosecution and defense projects will receive \$100,000.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency projects will receive \$99,000.

It is anticipated that a total of 25 projects will be funded. Efforts will be made to insure that a total, balanced training program is achieved.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total C Block Support	\$429,000	\$47,667	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

As part of the development of this program area, an examination was made of local, county and State statements of need. Progress reports, training manuals and evaluation questionnaires submitted by agencies now involved in training were reviewed.

All projects will be required to submit evaluation data including reactions from those being trained. Evaluation should show how responsive the training program is to the perceived needs of those being trained, how job-related the training is and what impact the training activity has on those being trained and the impact on the criminal justice subsystem being served. Projects will be required to keep data on the number of individuals trained, the length of training, the content of the training, the types of training materials used and the method of training utilized. Projects will be undertaken to supply this data in reference to previous training programs. For those groups who have previously received minimal or no training, an indication should be given of how training needs were analyzed and how the training program was developed in response to those needs. Evaluation data will indicate in what way training courses are kept current and related to present job requirements. Evaluation data should also include what changes in training content are indicated. This may be done by the pre and post testing method. Evaluation instruments will be developed to measure the retention of training by those individuals who have participated. In some instances it may be possible to measure the job-relatedness of training after several months and after the individual has returned to his/her operational duties.

## **Program A-4: Recruitment, Selection and Upgrading of Criminal Justice Personnel**

### **Objectives:**

To develop an assessment center for evaluating the promotion potential of administrative and policy making municipal police officials.

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Special attention must be paid to the problems of fairness in the oral portion of police examinations for promotions to supervisory positions. Improved management of police departments ultimately depends on the promotion process. The traditional oral testing process has been challenged on the grounds of being overly subjective and therefore non-competitive. The development of a job-related, performance-based assessment center will provide suitable candidates for promotion and will overcome objectionable features of the traditional oral examination.

The assessment center is essentially an examination procedure stressing work simulations. Candidates will be required to demonstrate their proficiency in job-related simulations (group discussions, oral presentations, background interviews, "in-basket" exercises, etc.). Their performance will be rated by an assessment team comprised of experienced police administrators. Once established, an assessment center could evaluate between 50 and 100 candidates a year.

In order to develop this examination technique, the Department of Civil Service will isolate common job elements, develop appropriate exercises, select

and train assessors, and begin the examination process.

### **Subgrant Data:**

The New Jersey Department of Civil Service will be the sole applicant. This pilot developmental grant is expected to be a one year project.

### **Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage of State or Local Match</b>
Total C			
Block Support	\$50,000	\$5,556	10%

### **Evaluation and Monitoring:**

The objective of the assessment center is to select administrative and policy-making police officials according to established merit criteria. The task is essentially evaluative in nature itself. How well the task is accomplished will depend on the care taken in developing data about supervisory police positions, in the development of well-designed performance exercises and the selection of trained assessors.

The Department of Civil Service will report frequently on progress towards objectives and will develop validated data to indicate if testing techniques are discrimination free.

## **Program A-5: Specialized Training of Court Professionals and Supporting Judicial Personnel**

### **Objectives:**

To maintain and expand a variety of comprehensive training projects for the judiciary and other court personnel.

To provide for at least 20 specialized training activities, conferences, seminars and courses for the judiciary and supporting personnel.

To establish a New Jersey College for Continuing Judicial Education.

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Training projects in this area are repeated frequently to serve incoming members of the judiciary. There is also a need to continue certain training

experiences for those not previously afforded these opportunities.

The in-state training program conducted by the Administrative Office of the Courts will include orientation programs for Superior Court, County Court and Municipal Court judges and Supreme Court and Appellate Division law clerks. Seminars will be held for upper court judges, trial court law clerks, assignment judges, trial court judges, court reporters and interpreters. Other types of activities to be presented may include a state institution visitation program, regional mini-seminars and a judicial conference.

Efforts will be made to continue institutionalizing in-state training opportunities. An advantage of this

policy in addition to making the material more specifically oriented to New Jersey practices will be the conserving of limited funding resources.

The Judicial Training Coordinator will continue the distribution of a Court Interpreter Manual and a comparison study of judicial standards previously developed with State Law Enforcement Planning Agency funding. A central information bank and research capability is maintained within the Office of Judicial Education. Training of juvenile intake officers and juvenile conference committee members will continue under the direction of the Training Coordinator for the Judiciary.

The Office of Judicial Education will oversee all aspects of the court training program and provide the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency with a comprehensive plan for further development. A preliminary comprehensive plan has already been prepared. It is anticipated that a more comprehensive, and more detailed document will be prepared giving a thorough identification of judiciary training needs and a specific strategy for providing the needed training.

The Office of Judicial Education will be supported with 1976 funds on an interim basis. A State assumption of costs for this activity is anticipated at the end of this funding period.

The Office of Judicial Education has been planning to establish a College for Continuing Judicial Education in the State. The college, when operational, will provide the judiciary with a unique resource, directly responsive to the needs perceived by the New Jersey judiciary.

The Office of the Probation Training was previously included in this program area. This activity is now included in Program Area C-11.

**Subgrant Data:**

The Administrative Office of the Courts will be

the sole applicant.

**Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage of State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$165,000	\$18,334	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

This program was developed based on a planning document submitted to State Law Enforcement Planning Agency by the Office of Judicial Information within the Administrative Office of the Courts. This plan was prepared in conjunction with the Supreme Court Committee on Judicial Seminars.

Evaluation instruments will determine if the program adequately anticipates the needs of the judiciary and if the program serves the short and long range needs of the judiciary. Efforts will be made to determine if the immediate objectives are integrated into a comprehensive program. The developing plan for the Office of Judicial Education will take into account available resources, changing laws and procedures and future needs.

The participants in the training will be asked to assist in the improvement of future training with the use of survey instruments. In all instances, training participants will assess the task-relatedness of the training.

Specific data will be maintained on the number of individual, trained, types of training employed and the length and content of the training programs.

The subgrantee will report regularly on the degree to which the training of judicial personnel is systematized and on the status of the judicial college.

**Program A-6: State Advisory and Training Services for Local Corrections**

**Objectives:**

To continue to provide State inspection and technical assistance services for local correctional facilities, programs and operations by conducting at least an annual inspection of every local jail, penitentiary, workhouse, municipal lockup and juvenile detention facility and by responding to each request for additional technical assistance.

To continue both regionalized and centralized training for a minimum of 400 line and supervisory county correctional staff. This includes a minimum of 80 hours basic training for all new staff and a minimum of 40 hours advanced training for experienced and first line supervisory staff.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

The Correction Officer Training School will continue the regionalized and on-site training program. Application for funding consideration must include a schedule for implementation of the following specific program functions:

1. A training needs assessment phase including the methodology used for assessment and the sources for input data.
2. Implementation of training cycles including the location and dates for these activities.
3. Evaluation of the impact of training through pre and post testing and follow-up institutional surveys.

4. Curriculum adjustment and update phase to be scheduled a minimum of two times during the grant period. Minor adjustments are expected to be made on an ongoing basis.

The Expansion of Services project application will continue to expand its scope of inspection and the comprehensiveness of its inspection reports. Emphasis will be placed on improving follow-up activities to ensure compliance with recommendations.

**Subgrant Data:**

The Department of Corrections is the sole eligible applicant. Funds are not indicated from the 1977 Plan, but application may be made under the 1976 Program Area A-7 to continue the Expansion of Services to Counties Project in an amount up to \$40,000 and a maximum of \$90,000 is provided for continuation of the Department of Correction's County Correction Officer Training Program.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
*Total Part E Block Support	-0-	-0-	-0-

\*1976 Carryover funds will be utilized.

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

In addition to the normal reporting required of

projects, the following reports will be submitted quarterly:

1. The Correction Officer Training School (COTS) will report on the extent of local correctional staff training per institution. The COTS report will provide quarterly and cumulative information using the following format:
  - a. County
  - b. Agency/institution
  - c. Name of trainee and rank
  - d. Classes attended and dates of attendance
  - e. Course completion status
2. The jail inspection team will include a Report of Inspection on each facility inspected during the previous quarter as a component of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency quarterly narrative. An addendum to the report, as required by the Department of Correction, will include the following survey and assessment materials:
  - a. Staff training
  - b. Operation of inmate assistance programs
  - c. Technical assistance visits. Indicate the source and type of request and summarize action taken.
  - d. Practices and procedures in violation of the constitutional rights of inmates.

Additional reports may be required by State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff to assist in the application review process for grants to local correctional facilities.

## Program A-7: Therapeutic Retention of Students in Local Public Schools

**Objectives:**

To increase to ten the number of school districts where programs have been developed through assistance from this program area.

To provide mechanisms within local school districts to reduce disruptive behavior, vandalism and truancy within public schools.

To create projects, the aims of which are to prevent the expulsion and suspension of students from the public schools.

To develop alternatives and activities within school systems for those juveniles who would otherwise be suspended or expelled from the ongoing school program.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

As funds for these projects are extremely limited, applications will be accepted from those school districts which can substantiate a critical need for the implementation of student retention projects.

Information on truancy, expulsion and suspension rates, as well as juvenile delinquency ranges, where applicable, should be included in defining the problem. Of paramount importance is the support of the local school board in the project and its willingness to initiate and oversee the project. There must be a commitment to provide services within the school system to the target population.

Innovative and experimental approaches are encouraged. Funding will be on a yearly basis for a period of three years contingent on an acceptable evaluation at the conclusion of the grant period. There should be a clear indication that costs of the project will be assumed gradually by the local school district. Assistance in developing programs will be provided by State Law Enforcement Planning Agency program analysts and personnel from already existing projects. Staff members from the State Department of Education are also available for consultation and technical assistance.

### Subgrant Data:

Three previously funded projects will be continued and four new projects within local school districts will be funded.

### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total JJDP Act Funds	\$220,000	\$24,445	10%

### Evaluation and Monitoring:

Subgrantees will be required to submit data on numbers of students served by a specific project as well as results of the particular activities. Data which substantiates the fulfillment of program objectives must be maintained. Information might include grade level performance, truancy and suspension rates relative to project objectives. A list of agencies with which the school cooperates could also be included.

All programs being developed will be reviewed by the State Department of Education for its recommendation and approval.

## Program A-8: Community Youth Services Program

### Objectives:

To establish specific referral relationships with police, juvenile court intake units, probation and local schools.

To provide agencies in the community that serve to divert youth from the criminal justice system by providing advocacy, crisis intervention and other needed services.

To develop an intervention plan with the youth for each individual referred.

To develop an information (tracking) system which enables Agency personnel to follow the treatment progress of each client, whether being serviced in-house or by an outside agency.

To coordinate and utilize existing social, medical and rehabilitative services and encourage system change/modification for improving services to youth.

It is projected that 17 youth service bureaus and up to four youth service bureau type programs will be operational in the 1977 Plan. They will provide services to at least 24,000 youths, including concentrated services to more than 7,000. Two additional projects are continuing without the support of State Law Enforcement Planning Agency funds.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

The need for community-based non-residential treatment and support programs for trouble-prone youth has been underscored by various groups and studies. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency hopes to meet this need by increasing the availability of such programs across the State.

Subgrantees will be expected to provide services through the establishment of projects oriented toward both the youth service bureau concept, as well as other activities providing community support services to prevent juvenile delinquency. Projects should not duplicate existing services.

The services for youth which will be provided by youth service bureau type projects either directly

and/or by purchase of services are extremely varied. The number and nature of services will differ from community to community, depending upon the extent of existing community resources. A specific treatment modality which meets stated goals and objectives and allows for tracking and follow-up of each referred juvenile must be described. Basic service capabilities should include, but not be limited to, counseling (personal, parent/family, educational, vocational), remedial education, social and recreational activities and information and referral. Information and referral services are basic to the project regardless of its nature and extent. The development of a resource directory is a prerequisite to the coordination and integration of services.

The number and types of services which can be provided by a bureau are limited only by the imagination of the local officials and personnel implementing the project and by the willingness of public and private agencies and organizations to commit themselves to a coordinated, cooperative effort. Specialized services/activities should be provided to meet the unique needs of the clients.

Experience has shown that the successful adjustment of a youth in a given program is often linked to the family and the home environment. The family functions as a system and the whole unit must be dealt with in order to effect change within any part of this system. Services directed solely toward youth must ultimately involve the parents and/or siblings of the juvenile if long term results are to be anticipated. There is a need to insure understanding of, cooperation with, and reinforcement by family members, of any diversionary program. The need exists to provide social services to families as a whole rather than only to the juvenile.

If the bureau is to be effective, it is essential that it be responsive to and a part of the community it serves. The process of ascertaining the needs of youth and the community must include input from local agencies and organizations but also from youth and the community/citizens it will serve. Therefore,

it is expected that an advisory board will be established prior to the development of the application to allow for their input. The advisory board should be a part of the organizational flow chart of the project to allow for continued community involvement during the operation of the program.

In order to be compatible with the overall goals and objectives of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, a bureau must receive referrals from all branches of the juvenile justice system. In addition, it is expected that projects will serve referrals from appropriate non-criminal justice agencies (schools, Division of Youth and Family Services, local welfare agencies, etc.), parents, concerned citizens and self referrals. Referral policies, procedures and agreements must be evidenced prior to the funding of a project.

The staffing pattern of a project will depend upon the nature and extent of its services. Sufficient full-time professional experienced staff should be employed to insure the capacity to respond to complex personal crises of youth, to interact with agencies and organizations of the community, and to provide leadership to assure the smooth operation of the project. As mentioned previously, the use of community people as staff and volunteers is highly desirable. In-service training and special institutes should be available to the bureau staff and volunteers to increase their skills.

Although the establishment of youth service bureaus has been emphasized in this program area, funds are available for innovative ideas which will provide help, guidance, counseling and other supportive services to youth and their families in a community setting. Demonstration projects that will provide a springboard for the development of new methods of reducing juvenile delinquency are encouraged. All funded projects must demonstrate, however, that they will become an integrated part of the community's youth services system and not be an isolated agency program that would be discontinued when federal funding is no longer available.

The New Jersey Governor's Adult and Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, in recognition of the effectiveness of present youth service bureaus, recommends their establishment throughout the State and "strongly urges the appropriation of State funds on a matching grant basis for the support and development of youth service bureaus."

## **Program A-9: Residential Facilities for Juveniles in Need of Supervision and Community Treatment Facilities for Juvenile Delinquents**

### **Objectives:**

To provide homelike placements for juveniles who

One group working to gain State support is the newly formed New Jersey State Association of Youth Services. This professional association of youth service bureaus and youth service bureau type programs is working to encourage the growth and development of services to youth and the community of people that serve youth.

Staff is available to assist applicants in the development of their applications. They will also continue to maintain contact with subgrantees during the operation of the project via regular visits to provide technical assistance, information and recommendations for the smooth operation of an effective program.

### **SUBGRANT DATA:**

Up to 20 grants will be available for continuation of previously funded projects which have demonstrated success by meeting slated goals. This will include up to \$40,000 to the Department of Human Services, Division of Youth and Family Services for the Youth Service Bureau of Camden. One new project will be funded.

### **Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C Block Support	\$1,027,850	\$114,206	10%
Total JJDP Act Funds	\$ 245,000	\$ 27,223	10%
Program Total	1,272,850	\$141,429	

### **Subgrant Data:**

### **Evaluation and Monitoring:**

An intensive evaluation design has been developed for all projects funded under this program area and must be followed. (See the Provision for Evaluation section of this document).

The subgrantee will be expected to report quarterly on the numbers of juveniles served, referral sources, and services received, as well as progress on achieving individualized goals and objectives.

cannot be situated in traditional foster home settings and who should not be placed in institutional facilities.

To expand the total number of community group care homes initiated with State Law Enforcement Planning Agency funds to 16 serving 160 to 180 juveniles. Program funds for this year will support up to two group homes serving at least 20 juveniles.

To bring the total number of State Law Enforcement Planning Agency initiated community residential treatment facilities to ten. Program funds for this year will support up to four residential centers with a capacity to serve 100 to 125 juveniles.

To upgrade the programs and services within private institutions and residential facilities for juveniles.

To maintain a six month delinquency free experience in community residential centers and a six month delinquency free period in the community after discharge for up to 200 juveniles with a history of chronic delinquency, as defined by formal arrest and charge.

To return to family and school of origin up to 150 children from group homes with prospects for a prolonged, stable and socially acceptable adjustment.

To reduce commitments to State training schools in percentage ratio to cases adjudicated in the jurisdictions served.

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

In 1977, this program area will continue and expand the Agency's effort to provide community based alternative residential programs for juveniles who should remain in the community rather than sent to an institutional facility. The planning and implementation for this program area is carried out in close cooperation with the Division of Youth and Family Services, as well as the county juvenile and domestic relations courts.

The residential treatment centers and group homes need not be uniform throughout the State, but each should provide distinctive services for particular groups of juveniles. Some facilities can serve residential as well as day care needs. They could serve as transition facilities for juveniles who had left institutions but who were not ready to return to their families or to an independent living situation.

Juveniles who await placement in juvenile shelters or at the Woodbridge Diagnostic Center demonstrate considerable service needs. An inventory of the current community residential programs in the juvenile justice system shows that gaps exist in the service delivery system. These gaps include absence of needed treatment as well as inappropriate matching of available services to juveniles. Juveniles cannot move from one residential program to another as their need for services change over time. The juvenile may not be receiving the appropriate services which would minimize time spent in the system and the likelihood of recidivism. Careful screening and evaluation are needed before, during and after par-

ticipation in criminal justice programs so as to identify service needs and to place juveniles in programs which provide the needed services.

A wide spectrum of facilities should be developed to allow for flexible transition according to need for particular services. This spectrum might include a service treatment program for the juvenile who has committed a violent act, as well as one for the repeat offender and the juvenile who has been in an open community facility but who needs some time in a more secure environment.

The residential treatment centers which exist in communities through the State of New Jersey play a key role in providing educational, psychological and social services to juveniles who have the need for such services. Programs need to be developed, including day programs, which allow juveniles with stable families (but with educational and psychological problems) to use some of the resources of a local residential treatment center while living with their families in the community.

Small unstructured group homes are needed for juveniles who have completed the residential treatment center program. The group homes are necessary not only for juveniles initially placed at residential facilities but also for those without parents who do not require the educational and psychological services built into the residential treatment center but only a supervised place to live.

Residential facilities making application for funds must be recommended and the treatment plan of the program approved by the Division of Youth and Family Services and shall meet the guidelines established by the Bureau of Residential Services of that Division. Agency funds can be used for operating costs but the facility must be provided by the applicant. Financial assistance for facilities is available in some cases from the Division of Youth and Family Services. Community based residential treatment centers for either JINS or delinquents can be funded under this program.

Grant awards to group homes will be limited to one year. Only under unusual and extreme circumstances will second year continuation grants be awarded. During 1977, up to two new group home facilities serving 20-25 youths are projected.

Grants will be provided for the development of one new residential center serving a total of 20-25 youths and monies will be available for the improvement of existing programs. Continuation grants will be available for up to three centers serving a total of 75-100 youths. No application will be funded in this program area without Department of Institutions and Agencies endorsement.

### **Subgrant Data:**

Continuation grants for group homes will be made upon a need basis and will not exceed \$15,000 each. Initial awards for new group homes will not exceed

\$30,000; new residential centers will be funded to a maximum of \$150,000 each and previously funded residential centers will be awarded continuation grants up to \$75,000 each. Up to \$35,000 will be made available to the Division of Youth and Family Services for the continuation of its project to provide technical assistance for upgrading residential facilities.

Group homes will be funded to jurisdictions in accord with specific needs for services as justified by the Division of Youth and Family Services. New residential treatment centers will be funded in jurisdictions that evidence the greatest need for service, substantially documented community and public agency support and a potential for assumption of ongoing cost. Preference will be given to cooperative efforts by the State and local governments to develop residential treatment centers for the seriously disturbed juvenile offenders.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C Block Support	\$402,850	\$44,762	10%

Total JJDP			
Act Funds	\$100,000	\$11,112	10%
Program Total	\$502,850	\$55,874	

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Evaluation information consulted included the Division of Youth and Family Services Residential Census reports, Division of Youth and Family Services field visits reports, monitoring visits and reports and the 1974 Division of Youth and Family Services Needs/Resources Analysis of New Jersey's System for Providing Residential Treatment to Delinquent and Disturbed Children.

Subgrantees will be required to provide information on the number of children served, the nature of new project directions instituted, the instances of where juveniles became reinvolved in the criminal justice system for delinquent behavior while in the project and the circumstances of severance from the project. The items above will be an integral part of the quarterly narrative reporting procedures. Field visits will be conducted in cooperation with Division of Youth and Family Services personnel.

## B. DETECTION, DETERRANCE AND APPREHENSION

### Program B-1: Increase Police Patrol Effectiveness

**Objectives:**

To achieve an increase in the number of on-scene arrests through the more effective deployment of existing police manpower.

To conclude more arrests with process to grand jury. (Percentage of total arrests).

To introduce Spanish speaking dispatchers in municipalities with significant Spanish speaking populations.

To increase the number of police patrol hours through the introduction of civilian personnel to perform administrative tasks.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

The tasks involved in improving the efficiency of police patrol allocation include, but are not limited to, examination of the present level of demand for services, prediction of future demand for services, establishment of an allocation criterion, repositioning and re-positioning of forces in response to real time need and tactical emergencies.

By carefully analyzing the time and place of expected demands and by reallocating police patrol resources to meet these demands, a measurable reduction of street crime should be realized.

Continued computer projects in this program area will be operated in two phases. The first phase will include collection of data (where appropriate this will necessitate consideration of geocoding-location, time and frequency of crime occurrence and inspectional services demand), study of existing patrol patterns and development of resource allocation models for maximizing coverage in areas of need. The second phase will include the necessary re-scheduling and reassignments of both manpower and equipment in accordance with the Plan developed under phase one.

IN ALL CASES WHERE UTILIZATION OF COMPUTER BASE SYSTEMS IS ANTICIPATED, IT IS REQUIRED THAT CONTACT BE ESTABLISHED WITH THE STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY PRIOR TO SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION. IN ALL CASES WHERE EDP PROJECTS ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION, A FEASIBILITY STUDY MUST BE CONDUCTED PRIOR TO SUBMITTING THE APPLICATION TO THE STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY. The contents of this study must conform to the format described in an addendum of the *Applicant's Guide*. A number of significant projects initiated by grant funds are available which may provide suitable software pro-

grams and/or total system approaches at a considerably reduced cost. These programs and technical assistance are available through the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

APPLICATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES MUST CONTAIN A PROJECTION OF MAN-HOURS TO BE REALLOCATED TO FIELD RELATED ACTIVITIES AND ANTICIPATED CLEARANCE RATES STATED BOTH IN RAW NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES.

As proposed by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, civilian police personnel should be assigned to various departmental functions. Then too, police chief executives should establish the role of the patrol officer and concentrate police efforts on fundamental police duties. (THEREFORE, PROJECTS EMPLOYING CIVILIANS TO REPLACE POLICE OFFICERS AS DISPATCHERS MUST DEPLOY SUCH OFFICERS TO STREET DUTY. DISPATCHER PROJECTS ARE PROJECTED FOR ONE YEAR OF FUNDING EXCEPT IN LARGE MUNICIPALITIES DEMONSTRATING A REQUIREMENT FOR FULL IMPLEMENTATION NEEDING MORE THAN ONE GRANT).

A need exists to continue both the crime analysis unit and the analysis unit with reaction team grants for a final year in order to measure the impact on assaultive street crimes in the cities. A final continuation grant will also be available to continue the Newark street crime tactical unit.

There is a need to continue a limited number of previously funded data processing projects to develop the full potential for analysis and implementation of enforcement activities. Civilian dispatcher projects are important to continue, particularly in larger jurisdictions where they permit the introduction of Spanish speaking contact points and offer an entry point for individuals who might not otherwise initially qualify for police service.

In 1977, two new projects will be funded and it is anticipated that previously funded dispatcher projects will be assumed by the subgrantee.

Due to fiscal concerns regarding the assumption of analysis persons and the high cost of computer maintenance, no new computer projects will be funded in 1977.

In 1977, it is anticipated that cities which institute

projects under this program will significantly increase the resources assigned to the patrol function resulting in increased clearance rates of index offenses.

#### Subgrant Data:

Up to three third year computer continuation grants not to exceed \$15,000 will be available. Up to three second year computer continuation grants will be available not to exceed \$20,000 each.

\$80,000 will be available for two new civilian dispatcher projects for a maximum of \$40,000 each project.

\$10,000 will be available for a final continuation of the crime analysis grant awarded in 1976.

Up to \$50,000 will be available to continue the tactical patrol demonstration project for the final year.

Up to \$150,000 will be available for a final continuation of the Newark Tactical Patrol Unit.

#### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$380,000	\$42,223	10%

#### Evaluation and Monitoring:

Evaluation of the on-going projects will continue. Both the program analysts and systems analyst from the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency will monitor the EDP projects on a predetermined schedule.

Each project will be required to furnish evidence on meeting program objectives. The quarterly and final reports will include number of arrests for index crimes compared to previous year's period; number of cases convicted in municipal court or bound over to grand jury for indictment compared to previous year's period; number of Spanish speaking dispatchers added where such service is indicated; numerical increase in police patrol manpower as a result of redeployment of sworn officers to patrol; percentage of change in incidence of street crime.

## Program B-2: Crime Specific Priority Targets

#### Objectives:

To continue the five Sex Crime Analysis Units funded in 1976 in order to meet the following sub-objectives:

1. To increase the proportion of reported rapes as compared to the previous year.
2. To increase the number of rape charges pressed to prosecutions in the jurisdictions served as compared with the previous year.

3. To increase the rate of convictions for rape as compared with the previous year.
4. To maintain the dignity of the victim through humane treatment.
5. To reduce the incidents of rape in the long term (3 years) by increasing the certainty of arrest and conviction.

To establish two specialized robbery investigative units in order to meet the following sub-objectives:

1. To stabilize the rate of robbery in two cities

by utilizing police resources consisting of crime analysis, patrol, intensive follow-up investigation, public education and prosecution.

2. To increase the clearance rate by ten percent of reported robberies by effective apprehension and prosecution.
3. To insure proper case development and case turn around time by utilizing a prosecutor assigned to the unit.
4. To analyze robbery trends and disseminate information to supportive patrol resources.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

This program area is designed to impact the target crime of robbery by utilizing various resources available and form a specialized robbery unit.

These units must consist of the following components:

- Crime Analysis
- Patrol
- Intensive follow-up investigations
- Public Education

The crime analysis should be accomplished by utilizing existing computers. If no computers exist within the department, a manual system should be employed. Funds should not be utilized for extensive hardware or software modifications, but may be utilized for the employment of a crime analysis specialist.

Patrol activities should be coordinated with activities of the unit and information should be disseminated to the entire patrol force. No unit member should be devoted for patrol for more than 10% of the time. Crime analysis reports should be available to patrol commanders to assist in deployment.

Intensive follow-up investigations should be accomplished by the specialized unit personnel. Surveillance activities should not be a major component of the project. Evaluations have shown that surveillances consume a large amount of manpower that in most cases is better utilized on investigations. This segment should deploy a minimum of five persons.

The public education segment should utilize one person, properly trained, to advise the public on the prevention of robbery and actions to be taken after robbery occurs. The personnel utilized on the prevention segment must be trained at the National Crime Prevention Institute in Louisville, Kentucky. Persons now employed in existing crime prevention units cannot be utilized to fill this position. All unit members should be trained in crime prevention.

A prosecutor will be a full-time unit member to offer legal advice and to prosecute all unit cases. The prosecutor must devote 100% of all activities to cases developed by the specialized unit. An office must be provided for the prosecutor at the project location.

A clear operational chart indicating unit responsi-

bilities and a formal chain of command must be established prior to the submission of an application in this program area. Funds in this program area can be utilized for limited personnel costs and unit personnel.

It is expected that local units of government will totally assume the cost of these demonstrative projects within two years. Funds may be available at a reduced level to assist in the assumption of costs during 1978.

The five Sex Crime Analysis Units funded in 1976 will be continued in 1977 with a reduced level of financial support. This will represent a final year of funding of the Sex Crime Analysis Units demonstration projects.

### Subgrant Data:

Two grants will be available to cities with populations of over 100,000 to initiate robbery investigation projects. The maximum amount of funds for each project will be \$123,500. Priority consideration will be given based on the occurrence of robberies and the ability to implement the project.

Five final continuation grants will be available to those counties initiating Sex Crime Analysis Units in 1976. The maximum amount of funds available for each project will be \$20,000.

### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C	\$347,000	\$38,556	10%
Block Support			

### Evaluation and Monitoring:

Evaluation of the Sex Crime Analysis portion of this program will consist of two studies occurring before and after implementation. The pre-implementation study will attempt to eliminate any bias which may develop during the units' operation. A victimization study, plus a review of existing records, will be conducted and compared to the same data gathered during and after the grant period. Monthly reports will include number of complaints received, type of treatment victims receive, number of arrests and indictments, number of convictions or dismissals and number of suspects under investigation. (See the Provision of Evaluation section of this document).

Evaluation of the robbery unit portion of this program area will consist of three levels:

Effort—the amount and types of input toward the project activities.

Effect—the impact the activities have on the goals and objectives.

End Results—Did the project achieve the desired results? Pre-grant and post-grant measurement

should be utilized to record the effect of the unit on the crime of robbery.

Monthly reports must include but not be limited to the following measurements:

1. Caseload of investigators,
2. Hours devoted to investigation,
3. Number of arrests for robbery,
4. Number of public educational meeting relating strictly to robbery,

5. Hours devoted to public education.

Factors concerning changes in policy, organization and the identification of other projects which may be having an effect on robbery should also be recorded on a monthly basis.

Subgrantees will be required to maintain the evaluation and submit the monthly reports along with the quarterly narrative reports.

## **Program B-3: Establishment and Continuation of Public Housing Security Units**

### **Objectives:**

To reduce the occurrence of crime and vandalism within affected public housing areas by five percent as compared with the previous year.

To increase the opportunity for residents of public housing to live in safe and secure conditions as measured through victimization studies.

To institutionalize enforcement services in public housing areas as an integral component of local police service, with emphasis on senior citizen housing projects.

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Projects to be funded or continued in this program area will be for support of housing security units which will be responsible for the policing of public housing projects. Types of patrol, patrol force strength and other pertinent data will be based on the respective unit's specific problems and their eligibility for funds will be based on subgrant data.

Each unit will be required to coordinate the unit's activities with the police department having jurisdiction in the housing projects. It is strongly recommended that the housing officers be supervised by a superior officer from the municipal police department. This will help to insure the close contact with the local police department that is needed for the successful operation of this type project. Additionally, the municipal police officer can serve as both supervisor and training officer.

Initial evaluations of the existing security units indicate that the units where the housing guards have full police powers, including the power to arrest, have had the most impact. It is suggested that this alternative be considered a desirable project component. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's Police Desk staff, along with personnel from the four original housing units, will be available for technical assistance in developing and implementing new projects.

A second approach to improving security at senior citizen public housing projects will be instituted this year. Two demonstration projects utilizing closed-circuit television surveillance have been

implemented in senior citizen housing projects in Plainfield and North Bergen.

Initial data collected for the Plainfield project indicate that there have been virtually no incidents of crime since the closed-circuit television system was installed in one of Plainfield's senior citizen public housing projects. An integral part of this system is 24-hour monitoring of the system. This has been accomplished by utilizing residents as security aides, and will be a requirement for all surveillance projects. Projects which entail the "target hardening" concept are conducive for senior citizen projects, because of the particular mobility and nature of senior citizens, but are not recommended for multi-family projects.

### **Subgrant Data:**

Camden, Passaic, New Brunswick and Long Branch will be eligible for final continuation grants from \$30,000 to \$50,000.

The units established in 1976 will be eligible for continuation grants from \$30,000 to \$50,000.

Priority has been given to high density, high crime rate housing projects with crime rates that exceed the norm for the respective municipalities. No funds will be provided for regular police salaries in the public housing security units. (However, regular police participation in this project is essential).

Five senior citizens closed-circuit television surveillance projects will be implemented at a maximum of \$8,000 each.

Eligibility for grants requires a firm statement of assumption of cost intention.

### **Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage of State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$460,000	\$51,112	10%

### **Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Evaluation information reviewed during the devel-

opment of this program area include statistics provided by the housing units, including victimization surveys and the 1974 and 1975 Uniform Crime Reports. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff field reports, monitoring reports and quarterly reports were also used. A review of the material indicated that public housing residents have expressed a greater sense of security with the unit's presence. In some cases there have been reductions of Part I crimes, and increases in arrests for minor crimes. This is in part attributable to the unit's presence in preventing the opportunity for Part I crimes and on-the-scene apprehensions for minor

crimes that would have gone unreported.

The monitoring design for the program includes field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's Police Desk and Evaluation Team, submission of statistics on program activities on a quarterly basis, and the submission of a narrative report by the project director on a quarterly basis. The Evaluation Team has developed an instrument to conduct an intensive evaluation for housing police projects. All grantees will be required to collect the required data (see the Provision for Evaluation section of this document).

## **Program B-4: Prevention of Crime Through Improvement of Combined Police-Community Efforts**

### **Objectives:**

**To reduce residential and commercial breaking and entering and larceny in each participating jurisdiction by five percent as compared with the previous year.**

**To enlist up to 15,000 citizens, including the elderly, in crime prevention programs in cooperation with police departments.**

**To return a demonstrated, significant quantity of stolen property that would ordinarily be unreturned to victims.**

**To assess up to 2,000 crime scenes for victim crime prevention counseling.**

**To reach up to 30,000 citizens, with special emphasis on the elderly, in general crime prevention demonstrations.**

**To enact new or renewed security ordinances in five grantee municipalities.**

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Every unit will consist of at least one full-time police officer (salary to be provided with local funds) and one full-time civilian employee who will serve as a security specialist advising citizens on how best to secure their property and will work with various civic groups to "harden" both residential and business potential crime targets. As part of this program, emphasis will be placed on crime prevention projects in the senior citizens communities.

As stated in the "Task Force Report Policy of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice", the only alternative to persuasion and public education in the crime prevention field is legislation that compels manufacturers and owners of personal property and real estate to maintain certain basic security standards. It is suggested that each subgrantee review its own municipal security codes and propose the enactment of new security codes. The security ordinances

enacted in Oakland, California; Seattle, Washington; Trenton, and Plainfield are cited as example ordinances. An important aspect of a security ordinance is its voluntary acceptance by the community. As to its overall effectiveness in "hardening" crime targets, the security ordinance in Plainfield has obtained favorable results from the business community.

An additional activity of projects funded under this program will be the analysis of specific crime data and *modus operandi*. In reviewing specific reports for crimes such as breaking and entering, larceny, robbery and car theft, crime prevention personnel should be able to analyze crime patterns to be utilized in manpower deployment.

Civilian and police unit personnel, will be required to attend the National Crime Prevention Institute's Crime Prevention Theory-Practice Course, held throughout the year at the University of Louisville in Louisville, Kentucky.

### **Subgrant Data:**

Up to 10 municipalities will be eligible for projects. Consideration will be given to combinations of units of government for consolidated units. No police salaries will be provided with grant funds. The range for each subgrant will be \$15,000 to \$20,000. A total of \$35,000 will be available to the New Jersey Police Training Commission to expand a Statewide crime prevention coordination and training effort.

Subgrantees are expected to assume project costs after one year of grant support.

### **Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage of State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$240,000	\$26,667	10%

### Evaluation Information:

Evaluation information reviewed during the development of this program area includes statistics provided by the crime prevention units and the 1974 and 1975 Uniform Crime Reports. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff field reports, monitoring reports and quarterly reports were also used.

A review of the material indicated a reduction of breaking and enterings in some jurisdictions, stabilization and a slight increase in others. In some jurisdictions there has been a marked reduction in the total amount of property losses which may

be attributed to public education programs.

In 1977, each subgrantee will be required to maintain the data required to complete this program's monthly evaluation form provided by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. The evaluation instrument will quantify the spectrum of service as well as the results as outlined in the objective.

The monitoring design for the program includes cooperative field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, submission of comparative statistics on program activities on a quarterly basis and the submission of a narrative report by the project director on a quarterly basis.

## Program B-5: Establishment of Regionalized Narcotic and Organized Crime Investigation/Prosecution Units

### Objectives:

To increase the number of indictments secured for the sale of hard core narcotics and/or crimes associated with organized crime as compared with the previous year.

To increase the volume of hard narcotics confiscated as compared to the previous year.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

During the previous years, emphasis was placed on a Statewide operation maintained by the Division of State Police and units functioning in various large municipal police departments. Experience indicates the value of advancing the major thrust at the State level. While efforts in the large municipalities were quite effective, there was a gap in meeting the problems which spread into contiguous communities. Several weaknesses in strictly local enforcement became apparent:

The failure to retain anonymity of unit members for required undercover operations, the loss of cost benefit accruable to maximize utilization of needed sophisticated equipment and the inability to have legal assistance when needed.

As a result of these findings, the emphasis of funding was shifted to the regional concept of enforcement.

Only projects which are countywide in scope are eligible for funding. The coordinated effort embodied in this program must utilize the prosecutor's legal and investigative staff and the investigative staff of municipal police departments. Projects should be directed by the county prosecutor in conjunction with local police officials and compatible with operations of the Division of Criminal Justice and the State Police.

All subgrantees will be required to maintain quantifiable data including but not limited to total number of investigations, total number of arrests, conviction

rate and seizures by amount and type. This data will be included in all reports and the evaluation component.

### Subgrant Data:

The two units started in 1976 will be eligible for continuation grants not to exceed \$40,000. These continuation grants will terminate federal monetary support for the projects.

### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$80,000	\$8,889	10%

### Evaluation and Monitoring:

The evaluation component of applications submitted under this program area should reflect the estimated number of investigations to be initiated and what level offenders will be the target.

A monitoring form is available from the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency which must be completed monthly and filed along with the narrative report each quarter.

Information to be collected includes but is not limited to:

1. Management information concerning referrals, man-hour deployment, number of intelligence entries, equipment utilization, volume of seizures and number of search warrants obtained.
2. Offense Analysis detailing the number of investigations initiated, on-going and closed during each period.

# Program B-6: Increase Police Efficiency by Improved Communication Methods

## Objectives:

To reduce the time it takes for response to calls for service in those counties improving communications capability.

To improve the use of existing frequencies by providing professional technical assistance in the development of improved communications systems in at least 35 jurisdictions.

To develop a common statewide tactical frequency to be utilized by all segments of law enforcement.

To attempt to reduce radio base station congestion by providing central dispatch centers multi-base station networks.

## General Strategy for Implementation:

During 1977, countywide central dispatch projects will receive priority for funding. It is anticipated that this program area will assist police departments to increase efficiency by insuring that officers on patrol are able to maintain communications at all times utilizing radios which can be removed from patrol cars and maintaining the dispatching point at a central location.

This program provides financial support to county dispatch centers for projects designed to improve police radio communications, improve citizen access into the police and reduce police response time. Projects include, but are not limited to, constant police communications via portable "take along" radios in place of mobile units and development of communications systems including the establishment and expansion of central dispatch networks encompassing entire counties.

In 1974, specific minimum requirements based on extensive research and experience were formulated for radio communications proposals submitted under this program area. In 1977 the minimum requirements have been further expanded to insure each system's requirements contain consideration of the following modules:

- A. 1. Concept paper with the following minimum considerations:
  - a. Citizen access,
  - b. Data capture,
  - c. Specifications for system hardware requirements,
  - d. Recording capability,
  - e. Personnel administration and training,
  - f. Federal Communications Commission and other regulatory bodies licensing.
2. Concurrence of the majority of the chiefs of police in the area to be covered.
3. Engineering evaluation and approval by the

technical staff of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

B. Program approval is based on three considerations:

1. That a recognized need for communications capabilities has been identified within the area under consideration.
2. That radio channel sharing, data access capabilities, financial considerations and pooling of telecommunications resources have been recognized and accepted by all participants in the consolidation area.
3. That there will be centralized and coordinated dispatch centers to insure the effective direction of interagency operations.

C. To evaluate cost effectiveness and efficiency of operation the applicant must complete the following procedural steps with the assistance of State Law Enforcement Planning Agency management and technical services:

1. Review and modification of design parameters,
2. Completion of an acceptable system and equipment package,
3. Preparation and approval of a vendors proposal,
4. Preparation of proposed contract terms,
5. Completion of FCC licensing surveys (frequency coordination) and preparation of license application forms and requirements,
6. Issuance of a Request for Proposal (RFP) or Detailed Equipment Specifications (DES),
7. Conduct pre-bid conference or formal modification of requirements,
8. Evaluation and review of vendor bid responses,
9. Selection of vendor for contract;
10. System implementation.

D. Throughout the above processes, documentation shall be provided that each of these steps have been successfully completed. The primary types of documentation required are as follows:

- a. Systems Description—this document shall be a detailed description within the concept paper previously described and will detail the basic components of the system and their capabilities in relation to these operational or administrative requirements. When reviewed and accepted by local agencies this document shall indicate that step #1 from above has been completed.
- b. System Equipment Specification—in addition to any individual system component

specification a system specification shall be prepared to incorporate the following:

The System Description document as detailed in (a) as jointly approved by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and all grant participants,

A system "block diagram" which defines the total system hardware complement in terms of specific equipment allocation to each participant agency,

An equipment "block diagram" which indicates the particular complement of hardware that identifies each system component and its relationship to the overall system.

A communications matrix or diagram which lists by channel the required communications capability from any fixed, mobile unit within the system and its relationship with other units within the system,

Service area coverage tables which describe the range or area limitations for communications among system units;

This will complete the requirements of Step 2.

- c. Vendors Statement of Work—this document shall permit evaluation of cost factors, implementation and installation timetables, etc., so that project cash flow requirements may be determined in advance. Compliance with Step 3.
- d. Contract Terms and Conditions—those particular requirements to system acquisition and implementation shall be reviewed with local purchasing agencies to assure that all terms of the proposed bid award are clearly stated to all prospective bidders in advance of contract. Corollary questions of restrictiveness and ambiguities may be resolved. Steps 4, 6, and 7.
- e. Federal Communications License Procedures—frequency selection criteria, survey data, system requirements which shall effect license award are prepared with the assistance and approval of the frequency coordinators and the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. License application and supportive data will be prepared and processed. Step 5 and 10.
- f. System Implementation—evaluation and review of vendor response to proposal to bidding evaluation and selection of successful bidder and system installation and implementation shall be conducted and documented. Steps 8 and 9.

In 1977, it is anticipated that the office of the State Radio Frequency Coordinator will receive a limited amount of funds to continue the full-time coordination services.

With the assistance of a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Discretionary Grant, technical assistance in system planning and design will be available from the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. During 1977, it is anticipated that 35 jurisdictions will receive indepth technical assistance from the Agency communications engineer.

Implementation of a project to study statewide tactical frequencies is projected to be completed in 1977. Funds will be allocated to a task force to continue researching existing systems, clerical support and the development of priorities and a master plan, and provide for the implementation of the system.

Any project which proposes a change in operating radio equipment will be special conditioned to insure the municipality retains the older radios. This will permit future flexibility in the event that a State-wide tactical frequency is developed.

Any equipment normally considered standard police equipment or any other equipment, the primary purpose of which is not the reduction of police response time to crime scenes, will not be funded. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency reserves the right to make individual determinations on requirements and exclusions on a case-by-case basis.

Grants will be for a duration of one year with no continuation funding anticipated.

**NO APPLICATION WILL BE CONSIDERED UNLESS A FREQUENCY COORDINATION STUDY PERFORMED BY THE STATE FREQUENCY COORDINATOR IS INCLUDED WITH THE SUBMITTAL.**

Only public safety agencies which respond to initial calls for service are eligible under this area. A copy of the application must be submitted to the State radio frequency coordinator prior to submission to the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

Any county planning a communications project should contact the Agency Police Desk. A waiting list has been established of possible future applicants.

All applications must include a constant mode of communications, e.g., in-car/out-of-car radios, personal portable radios.

#### **Subgrant Data:**

Priority consideration will be given to those projects that are countywide central dispatch approaches. Two counties will be eligible for a maximum of \$235,000 per project.

Second priority will be given to jurisdictions with populations exceeding 20,000 that can demonstrate a need for communications improvement to solve a problem where it is not practical to consolidate or join an existing network.

The State Frequency Coordinator will be eligible for a continuation grant of \$40,000. Funds will be utilized for engineers, clerical support and transportation.

Up to \$90,000 will be made available to implement the statewide tactical frequency.

All prospective subgrantees must provide information containing a plan for the jurisdiction to augment the grant with local funds to insure an improved communications system if the amount deemed necessary exceeds the grant award.

All prospective subgrantees must utilize the technical resources of the State radio frequency coordinator and the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff in the assessment of the existing radio system.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$600,000	\$66,667	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

The evaluation component of applications submitted under this program area are to include information concerning pre-grant response time for all calls for service. An evaluation form is available from the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency

## Program B-7: Mass Transportation, Crime Target Hardening Demonstration Project

**Objectives:**

To increase ridership at the demonstration site.

To decrease crime and vandalism at the demonstration site by ten percent.

To demonstrate an effective target hardening technique and insure transferability to other transit facilities.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

In 1977, a demonstration project will be implemented at a selected mass transportation facility. The project will involve the general security needs at the selected site. The project will include, but not be limited to: locked fare boxes, radio communications, station improvements with concentration on improved lighting and personnel-increased patrol coverage at mass transit facilities.

The project will be implemented with the support and cooperation of the local police department and the Port Authority police where applicable.

It is anticipated that this project will improve public confidence in mass transportation by eliminating conditions that are conducive to crime and by improving physical conditions at the facility.

Documentation of the implementation and results

which must be completed monthly during the grant award period.

In order to obtain the information necessary for evaluation, a dispatch analysis system must be initiated to capture the following data:

1. Response time must be measured by use of a stamped key tab card. The times required to be kept are as follows:
  - a. Time telephone or desk complaint was taken.
  - b. Time patrol was dispatched.
  - c. Time patrol arrived at scene.
  - d. Time patrol completed/back in service.

2. Information recorded on the card relevant to the incident must be "data captured". This will allow for a dispatch analysis system in the following method:

A manual or automated system which will allow the capture of information must be instituted. A software program was developed to allow different configurations of print-outs from the material contained on the key-tab cards.

Some of the reports available are as follows:

1. Uniform Crime Report
2. Officer Profile
3. Daily Log
4. Response Times

of the demonstration project will be prepared by the project staff to assist in transferring the concept to other areas.

This project may require continuation funds in 1978 to insure its completion and effectiveness.

**Subgrant Data:**

The New Jersey Department of Transportation will be eligible for a \$50,000 grant to implement this project.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$50,000	\$5,556	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

The monitoring design for this program includes field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's Police Desk, and the submission of a narrative report by the project director on a quarterly basis.

An evaluation of the program's usefulness and success will be partially based on a reduction of incidents of crimes, vandalism and other related inci-

dents. It is also anticipated that interviews of both the patrons and employees will be utilized to determine if there has been a reduction in fear.

## Program B-8: Statewide Expanded Specialized Investigation of Organized Crime

### Objectives:

To increase and expand the capabilities of State level law enforcement agencies within the State of New Jersey to detect, investigate and apprehend individuals involved in the specific organized crime related areas of arson and labor racketeering.

of Law and Public Safety, Division of State Police, to continue the activities of the Labor Racketeering Unit and \$189,000 to continue and expand the Arson Unit.

### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$338,000	\$37,556	10%

### General Strategy for Implementation:

For the Labor Racketeering Unit, funds will be made available to maintain the present structure of four Division Detectives and one Civilian Intelligence Abstract Clerk, to be augmented by additional investigative personnel and civilian assistant. Increased workload and responsibilities mandate this increase in personnel. In the Arson Unit, funds will support additional State Police detectives.

### Evaluation and Monitoring:

An evaluation of the program's usefulness and needs will be ascertained by the number of investigations made, arrests effected and requests made for intelligence and assistance. Comparison will then be made with data for the time period prior to project expansion.

Additional personnel, both investigative and clerical, will be assigned to the Arson and Labor Racketeering Units of the New Jersey State Police to operate statewide and to concentrate in the areas of high employment, i.e., waterfronts, Newark International Airport, etc., to gather intelligence information, maintain centralized files, to disseminate such information to other State and local law enforcement agencies and to conduct field investigations where needed. As both units progress, requests for assistance and information from local departments continue.

Evaluation information reviewed during the development of this program area included data provided by the Division of State Police. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff field reports, monitoring reports and quarterly reports were also used. A review of the material indicates investigations involving organized crime members with arson and labor racketeering are being conducted and suspected participants identified.

This project was originally scheduled to begin during fiscal year 1976. Due to the State's fiscal situation, the project was not able to begin until fiscal year 1977.

The monitoring design for the program includes field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's Police Desk, submission of statistics on program activities on a quarterly basis and the submission of a narrative report by the project director on a quarterly basis.

### Subgrant Data:

\$149,000 will be made available to the Department

## Program B-9: Increased Crime Laboratory Service

### Objectives:

To increase the number of forensic laboratory examinations completed through the expanded laboratory capability.

To decrease the time between a request for laboratory examination and the issuance of a report.

grammed as a three phased undertaking:

Phase I—Construction of Regional North Laboratory at Little Falls and expansion of the central facility at West Trenton. Both accomplished.

Phase II—Construction of Regional South Laboratory at Hammonton and commencement of operation, accomplished.

Phase III—Construction of Regional East Laboratory at Sea Girt.

A new laboratory will be constructed and operated

### General Strategy for Implementation:

The overall forensic laboratory plan was pro-

at Sea Girt to increase State Police forensic laboratory services to the 180 potential contributors in Ocean, Monmouth and Middlesex Counties. The funds will provide for the partial construction and equipping of 600 square foot laboratory. It is anticipated that future funding will be utilized to provide for the salaries of 15 professionals, three administrators, and six support personnel. The location of the laboratory at Sea Girt will considerably reduce travel time and reduce turnaround time thereby expediting court cases.

The important result will be to make the laboratory services more accessible to contributing agencies. With the Sea Girt location, no law enforcement agency will be over 30 miles from a laboratory.

**Subgrant Data:**

The Division of State Police will be the only eligible applicant.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Part C Funds:			
Construction	\$350,000	\$350,000	50%

**Program B-10: Major Crime Fugitive Squad**

**Objectives:**

To increase significantly the proportion of fugitives arrested and returned to appropriate jurisdictional control as compared with the previous year.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

Project implementation will include the establishment of a Statewide centralized data center within the Division of State Police. The unit would create and maintain a Statewide manual central file and would gather and record all available intelligence information concerning fugitives. The information contained within this file would be disseminated to county and local law enforcement agencies within the State and to federal and state agencies throughout the nation and the world. The unit would maintain constant channels of communication with law enforcement agencies throughout the nation and would function as liaison among agencies with a common purpose regarding fugitives.

The unit will also provide investigative personnel to coordinate and assist intrastate and interstate investigations concerning escapees and other fugitives from justice. The investigators will be available to initiate, assist and supplement all investigations into the whereabouts of fugitives.

This program is expected to be expanded in future

Block Grant	\$125,000	\$ 13,889	10%
Total	\$475,000	\$363,889	

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Evaluation information reviewed during the development of this program area included statistics provided by the Division of State Police. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff field reports, monitoring reports and quarterly reports were also used. A review of this material indicates an increase in population accompanied by a greater increase in index crime which has demonstrated a 300% increase in laboratory cases. Evaluation will be based on the number of increased cases completed and the decrease in time for completion.

The monitoring design for the program includes field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's Police Desk, submission of statistics on program activities on a quarterly basis and the submission of a narrative report by the project director on a quarterly basis.

years, with the goal of establishing satellite collection and dissemination centers with investigative teams in strategic locations throughout the State.

Fifteen State Police personnel, one clerk-transcriber and one abstract clerk will be assigned exclusively to correlate fugitive information and intelligence, disseminate the intelligence and actively assist in the tracking down and apprehension of fugitives.

**Subgrant Data:**

Because of the nature of the program, there will be only one eligible subgrantee, the Division of State Police within the Department of Law and Public Safety.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$225,000	\$25,000	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Evaluation information reviewed during the development of this program area included data provided by the Division of State Police and the 1975 Uniform

Crime Reports. A review of this material indicates 17,000 persons are listed as fugitives in New Jersey. This program area will be evaluated by the number of persons listed as fugitives who are apprehended and the final dispositions as related to previous years' figures.

The monitoring design for the program includes field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency's Police Desk, submission of statistics on program activities on a quarterly basis and the submission of a narrative report by the project director on a quarterly basis.

## **C. DIVERSION AND ADJUDICATION**

### **Program C-1: Improvement of Police Services to Juveniles**

#### **Objectives:**

**To develop and implement programs within police departments that will promote a fair, consistent and understanding approach in the handling of juveniles.**

**To establish separate juvenile aid bureaus as part of local police departments.**

**To have available counseling and referral services within the juvenile aid bureau for those juveniles who have had police contact but have no complaints signed against them. These services will be provided by professionally trained counselors who will be responsible for the identification of specific juvenile problems as well as direct treatment and referral services for those juveniles who volunteer for these services.**

**To prevent further contact with the juvenile justice system for those young people whose problems would more appropriately be handled by direct service staff and/or other community resources.**

**To establish a total of 45 projects within police departments to serve a minimum of 6,500 juveniles per year.**

#### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

The objective of this program area is to enable police departments to serve juveniles who have had contact with the police. These services are provided by either short-term counseling services or referrals to agencies within the community which provide a complete range of professional services. These services must be voluntarily requested by the juvenile and parent or guardian.

Applications are encouraged from local units of government and combinations of such units to implement improved juvenile aid bureaus and/or to implement projects that will service those juveniles not referred to court. This program area does not include funds for police salaries, police equipment and police juvenile relations programs in the schools.

Funding consideration will be given to the following:

1. The establishment of juvenile aid bureaus in communities with at least 40 sworn police officers where a substantial number of juveniles are being handled by the police whose other normal duties may not assure the proper handling of juvenile offenders. This unit must include a social service component to provide crisis intervention and counseling and make referrals for those juveniles in need of services where such services are requested.
2. The expansion of present juvenile aid units in communities with at least 60 sworn police officers in order to incorporate a wider variety of services for juvenile offenders. These services are to include a referral source to other agencies that serve youth and the hiring of social caseworkers or other professional staff to help and advise in the handling and disposition of cases.
3. The establishment of a regional juvenile bureau for several police departments having at least 40 sworn police officers between them in order to provide small communities with alternative services in the handling of juvenile offenders. These services are to be provided by a full-time social worker whose responsibilities include counseling and referrals for those juveniles in need of such services.
4. All police departments are encouraged to formulate police guidelines and training programs on juvenile matters for department personnel including community referral, detention and court referral policies. It is anticipated that these guidelines will cover the wide range of police dispositions and criteria for selection of appropriate dispositions. All guidelines must be approved by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
5. As a general policy, projects in this area will not be funded for more than three years. Local jurisdictions will be expected to begin to assume the costs of the projects during the third year.

**Subgrant Data:**

Up to 12 projects will be awarded second or third year continuation funding.

Up to three new projects will be funded at up to either \$25,000 or \$50,000 for each project depending on the need, population and existing services.

**Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage of State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C Block Support	\$487,850	\$54,205	10%
Total JJDP Act Funds	\$100,000	\$11,112	10%
Program Total	\$587,850	\$65,317	

## **Program C-2: Community Resource Systems for Treatment of Adult Drug and Alcohol Offenders**

**Objectives:**

**1976 Programs:**

To provide for the systematic processing of at least 200 substance abusers referred from the criminal justice system through intake, evaluation, detoxification, referral/placement and follow-up by providing funding assistance for one Central Intake Unit.

To support four Vocational Adjustment Units to serve 265 substance abusers through evaluation of academic and vocational skill potential, development of acceptable work habits and attitudes and effecting academic, vocational or employment placement for each client.

To fund two out-patient components attached to Community Health Centers, providing readjustment services for a minimum of 300 parolees with emotional and psychological problems.

To purchase short-term, residential non-medical detoxification services for 1,800 court referred male and female alcoholic offenders by continued support for five social detoxification units.

**1977 Program:**

To continue four social detoxification projects and to provide detoxification and short-term treatment for 700 alcoholic offenders referred from the courts and probation.

To continue funding one out-patient component attached to a community health center, providing readjustment services to a minimum of 100 institutional releasees.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

Drug Component: The 1976 drug program consisted

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Each project funded will be required to maintain statistics to determine the effectiveness of the juvenile bureau. In line with the Advisory Committee's recommendations these statistics should ascertain the success of the bureau by the number of young people successfully deterred from delinquent behavior and/or further system involvement. These statistics should give the number of juveniles involved in counseling who committed repeat offenses in comparison to the number of juveniles not involved in counseling who committed repeat offenses.

In addition, an intensive evaluation design has been developed by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency for all projects funded under this program area and is to be followed as a condition of funding. (See the Provision for Evaluation section of this document.)

of two project categories: the management oriented central intake unit and the client centered vocational adjustment unit.

Central Intake Unit: The primary purpose for Agency funding of Central Intake Units was to provide the courts and criminal justice agencies with an evaluation mechanism to identify and divert the drug offender from the criminal justice system. This function may best be accomplished by providing intake screening, medical diagnosis and social history during a diagnostic workup. The evaluation will also affect referrals to appropriate treatment modalities and continue with a follow-up process to assess the impact of treatment on the client. This effort is an expansion of functions and responsibilities of existing central intake units and is directed toward the development of referral, treatment and follow-up standards for evaluation of this client group. A secondary purpose of follow-up is to provide on-going client monitoring to determine the accuracy of the referral decision by the C.I.U. and also to maintain a check on the content and quality of treatment services.

Involved in the intake function are several processes that must be considered by the applicant in the development of a project design:

1. Standardization in the processing of client referrals is achieved through the use of centralized screening, diagnosis and referral. As the C.I.U. would be the initial contact agency for receipt of clients referred for treatment from the criminal justice agencies and would be responsible to these agencies for providing client status reports, a clear definition of roles must be made for both the C.I.U. and the treatment facilities. For example, the C.I.U. will require justification

from treatment facilities should referrals be rejected from their programs and notice of client absence or failure to participate in treatment. The C.I.U. should orient the client to available treatment modalities, and program requirements and negotiate treatment selection. Clients failing in one modality will require re-assessment at the C.I.U. A level of interaction with the service agencies should be maintained so that problem oriented treatment plans can be developed and feedback reporting provided on client progress so that the efficiency of the intake unit can be increased and updated.

2. In order to systematize recordkeeping, all intake information collected and referred to the treatment program will meet federal, State and SLEPA requirements consistent with laws governing release of information covered by federal statute in Section 408 of Public Law 92-255. The treatment record from any one program will be returned to the C.I.U. if the client is terminated or drops out from treatment. This procedure will expedite re-admission and provide a description of the client's progress and needs prior to withdrawal from treatment. Specific external reporting may be required by the referral agencies and procedures for providing such data should be considered in the SLEPA application.
3. Staffing for the SLEPA portion of the C.I.U. project should consist of two intake counselors, one field representative and partial administrative and clerical costs. Other costs such as medical, facility and rental are not provided.

#### Vocational Adjustment Unit:

The vocational adjustment unit (VAU) program should be designed to complement and re-enforce therapeutic techniques utilized in residential and out-patient treatment programs. Treatment referrals to the VAU may be separated into three general groups for programmatic purposes within the unit: youthful drug/alcohol offenders with behavioral problems requiring a structured daycare program, clients demonstrating stabilized behavior that require work habit and skills development and clients undergoing the specific diagnostic evaluation to determine suitability for vocational adjustment and development of individualized treatment plans. The modified daycare program would combine the therapeutic treatment process with vocational adjustment to develop those qualities which can generate a positive attitude toward self, i.e., achievement through improved work habits, understanding and recognition of authority levels and acceptance of positive values.

The functional components of a vocational adjustment unit are as follows:

1. Diagnostic Evaluation. Referral agencies should provide the VAU with client profiles describing social and family history, educational level, work

experience and an indepth treatment progress report. The VAU will measure academic and vocational skills in addition to attitudinal and preference ratings. The diagnostic evaluation should be completed within five working days after the client is received by the unit.

2. Work adjustment should emphasize personal development of work habits and skills rather than vocational training. A vertically structured shop environment will be provided in which clients may progress through succeeding levels of work complexity and responsibility. A basic shop can provide work experience at the following levels: laborer, technician, line supervisor, recordkeeper, sales person and property controller. As the client experiences each level, supportive counseling should be provided both by regular group sessions and individual contacts with staff. The normal time duration for this phase of the program will average 16 weeks.
3. Each client accepted into the program will be provided an individual treatment plan subject to formal staff review and, if necessary, adjustment at least bi-weekly. Reports of significant client contacts by professional staff are to be entered into client folders promptly. A post assessment of client progress and needs should be evaluated and compared to the initial assessment. Federal guidelines and Chapter 334, Laws of New Jersey, 1970 Narcotic and Drug Abuse Treatment Center Certification Statute (N.J.S.A. 26:2G-21 through 30) govern the required content of folders and assistance in development of a format for such folders is available from State Division of Narcotic and Drug Abuse Control staff.
4. The basic staff of a VAU project may consist of coordinator, psychologist, workshop supervisor/counselor, treatment counselor and secretary/bookkeeper. It is important that the project coordinator have experience in both administrative and vocational counseling skills.

#### Mental Health Component:

The community readjustment program coordinates and delivers mental health services for emotionally or psychologically disturbed parolees or inmates on work release through the Community Guidance Center or equivalent agency. Program design should be flexible and suitable for model development. The following purposes should be satisfied:

1. Provide the parole officer with a referral source for unstable parolees who require professional treatment services.
2. Assess the problems and needs of parolees and effective methods of handling these problems through an evaluation of services provided by a professional staff consisting of a psychiatrist, psychologist and social worker.

3. Assist parolees toward utilizing community resources such as vocational training, manpower development and employment programs, welfare, drug and alcohol abuse programs.

The pilot project in Mercer County provides policy procedures for crisis intervention counseling, as well as treatment at a normal support level. The project is required to assess types and extent of services required to more effectively manage the client group, while a follow-up component should provide quantifiable data.

#### Alcohol Component:

Applications for alcohol programs will be limited to 24 hours, operational non-medical detoxification units for the purpose of providing services to court referred male/female alcoholic offenders in need of treatment. Alcohol projects will be funded through a purchase of services agreement based on a pre-determined number of client slots for a maximum residency period of ten days. Short-term care is intended to stabilize the alcoholic offender's condition to a point where the client can be motivated to begin an initial phase of rehabilitation. Applicants must document a local capacity for a comprehensive treatment delivery system that will include the following components: residential intermediate care, outpatient clinics designed for aftercare and a follow-up capability for evaluating treatment impact.

Agency funds will supplement State Department of Health grant awards since the Division of Alcoholism Control is a primary funding source for staffing alcohol projects. Applicants should also describe arrangements with the judiciary in assigning a liaison to recommend postponement of court proceedings (3:28) and refer the alcoholic offender to detoxification unit as an alternative to sentencing (3:26-1). Another function of the liaison is to open communications with criminal justice agencies and provide the court with a three month follow-up report to determine each court referral's probationary status.

The non-medical approach to alcohol detoxification is therapeutic in design and provides an informal environment during the intake phase of treatment.

Applicants for project funding may wish to consider the program activities design developed by the Essex County Turning Point project staff as a model:

1. **Referrals.** Courts and the Department of Probation are the sole sources of referrals.
2. **Transportation** is provided by the referrer in most cases. Transportation subsequent to admission, such as court hearings, job interviews, medical appointments or the Welfare Department, etc., is arranged by the project.
3. **Admissions.** The detoxification center admits only those whose primary addiction is to alcohol. As abstinence is fundamental to the treatment of alcoholism, no patient requiring maintenance (such as methadone) is admitted. When an in-

dividual needs immediate medical attention, he is transported to the nearest hospital, from which the client may later be referred to the program for short-term treatment. Only clients who are ambulatory or have been medically cleared by a hospital or prison physician are accepted. No client requiring major surgery or whose most emergent problem is anything other than alcoholism is considered suitable as a candidate for the program.

4. **Screening** in the case of Turning Point is handled by a Probation Department Investigator.

Clients are screened to define 1. drinking history, 2. employment history, 3. job potential as well as 4. history of charges and/or arrests. Recommendations from the Investigator are made to the Project Director or Supervisor who then determines the client's eligibility for treatment.

Regarded as unsuitable or inappropriate referrals to the Turning Point program have been those charged with crimes of violence, such as murder, manslaughter, rape, and also those charged with distribution and sale of narcotics, atrocious assault and battery, etc.

5. **After Admission:** During the first 24-48 hour period, the Investigator develops a more comprehensive run-down on the client and, with the social worker, begins to involve the client's family in the rehabilitation process. In that as the client must ultimately return to his own environment, his immediate associates should be prepared to aid rather than to endanger the ongoing recovery. Frequently the families of alcoholics are, themselves, highly disturbed persons whose problems must be assisted, both for the sake of the client and their own.
6. **Activities:** The client is assigned a room and bed, which is the client's responsibility to keep orderly and clean. The client is then exposed to group and individual sessions with alcoholism counselors and aides, the Investigator, job-development personnel, occupational therapists, the social worker and other male and female alcoholics with whom he may identify. Families are asked to attend meetings of Al-Anon sponsors. Teenaged youngsters are introduced to Alateen, a fellowship of teenaged children of alcoholics. The introduction of appropriate nutrition, especially in terms of high-protein diets, makes the clients begin to feel quite well, physically; to enjoy the sensation of well-being and to learn how, from the point of views of nutrition and adequate work and rest, to maintain that feeling. Clients are then given a concentrated course on the disease of alcoholism through participation in meetings of Alcoholics Anonymous.
7. **Follow-up.** Follow-up at Turning Point is the

responsibility of the Investigator and Social Worker, who are aided by the A.A. sponsor, the outreach worker and the designated public health agency or nurse.

8. **Client files** refer to the above services and maintain up-dated treatment plans, progress notes and follow-up status information.

The following information must be included in attachment one, Part A, Statement of the Problem:

1. Identify those existing resources in the geographical area to be served that have, as their prime responsibility, the provision of such services as career counseling, vocational evaluation, training and job placement.
2. Provide some estimation of the criminal justice offender population within the area to be served, categorize if applicable and describe in quantifiable terms the specific needs of this population. This survey should be as recent as possible and should identify sources of information such as probation, parole, courts, jail or other. The methodology used in the survey must be explained.
3. Estimate the extent to which these needs are being addressed by the existing resource agencies. The difference, if any, between the amount of services needed and the extent that these services are being met is the basis for the statement of the problem. This statement may address the lack of specific service that would be provided by the proposed project or an expansion of existing services to a greater number of clients, or a combination of both.

Relate the objectives, activities and evaluation components directly to the stated problem. Objectives should be specific and measurable. Finally, develop realistic procedures for client followings and adequate forms for data reporting.

**Subgrant Data:**

**Alcohol Component:**

Funds not to exceed \$110,000 will be utilized for third and final funding for the Essex and Camden Social Detoxification projects from the 1976 Plan.

Funds from the 1976 Plan in an amount up to \$150,000 will be provided for continuation funding of three projects initiated under the 1975 Plan. Tentative plans for funding include Atlantic County, up to \$55,000; Salem County, up to \$30,000 and Middlesex County for a maximum of \$65,000.

The 1977 Program will be limited to continuation funding of social detoxification projects initiated under the 1975 Plan and not receiving 1976 support, as follows: Morris County, up to \$75,000; Somerset County, up to \$45,000; Burlington County, to a maximum of \$25,000; and Ocean County, up to \$75,000.

**Drug Component:**

Funds from the 1976 Plan up to the total amount of \$250,000 will be utilized for final funding of the

PUADA project and continuation of vocational adjustment units funded under the 1975 Plan.

Should a central intake unit be initiated under the 1975 Plan, up to \$35,000 will be considered for final funding utilizing 1976 funds.

Funding from the 1977 Plan will not be required for this program component.

**Mental Health Component:**

Carryover 1976 funds not to exceed \$45,000 will be provided for final funding of the Mercer Community Readjustment project.

Funding of up to \$50,000 will be provided from the 1976 Plan to initiate one additional readjustment unit. Final continuation funding not to exceed \$55,000 will be provided under the 1977 Plan for this project.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$294,500	\$32,723	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Each project funded will be required to maintain data and reporting consistent with the following components of program evaluation:

1. Client Admission
  - Tabulate the number of referrals by source of referral. Include an update of client demographic data (e.g., age, sex, ethnicity, educational level, employment status, etc.) and compare the client group with the target population described in the initial application.
2. Client Processing
  - A. Provide statistical data that demonstrates services rendered directly by the project to each client such as intake, evaluation, detoxification, medical, counseling, crisis intervention, psychiatric consultation and psychological evaluation. This component requires maintaining client files which will include, as applicable, individual treatment plans and modifications and client progress and performance measures.
  - B. List the number and types of outside referrals and placements, (e.g., welfare, job placement, vocational training, educational resources).
3. Client Status Reports
  - A. Reports will include participation and performance information, as required by referral source. List the number of clients completing program requirements, active in treatment, readmitted, self-withdrawn and rejected/terminated by project staff.

- B. Indicate average length of involvement in treatment by the categories listed above.
- C. Number of clients re-arrested during one year post treatment period for drug use, abuse or possession who were enrolled (for at least a two week period of treatment involvement) in the project and the re-arrest rates for clients completing program

requirements or withdrawing without staff consent.

4. Evaluation Statement

- A. Determine accuracy of referral and placement decisions through follow-up.
- B. Discuss methods used to choose content and evaluate quality of treatment.

## **Program C-3: Improvement and Expansion of Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Intake Screening**

**Objectives:**

To aid in providing juvenile and domestic relations courts with intake units which can screen approximately 110,000 potential complaints filed yearly against juveniles charged with delinquent and JINS offenses.

To reduce by 25%-35% the number of complaints formally adjudicated by the juvenile court judge through referrals to community resources including juvenile conference committees, youth service bureaus, social, medical, mental health, vocational and educational agencies and through the use of pre-judicial conferences.

To increase significantly the amount of time available to the court to service the serious juvenile offenders.

To reduce the number of juveniles inappropriately placed in detention and shelter care through strict adherence to statutory requirements regulating such custody.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

Funds in this program area will be used to continue to expand the State's network of juvenile intake units to provide complete intake coverage for every vicinage in the State. The funds will be for units which screen and divert juvenile complaints only. Some counties, through the use of local funds, may expand the capability of the intake units to include domestic relations complaints. As the State looks toward the establishment of a family court system, it is anticipated that the intake units will absorb the entire preliminary review of both juvenile and domestic relations complaints.

The organization and supervision of the juvenile conference committees was incorporated into the intake units in the 1976 Plan and will be continued in 1977. Juvenile conference committee coordinators will not be funded apart from the intake units. The use of pre-judicial conferences will continue and exploration of various other forms of crisis intervention counseling for juveniles and their families will be encouraged.

Generally, funding for an intake unit will continue on a yearly basis for up to three years with the pro-

gram costs gradually being assumed by the county.

Standardized guidelines for the operation of juvenile intake units have been developed by the Administrative Office of the Courts and all intake units will adopt their procedures to conform to the guidelines.

Staff from the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the Administrative Office of the Courts will be available to provide technical assistance to the intake units and to evaluate the operation of the projects.

**Subgrant Data:**

Funds will be available to the counties to continue up to 12 intake units.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$437,850	\$48,650	10%
Total JJDP			
Act Funds	\$100,000	\$11,112	10%
Program Total	\$537,850	\$59,762	

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Evaluation information reviewed during the development of this program area includes comparative statistics provided by the intake units, Administrative Office of the Courts court reports, the 1974 Uniform Crime Report and information provided by the Governor's Advisory Committee on Standards and Goals. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff field reports, monitoring reports and quarterly reports were also used. The evaluation of the material indicated a reduction of the informal calendars in counties with operating intake units and an increase in the use of juvenile conference committees and pre-judicial conferences as well as an increase in referrals to agencies in the community. Formal calendar cases remained at about the same level.

In 1977, each subgrantee will be required to maintain statistics on the results of intake screening and to submit comparative statistics on all phases of the program's operation. Detention and shelter care referral statistics will also be required.

The monitoring design for the program includes

## Program C-4: Municipal Court Management and Improvement Program

### Objectives:

To institutionalize the concept of professional court administration within several municipal courts, thereby improving case flow and reducing delay.

To improve court efficiency by establishing units to resolve family and neighborhood disputes; significant diversion of appropriate cases will result and members of the public will be better served in times of stress.

To demonstrate that defender services to the indigent will be improved by regionalization of services to the municipal courts.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

The 525 municipal courts in New Jersey represent the outer periphery of the State court system. Because these courts are generally the court of first impression, they are the subject of increasing concern. The concerns are many and varied, but the problem is the enormous and diverse caseload volume to be handled with inadequate and fragmented resources.

National reports over the years have identified the special problems of the lower courts. These already overworked and under-supported courts are frequently unprepared to react to changes in criminal justice strategies, primarily because of long years of neglect in developing a management orientation. The lower courts handle 90 per cent of the nation's criminal cases and are the courts upon which most citizens depend for resolution of criminal matters. There is a substantial potential for identifying and correcting problems of recidivism inherent in the role of the municipal courts. The review process of the municipal courts may be the point in the criminal justice system where adult criminal careers may be shortened most effectively.

The thrust of this program area will be the development of programs to utilize scarce public resources more efficiently by developing administrative economics and by increasing interagency cooperation.

Maintenance of projects already started will account for the bulk of SLEPA funding support. Considerable progress has already been made in developing pilot projects which will be ready for evaluation and replication. For example, several records equipment projects have been completed

cooperative field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the Administrative Office of the Courts, submission of comparative statistics on program activities on a quarterly basis and the submission of a narrative report by the project director on a quarterly basis.

## Management and Improvement

and their value has been established. These courts are in a position to provide technical assistance to other interested municipal courts.

Final funding will be made available to complete the Camden Omnibus Court Improvement Project. Camden now has a court administrator, defense services and a dispute center. A regionalized approach to defender services in Atlantic County municipal courts will serve as a model to other counties. Family and neighborhood dispute centers in East Orange and Trenton will continue with final funding. These projects provide more appropriate court related services to those citizens, in dispute, for whom a full-scale criminal proceeding is not desirable. Funds will be available to continue comprehensive management improvements.

This program area will generally be used for projects in their continuation phase with special attention to evaluation. Future projects should be able to profit from the experience of these existing projects.

### Subgrant Data:

The City of Camden will be eligible for \$75,000 to continue its multi-faceted project.

Atlantic County will be eligible, with the Office of the Public Advocate, for final funding of \$100,000 for regionalized defender services.

A total of \$100,000 will be available to Trenton, East Orange and Plainfield to continue existing projects.

\$75,000 will be available to fund up to three new projects.

Municipal Court applications will require the endorsement of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$350,000	\$38,889	10%

### Evaluation and Monitoring:

Sources consulted in the development of this program area include the Administrative Office of

the Courts Annual Report, National Advisory Commission Court Report and "Improved Lower Court Case Handling", (a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice publication).

Statistics in these projects will be maintained relative to clients served, delays reduced, and activities undertaken. Work schedules and work plans will be submitted. Documentation of work undertaken and progress made will be on a regular basis.

Court administrator projects will be required to demonstrate scheduling improvements. Grants providing for legal services will show number of clients, manner served and impact on the court system. Records on clients served, how served and follow-up information will be maintained. Impact on other criminal justice components will also be described.

## **Program C-5: Improvement of Services and Information Programs for Victims, Witnesses, Jurors**

### **Objectives:**

To reduce waiting time for witnesses, jurors and victims served by projects in this area by 15% in the first year and an additional 5% in the second year.

To reduce the number of cases which were not processed due to the failure of witnesses and victims to appear by 35% in the first year of project operation and an additional 5% in the second year.

To provide counseling, referral and direct emergency services to 1,500 victims of crime.

To use training films to instruct 1,500 jurors a year in the responsibilities of jurors and the procedures involved in jury duty.

To assist 750 persons in gaining information about cases in which they are involved. Additional groups and individuals will be given factual information about the judicial process.

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Victim Assistance Centers will be continued. These centers provide counseling, referrals and direct assistance to crime victims. These services will be provided under the guidance of qualified social service workers who will, in some instances, provide supervision to carefully selected and trained volunteers. Project staff will also seek out and inform citizens about cases in which they are involved, as well as provide instruction to police and others who have public contact. Scheduling techniques to lessen waiting time for victims, witnesses and jurors may also be funded within this program area. Projects with emphasis on services to elderly citizens will be encouraged.

These projects will be limited to two years of funding, contingent upon demonstration of high

Evaluation instruments will demonstrate the impact of court administrators on case-flow, delay reduction and provision of more effective public services. Dispute center projects will be evaluated to determine increases in services offered to the public, as well as the impact these centers have on traditional caseload reduction. Defender projects will be required to show how their services increased services to indigents. Record management projects will demonstrate how the public is served by lessened waiting time, provision of more accurate information, as well as how the court itself is served by reduced data recall intervals, more accurate records and reduced storage space.

Further evaluation information will be developed when the Administrative Office of the Courts Technical Assistant Project becomes operational.

performance standards and major improvements in criminal justice services.

SLEPA will provide technical assistance in the form of program development and evaluation design.

### **Subgrant Data:**

On-going projects may be continued with carry-over funds. Up to three additional projects may be supported with no more than a \$35,000 maximum for each project.

### **Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage of State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$100,000	\$11,112	10%

### **Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Resources utilized in developing this program include the National Association of Counties Research Foundation Publication, *Integrated Services for Victims of Crime: A County-Based Approach*, the Governor's Advisory Committee recommendations, various LEAA discretionary grants, publications and a LEAA citizen initiative program guide entitled "Justice for Witnesses, Victims and Jurors".

Applications will be reviewed with emphasis on the evaluation component, particularly since the initial efforts will be demonstration projects. In projects involving reduction in waiting time for citizen participants in the adjudicatory process, it will be necessary to develop a data base for future

evaluation. Estimates based on survey information may be used for comparative evaluation where statistics are not available. Statistics will be kept on the number of persons affected, how much of a reduction in waiting time results, and what impact this reduction has on other criminal justice elements.

One indication of personal inconvenience to witnesses and victims is the failure to proceed with prosecution. The number of cases which are terminated by the victim or witness failure to appear will be tabulated. In those instances where statistics are not available, estimates based on current experience may be used.

Victim assistance projects will record the number of clients served, the number of referrals made, the types of services performed and follow-up information on the impact of the program on the victims' lives. Victimization data will be sought to determine

if there is an increase in the willingness to report crime and to cooperate with subsequent prosecution.

Statistics will be kept on the numbers of jurors trained. The SLEPA evaluation team will assist in the development of data collection forms, tracking devices and survey instruments. (See Provision for Evaluation section of this document). Questionnaires will be submitted to the jurors trained in these programs to indicate the jurors' evaluation of the training. Evaluation statements from the prosecutor, the public defender's office and judiciary will be solicited.

Public information projects will record the numbers of inquiries handled, the numbers of persons assisted and the types of information disseminated. Efforts will be made to determine if an increase in activities to facilitate communication with the public results in increased efficiency of the judicial process.

## **Program C-6: Pre-Trial Service Programs**

### **Objectives:**

**To complete a statewide capacity for pre-trial intervention at a core level through the continuation funding of seven PTI projects.**

**To increase the total enrollment capacity for pre-trial diversion within the courts from the present annual capacity of 3,500 to a maximum of 5,000 enrollees.**

**To maintain the success rate (dismissal of charge(s)) at a minimum of 70% of the defendants enrolled in the PTI programs.**

**To demonstrate a recidivist rate not exceeding 10% of clients during a three year period following their dismissal.**

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

All applications under this program area must contain endorsements by the Administrative Office of the Courts and the assignment judge(s) of the jurisdiction serviced by the grant. Pre-trial Intervention (*R. 3:28*) applications must include the prosecutor's endorsement and the expanded bail project should include endorsement by the Probation Department and/or trial court administrator. In addition to the normal application requirements, prospective subgrantees will be guided in application development by the following conditions:

Applications for PTI projects to establish a core level PTI capacity must meet the following criteria:

1. Project staffing will consist of a PTI coordinator and a counseling supervisor. The PTI coordinator will be responsible for the operation of the PTI program both to the court vicinage in which the project is located and to the appropriate division of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The counseling supervisor is responsible

for staff training, client intake screening and interviewing and referrals for community-based supportive services.

2. A minimal amount of office supplies and equipment may be considered as project costs. These items and facility space, however, should be provided as local input to the program.
3. The remainder of project costs should be met by local, CETA and/or other federal or State sources to provide sufficient clerical, court liaison and counselor positions to permit the program to function adequately. Commitments from these funding sources are required in the applications for SLEPA funds.
4. An additional administrative staff position, responsible to the PTI coordinator, may be considered for those court vicinages consisting of more than one county to effect a vicinage-wide Rule 3:28 capacity.
5. A developed program to ensure effective release supervision, i.e., the mechanics of client control and assistance that will be utilized.

Applications for unified pre-trial services program:

The Mercer County project may be utilized as a basic model for applicants wishing to combine bail processing, ROR and 10% cash bail with conditional bail release under Rule 3:26-1 and pre-trial intervention under Rule 3:28. Such projects are considered advantageous for reasons of centralized screening and interviewing, recordkeeping and client counseling, referral and follow up. Existing court and probation staff resources are to be utilized whenever possible to implement staffing of these proposed projects. The staffing conditions detailed in the section under PTI core projects may also be applied to this section.

**Subgrant Data:**

The 1977 Plan will provide continuation funding for the following projects up to the amounts indicated: Monmouth, \$50,000; Passaic, \$80,000; Union, \$75,000; Atlantic Vicinage (including the Counties of Cumberland, Cape May and Salem) \$50,000; Burlington-Ocean Vicinage, \$80,000; Hunterdon, (Mercer Vicinage) \$25,000 and Sussex-Warren (Morris Vicinage) \$40,000.

Remaining funds within the program will support the expansion and reform of non-monetary pre-trial release programs.

Any project funded under this program area will be subject to programmatic and/or fiscal modifications that may be necessary to ensure conformance to forthcoming State Supreme Court and Administrative Office of the Courts rules and guidelines.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$580,000	\$64,445	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Each PTI project is required to maintain the following statistical information for both indictable and non-indictable cases:

The number of potential clients interviewed and subsequently rejected or accepted and formally enrolled under R. 3:28.

The number of enrolled participants and the percentage of cases leading to dismissal of charge(s).

The reason for termination of each unsuccessful participant.

The type and extent of supportive service rendered to each client by project staff.

The type, scope and effectiveness of outside agency service delivery through continued contact with referred cases.

Follow-up data on dismissed clients for a period of one year following successful program completion (e.g., continued employment, non-reversion to substance abuse, etc.).

Rearrest and conviction data for dismissed clients for a period of three years following successful program completion.

Proposed projects which include bail and/or pre-trial service components should maintain additional information as follows:

1. The number of defendants interviewed for bail consideration.
2. The number of release recommendations made to the court and the percentage of these defendants released, tabulated by type of release.
3. The number of clients for whom release was gained who failed to appear for court.

Each PTI project will additionally be required to maintain information consistent with evaluation requirements of the Administrative Office of the Courts and to include such information in quarterly and final narrative reporting to SLEPA.

The following chart demonstrates the level of activity and impact of SLEPA funded Pre-trial programs during the period from March 1, 1975 through March 1, 1976:

Locality and Title	Number of Applicants	Number of Acceptances	Number of Rejections	Number Completing Program Successfully	Number Returned to Prosecution	Number Successful Completions Rearrested
Morris County Pre-Trial Intervention Program	752 Indictables 20 Non-Indictables	508 Indictables 20 Non-Indictables	228 Indictables 16 Non-Indictables	103 Indictables 20 Non-Indictables	8 Indictables	7 Indictables 0 Non-Indictables
Hudson County* Pre-Trial Intervention Program	341 Indictables 801 Non-Indictables	871*	605*	477*	100*	2 Indictables 3 Non-Indictables
Mercer County Pre-Trial Intervention Service Program	294 Indictables 362 Non-Indictables	136 Indictables 232 Non-Indictables	158 Indictables 130 Non-Indictables	87 Indictables 188 Non-Indictables	1 Indictables 4 Non-Indictables	2 Non-Indictables
Bergen County Pre-trial Intervention Service Program	452 Indictables 217 Non-Indictables	367 Indictables 100 Non-Indictables	100 Indictables 102 Non-Indictables	319 Indictables 27 Non-Indictables	4 Indictables 27 Non-Indictables	5 Indictables 2 Non-Indictables
Essex County Prosecutor's Office	595 Indictables 1,457 Non-Indictables	226 Indictables 851 Non-Indictables	204 Indictables 771 Non-Indictables	122 Indictables 458 Non-Indictables	50 Indictables 188 Non-Indictables	7 Indictables 5 Non-Indictables

\*Breakdown of Indictables and Non-Indictables unavailable at this time.

## Program C-7: Improvement of Juvenile Probation Services

### Objectives:

To improve probation practices by expanding the range and quality of services available to juveniles on probation through the development of two new probation projects.

To develop and implement innovative programs within probation departments that will provide specialized services to probationers and their families.

To increase the percentage of probation experiences terminating in good adjustment discharges as compared to pre-program operation in the jurisdictions served.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

Applications for 1977 are encouraged from county governments interested in experimenting with innovative juvenile probation programs that provide specialized services for juvenile probationers and their families. These services should include the utilization of mental health agencies or social services for those juveniles determined in need of these types of services. Those counties that presently have operating juvenile court intake programs are encouraged to apply for family counseling projects. Applications are also encouraged from county governments to utilize well trained citizen volunteers to assist probation officers in supervising juvenile probationers. Grants will also be available to upgrade the quality of diagnostic reports required for disposition purposes.

Funding consideration will particularly be given to the following:

1. The establishment of expansion within probation departments of intensive service techniques which are innovative projects.
2. The establishment of a citizen volunteer program in those counties that presently do not have staff coordinating a volunteer program on a full-time basis. These projects must be in accordance with the Guidelines for the Establishing and Operating of Volunteer Probation Programs developed by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

As a general policy, projects in this area will not be funded for more than three years. Projects for volunteers in probation will not be funded for more than two years.

### Subgrant Data:

Up to eight probation projects will be considered for continuation funding. Up to two new projects designed to improve probation services will be funded.

### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$327,850	\$36,428	10%
Total JJDP			
Act Funds	\$100,000	\$11,112	10%
Program Total	\$427,850	\$47,540	

### Evaluation and Monitoring:

Any project funded under the program area will be subject to programmatic modifications that may be necessary to be in conformity with State Supreme Court and Administrative Office of the Courts rules and guidelines.

Projects are expected to follow the evaluation guidelines determined by the Administrative Office of the Courts. Each project funded will be required to maintain statistics to determine the effectiveness of the program. These statistics should define the success of the program by the number of young people successfully prevented from further system involvement. These statistics should give the number of juveniles involved in the project who became further involved in the system compared to the number of juveniles with a similar record not involved in the project who became further involved in the system.

Project evaluations will be expected to utilize technical assistance offered by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

## Program C-8: Prosecutor's Office Management Improvement

### Objectives:

To provide a county prosecutor's office with a professional management capability to increase efficiency which may be measured by an increase of 5% in individual staff prosecutor caseloads.

To establish policy guidelines and implement a

system of prosecutorial case screening in two additional county offices so that the public interest and justice can be better served by early use of the prosecutor's discretionary authority. Work flow will be improved by earlier case evaluation. A decrease in "downgrades" over a comparable prior period should result. By the elimination of "border-

line" cases, an increase in the successful prosecution rate over the prior year should result.

To reduce the detention time of persons accused of criminal activity by enabling the prosecutor to expedite decisions regarding cases in counties with screening units.

To provide prosecutorial interfacing with pre-trial intervention programs.

To continue the development of the Prosecutors Management Information System.

To provide technical assistance on legal matters to the State Police.

To reduce the number of cases that are dismissed for legal insufficiency or procedural error in jurisdictions served by the State Police.

To provide training in legal aspects of police work for 300 police officers in jurisdictions served by combination case screener/legal advisor units.

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

The prosecutor's office managers supported in this program area have the responsibility for budgeting, supplies, personnel, equipment, record-keeping, facilities, security, clerical supervision, the administration of special programs, the compliance with Civil Service regulations and the gathering of statistics. As a result, the prosecutor and assistant prosecutor can devote all their efforts to the prosecution of cases.

In addition to increased office management services, a need for more refined case screening and evaluation is apparent in many instances. Pre-trial intervention candidates, screened by pre-trial units, will be investigated, reviewed and approved or disapproved by a prosecutor's project evaluator under Court Rule 3:28. Candidates for conditional discharge under the Controlled Dangerous Substance Act will be reviewed. Some cases may qualify for administrative closing.

Case screening is justified in instances where the defendant and nature of the crime do not pose a serious threat to the community and when alternatives to prosecution are available. It is anticipated that prosecutors will assign experienced assistant prosecutors in these projects to the municipal courts.

Another facet of the screener's function is the recommending of appropriate personnel assignments based on case priority and difficulty. The case screener and evaluator also assist in various pre-trial proceedings. They insure completeness and accuracy of witness lists, check defendants' records, check bail information and develop case folders in addition to making recommendations for or against indictment or accusation.

A Prosecutor's Management Information System (PROMIS) was proposed in the 1976 Plan as a pilot project in one county. This 18 month project may be a forerunner of a State level system. This system provides a mechanism for giving priority attention

to serious cases. PROMIS rates each case according to the gravity of the crime and the record of the defendant. Procedures are established for giving intensive pre-trial preparation to serious cases. The prosecutor's staff will also have instantaneous access to case status information where multiple cases are pending. Through PROMIS, statistical reports can be developed, giving the prosecutor management information about delay points, crime trends and problem areas. Time lags may be reduced resulting in speedier trials. Information about witnesses and victims and case planning is provided in an orderly manner. Consistency in policy and case handling becomes more of a reality. Additionally there is a saving in routine clerical operations. With an operational PROMIS system, the prosecutor is able to make better use of his limited resources.

The State Police Legal Advisory Unit will perform the following services on a statewide basis: 1. the screening of search warrants for legal sufficiency and the standardization of procedures for obtaining them; 2. the review for legal sufficiency and the standardization of arrest procedures; 3. the provision of appropriate on-the-scene legal advice and development of legally sufficient procedures with regard to riot or crowd control emergencies; 4. the dissemination of legal interpretations and practical implications of statutory and case law changes; 5. the provision of around-the-clock availability of legal guidance when required, and 6. the provision of criminal law instructional services for the various local in-service training programs and Police Training Commission approved schools.

Technical assistance in developing uniform guideline forms and procedures is available through the Prosecutor's Supervisory Section of the Department of Law and Public Safety. Technical assistance for PROMIS will be available from the Institute for Law and Social Research, Washington, D.C.

### **Subgrant Data:**

The State Police Legal Advisory Unit will be supported with \$40,000.

Hunterdon and Gloucester County case evaluation/screener projects will receive continuation funding at \$17,500 each.

An Office Manager project originally funded with 1976 funds will receive \$25,000 in continuation funding.

The Burlington County case screener/evaluator project will be continued with up to \$35,000. Two additional counties will receive up to \$35,000 to initiate case evaluator/screener projects.

The Prosecutor's Supervisory Section of the Division of Criminal Justice will assist in the selection of participants for these projects.

## Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$200,000	\$22,223	10%

## Evaluation and Monitoring:

Input into this program area was received from the Division of Criminal Justice, Department of Law and Public Safety. Documents from the National District Attorneys Association, the National Center for Prosecutor Management, the Institute for Law and Social Research, as well as the National Advisory Commission on Standards and Goals have been consulted in the preparation of this program area.

Evaluation reports will contain specific information as to numbers of cases screened, outcome of these cases and relationship to overall workflow. Data on the effect of the screening of cases referred

back to the municipal court will be maintained. Statistics on conviction rate improvement will also be maintained.

The office manager projects will include information as to specific instances of improvements in workflow and indications of the range of activities in which the manager has become involved. Data relating to the increase in staff prosecutor productivity will be maintained. Office managers will develop operations and procedural manuals.

The Legal Advisory Unit will be monitored by SLEPA operations staff and the evaluation team of SLEPA (See Provision for Evaluation section). Data will be maintained as to the nature of assistance given by the Legal Advisory Unit, number of police personnel assisted and a description of procedural improvements made.

The general objective of the program area is the reduction of time needed to prosecute serious cases. Evaluation instruments will be devised to measure the planned increase in effectiveness.

## Program C-9: Utilization of Technological Resources Within the State Court System

### Objectives:

To identify data required for development of comprehensive, uniform, reliable and timely court statistics, planning and research data and court management information on a statewide basis.

To maintain staff support in the Administrative Office of the Courts for the expansion of the Statewide Judicial Information System, thereby reducing delay and congestion in the courts.

To implement a Judicial Management Information System module for the Supreme Court.

To participate in the System for the Electronic Analysis and Retrieval of Criminal Histories (SEARCH) Judicial Information Systems project.

To interface the Statewide Judicial Information System with the various county projects, utilizing multi-purpose terminals.

To continue the development of a Probation Administrative Management Information System.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

The major impact of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency funding in the court area has been in the reduction of court delay. As the volume of judicial business increases, the need for a comprehensive court information system providing complete, uniform and timely data becomes more urgent. The support of these priorities has long been a primary objective of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

Delay in case processing may be the most serious law enforcement problem. For the defendant, delay

means uncertainty, additional expense and loss of earnings. For society, delay may mean that wrongdoers remain in the community to commit further transgressions. For the correction process, delay may mean that the correction process is not initiated when needed. For the prosecution, delay may mean loss of evidence, testimony and decreased impetus. For the victim, delay may be traumatic and result in complete lack of redress.

In addition to lack of resources, lack of management tools to maximize the utility of the existing resources has contributed to the problem of delay. Recent availability of computerized court information systems has given the judiciary some capability to manage the onslaught of increasing caseloads.

Essentially, 1977 funds will maintain existing efforts. Activities during 1977 will center on the refinement of existing State and local systems and in a very few instances, the expansion of these systems into other areas of court information.

Funds will be utilized to support the present Administrative Office of the Courts Statewide Judicial Information System staff and to provide for the programming and the testing the State Judicial Information System modules.

A second area of emphasis will be the vertical integration of the State Judicial Information System module with trial court level systems. Non-automated counties will receive support to secure Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) terminals to input directly into the Statewide system. In a few instances support may be necessary to modify local systems to ensure consistency with Project SEARCH objectives. In

most instances the counties have sufficient expertise to make their own modifications.

Additionally the Administrative Office of the Courts will continue a Probation Management Information System to capture useful, current information on probation activities, probationer characteristics and system evaluation indices to monitor and plan for possible improvements.

Local innovative efforts may be continued.

In each instance technical assistance will be supplied by the Administrative Office of the Courts central staff.

**Subgrant Data:**

Funds from the 1976 Plan will be available to the Administrative Office of the Courts to develop a Probation Administration Management Information System.

Funds from the 1976 Plan will also be available for one county, to be selected by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the Administrative Office of the Courts, to develop a computer aided transcription project.

Up to \$45,000 will be available to local innovative projects. Some local JMIS projects may require assistance in compatibility projects.

\$70,000 will be available to continue development of the Statewide Judicial Information System.

<b>Budget:</b>		<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage of State or Local Match</b>
	<b>LEAA</b>		
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$115,000	\$12,778	10%

**Program C-10: Office of the Public Advocate Activities**

**Objectives:**

To provide for a comprehensive child advocacy project within the Office of the Public Advocate to promote new court rules, legislative enactments, executive directives and procedural changes.

To provide staff within the Office of the Public Advocate to research major areas of the criminal law in order to develop strategies and responses for the Public Advocate.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

The Child Advocacy project will be continued. The defender's activities will go beyond defending a juvenile on specific charges through the usual court process. An effort will be made to represent children brought into the process, as a class. The Public Advocate will undertake a program to insure more adequate, systematic concern for children being processed within the criminal justice system. The provision of basic rights to children in custody

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Input into this area has been received by the Administrative Office of the Courts Court Planning section and the Administrative Office of the Courts Statewide Judicial Information System section. These offices will maintain a coordinating function. The program area will be consistent with the developing New Jersey State Systems Master Plan. Coordination with the Comprehensive Data System Coordinating Committee will continue. Special overview will be maintained by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency systems specialist.

The Administrative Office of the Courts will continue to insure that the courts receive the required information from the individual systems on a timely basis. Information to be submitted to the AOC will include status of calendar statistics (complaints and appeals filed, narratives and types of dispositions, etc.). Information concerning age, timing and status of cases will be included. Number of post conviction relief petitions and appeals from the municipal courts will be maintained. Measurements will be made of timing among all processing points from indictment to disposition. Quarterly reviews will be made. User documentation will be kept in each system and will be available for inspection and possible replication.

Projects will adhere to privacy, security and confidentiality standards promulgated by the Judiciary as described in the State Privacy and Security Systems Plan.

and the provision of opportunities similar to those of adult offenders in custody and the right of youngsters with deep psychological problems to receive appropriate treatment might be typical examples of representation. Efforts will be made by the Public Advocate to foreclose on the possibility of juveniles being lodged in county jails or confined with adults in any form of custody.

Additionally, the Public Advocate will be supported in the establishment of a special projects section to research and respond to evolving issues in criminal law.

Special support staff within the Public Advocate's Office is needed to assist in resolving specific issues. The Office of the Public Advocate has responsibilities to several other criminal justice agencies; these responsibilities involve research and recommendations on a variety of policy matters. For example, concerns raised by the Correctional Master Plan Council of the Department of Institutions and Agencies require the development of position statements

by the Office of the Public Defender. A similar situation exists by virtue of the assignment of liaison personnel to the New Jersey Adult and Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee. Another recent example of support to other agencies was a request for assistance from the Department of Law and Public Safety and the Administrative Office of the Courts regarding the Governor's proposal of a speedy trial program from the point of view of Public Advocate resources. A recent inquiry requires a Public Advocate staff response into the question of the Grand Jury in New Jersey. Several other potential issues of concern to the Public Advocate arise as a result of the Supreme Court's Criminal Practice Committee study of the Grand Jury in its relationship with the probable cause hearing function. The Public Advocate will also research questions relating to multiple co-defendant trials.

**Subgrant Data:**

It is anticipated that these projects will receive a total of two years each of State Law Enforcement Planning Agency support. The Office of the Public Advocate will be the sole applicant.

**Program C-11: Continued Support of Statewide Court Activities**

**Objectives:**

To continue the development of a State level mechanism to implement pre-trial service and intake programs on a statewide basis reducing the number of defendants processed through to adjudication, thereby conserving judicial resources for "speedier trials" of defendants charged with serious offenses.

To continue to address the problem of delay and backlog by increasing the number of dispositions per judge. Dispositions per judge should increase at the rate of seven percent per year for the next four years.

To continue to provide the judiciary with a Judicial Information Service to engender greater community support and understanding of the judicial branch of government.

To provide State level coordination of citizen volunteer probation programs resulting in this supervision modality being available to 25% of the county juvenile probationers, intake and pre-trial intervention enrollees and five percent of the county adult probationers and intake and pre-trial intervention enrollees.

To develop a State level program to reduce sentence disparity.

To continue a program of coordinated probation training projects.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$160,000	\$17,778	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

This program area was developed as a result of the Public Advocate's own needs assessment. Other input into program design results from a review of the Governor's Advisory Committee recommendations and the National Advisory Commission on Standards and Goals Court Report.

The child advocacy project will maintain records indicating the range of activities detailing specific efforts to introduce legislative, court and executive changes on behalf of children, as a class, who have contact with the criminal justice system. A systematic documentation of accomplishments will be maintained.

The special projects activity will maintain records, indicating activities, research completed, recommendations made, changes made in policies and procedures made within the Office of the Public Advocate and impact on the criminal justice system.

To support the judiciary with a statewide facilities study program.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

The Office of the Diversion Coordinator and Office of the Volunteer Coordinator will be incorporated into an Office of Pre-Trial Services. The Intake Administration Office will be continued under the general purview of this section. The intake administrator will be available to assist in program development and to provide technical assistance to the participating vicinages.

The Judicial Information Service will be continued to keep the public informed about court functions and will supply information to persons directly involved in the adjudicatory process.

There is a substantial need in some jurisdictions for court facility design, renovation or improvement. The AOC has a planning and standard-setting responsibility as well as a direct budgetary responsibility for State courts. It is necessary to develop a statewide interim and long range facility requirement assessment. There is a clear need for coordination and transfer of existing planning and knowledge. The development of a model courthouse will be supported; evaluation and demonstration techniques will result in guidelines for future de-

velopment. It would appear to be critical to assess all aspects of the existing New Jersey judicial operation to avoid further and even more costly facility dysfunctionality.

The coordination of Statewide Probation Training will be continued through an appropriate office within the AOC. This office will continue to coordinate training activities within the 21 county departments and will continue to improve orientation, skills and methods training, administrative and supervisory training and to develop specific training responsive to needs perceived by the probation departments and judiciary.

The previously funded Central Appellate Research Staff will be expanded into an interbranch appellate effort in Essex County as described in Program Area C-12.

Funds already allocated will be available to continue the Sentence Disparity project.

Historically, the statewide court activities program area has provided central staff within the AOC to advance the objectives of a unified, statewide court system. The various projects developed in this area over the years have been focused on court efficiency—the reduction of backlog and delay. As such, these projects are long-range, on-going and subject to almost continuous refinements and changes in emphasis as changing conditions indicate. Under these circumstances, short, specific "hardware" projects have not been planned. As the objectives are broad, the projects undertaken have been of considerable duration. There have been instances in which anticipated State assumption of costs have been delayed as a result of budget constraints.

#### **Subgrant Data:**

The 1977 funds will be allocated to the AOC as follows:

\$80,000 will continue support of the Office of Pre-Trial Services.

Probation Training will be continued with \$83,000 in 1977 funds.

A Judicial Facilities project will be undertaken with \$100,000.

The Judicial Information Services office will be

continued with \$50,000.

The Intake Administration Office will be continued with \$40,000.

The 1975 and 1976 funds will support a Sentence Disparity project.

#### **Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$353,000	\$39,223	10%

#### **Evaluation and Monitoring:**

The sources of information consulted in the development of this program area have been the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals Court Report, studies by the National Center for State Courts and the Administrative Office of the Courts and State Law Enforcement Planning Agency monitoring reports. The AOC Court Planning Office has been a primary source of input. The Governor's Advisory Committee has provided input. Various National Institute on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice documents have been consulted.

Activity statistics will include number of clients served and a description of services, accounts of specific delay reductions, improvements undertaken as well as the range of activities of project personnel. Interagency impact will be examined.

Those programs which divert persons from further penetration into the criminal justice system will maintain data about clients served, referrals made, services rendered and impact on the adjudicatory process as well as follow-up statistics. Outcome statistics of reduction in excessive sentence disparities will be maintained. Number of persons trained, training given and impact of training of probation personnel will be made available. Facility study documentation will be filed with SLEPA. Activities of Judicial Information Service personnel and records of improved procedure will be kept.

Data will relate to the central objective of delay reduction.

## **Program C-12: Improved Appellate Capability**

#### **Objective:**

To support the Central Appellate Research Staff of the Superior Court Appellate Division, the Public Defender and the Division of Criminal Justice in their efforts to reduce backlog and delay in the handling of appeals by ten percent.

#### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

One possible result of efforts to reduce delay and congestion at the lower court and trial court level may simply be the change of location of that delay and congestion within the system. A better response at one level increases the burden and backlog at

another.

There is clear need for a system-wide response. Very little justification can be made for improving the capability of one component of the system without providing for similar growth in the other two components. This program area is designed to provide uniform interbranch capacity growth to respond to the central problem of appellate delay.

The Division of Criminal Justice, as previously noted, has developed significant staff expertise in centralizing the appellate function throughout the State of New Jersey, with the exception of Essex County. Accordingly, every endeavor should be made to increase federal resources to complement the present capacity without supplanting current functions. This attempt will be made in concert with increases and resources made available to Administrative Office of the Courts Central Appellate Research staff. A third project will be funded to support an increase in staff for the Public Defender function.

The innovative aspect of this strategy lies with the tripartite approach. By coordinating the entire criminal system response, it may be assumed that system-wide improvements may be evaluated. It is expected that such system improvement will lead to the expeditious disposition of criminal causes at all stages.

This program area is concerned with the central SLEPA court priority, the reduction of delay. Certainly there is "delay" inherent in any process; also, there are instances where "delay" is in the best interests of all concerned in that a deliberate analysis of issues may take place. "Delay" becomes intolerable when it results from inadequate or misaligned

resources. The SLEPA funding strategy was developed with the expectation that advantages will accrue from a concentrated intergovernmental effort.

**Subgrant Data:**

As previously described, three grants will be made to encourage uniformity of response.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$255,000	\$28,334	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Monitoring reports for previous appellate activities have been consulted as input into the development of this area. Direct guidance was received from members of the SLEPA Governing Board.

Evaluations of activities where backlog reduction is an objective have traditionally been especially difficult. Many varied factors involving several criminal justice agencies have impact. Improved evaluations can be achieved simply by the nature of the cross-system approach. Evaluation designs will assess the efficiency and effectiveness of projects and will depend on the collection of data indicating research undertaken, cases processed, decisions reached, time-delay reduced and general cross-system impact.

## D. INSTITUTIONAL AND NON-INSTUTIONAL REHABILITATION

### Program D-1: Local Correctional Institution Rehabilitation System Management and Service Delivery

**Objectives:**

To continue seven projects containing jail population management program components designed to identify correctional service area needs by implementation of improved assessment and decision-making techniques such as classification and through the development of standardized communication and feedback procedures with the judiciary and local criminal justice agencies.

To fund at least one new jail project.

To process a minimum of 5,000 persons through formal classification.

To continue the service delivery components of seven projects and thereby provide intake, counseling and pre-release services for a minimum of inmates.

To continue at least one family counseling services project and to develop the program in at least three of the continuation projects.

A minimum of 100 families should be contacted

as a result of this program component.

To increase the number of pre and post-release referrals to community service agencies from 6,000 to 7,000 and to conduct a follow-up survey on the progress of these referrals at three months and six months following referral.

To increase the number of initial intake orientations and interviews conducted within 48 hours of detention from 18,000 to 20,000.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

As the 1977 program is an expansion of the 1975 and 1976 approaches, the following elements remain as considerations essential to a jail program:

1. Expansion of the inmate classification system to provide a realistic decision-making resource for effective jail management. To accomplish this goal, the following needs must be met:
  - a. Data must be gathered from external sources and from such internal reports as can be developed from interviews, testing and follow-up information required to update case records.
  - b. A method of realistically assessing needs of the offender in term of risk, psychological treatment, vocational and academic education and social adjustment must be developed. Such a decision-making structure may be composed of a committee, team or unit but must be provided with procedures for balancing decisions relating to programming custody, personal security and resource allocations of the institutions.
  - c. Decisions must be consistent with individual dignity and based on objective judgments. The offender should be provided maximum involvement in determining the nature and direction of the programmatic decision provided and a mechanism to appeal such decision.
2. A rehabilitation system should be developed and adequately staffed with provision for training in its use. A basic staff orientation program should encompass judicial decision-makers, staff of community support programs, institutional staff and the offenders—both detained and committed. Opportunity for staffing should be provided for experienced correctional personnel with advanced academic credentials to fill correctional counselor positions.
3. A bank of service delivery programs consisting of internally developed programs when necessary and referrals to community service delivery agencies whenever possible should be established. Such programs must provide greater emphasis on involvement of the female offender both within the institution and in the pre-release work/study/family care approaches. Applications must contain documentation describing

agreements reached with service agencies and types of services available and procedures for client follow-up.

4. Each application must contain, as comprehensively as possible, a data survey and analysis of present offender population trends, the correctional alternatives to incarceration available and projections for the use of such alternatives based on an estimated impact of changing judicial practices.

Applicants should consider a project position which may be identified as a classification officer, in both continuation and initial applications. This person should ideally have background experience from the criminal justice system and be capable of statistical analysis. The following activities will be within the area of responsibility for this person:

- a. Developing of such forms and data gathering procedures as are necessary to implement the proper management.
  - b. Analyzing trends in the jail population make-up for the purpose of predicting future jail populations and allocating jail resources.
  - c. Administering the inmate classification system.
  - d. Evaluating the effectiveness of those programs designed to impact on the offender.
  - e. Anticipating changing institutional problems and needs. It is anticipated that, once the manual reporting and analysis system is established and refined during the initial program phase, the larger institutions, with bed capacities in excess of 150 beds, may require some additional mechanized capability to assist in sorting and counting data. Provision for such equipment will be a consideration in the 1976 plan, dependent on an evaluation of the start-up phase of the program.
5. The family counseling unit will provide for no more than two staff members for the larger institutions and one staff person for the smaller (100 bed or less) jails. The unit will receive cases from the intake interviewers and other staff when requested by the defendant or sentenced offender. Guidelines must be developed governing the family contact program.

### Subgrant Data:

1976 Plan revised program funding:

The following projects will receive final continuation funding from the 1976 Plan within the amounts indicated: Somerset, \$16,000; Mercer, \$25,000; Salem, \$30,000; and the Essex Correctional Center Legal Services project, \$50,000.

Continuation funding up to the amounts indicated

will be provided for: Passaic, \$65,000; Gloucester, \$40,000; Essex Correctional Center Diagnostic Unit, \$70,000; and the Essex Jail, \$70,000.

Funding will be available in the total amount of \$100,000 to initiate a new jail project and a family counseling unit developed as an entity within an established jail program.

1977 Plan Program funding:

The 1977 Program will provide final funding for the following projects within the amounts as indicated: Passaic Jail, \$40,000; Gloucester Jail, \$30,000; and the Essex Correctional Center Diagnostic Unit, \$50,000.

Continuation funding will be provided in the total amount of \$130,000 to continue projects initially funded under the 1976 program.

A maximum of \$41,000 will be provided to establish a new jail project.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C Block Support	\$291,000	\$32,334	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

In addition to the statistical data detailed below, the subgrantee may be required to furnish additional information as needed by the Evaluation Team of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency. (See the Provision for Evaluation section of this document).

The monitoring level of evaluation will require at least the following data separately reported for detainees and sentenced offenders:

1. The number of clients received in the institution

during the project period, the number receiving basic orientation to the procedures and programs of the institution, the number remaining at the institution for over 48 hours and the number formally interviewed within 48 hours of entry for the purpose of eliciting personal background data and determining immediate and long-range needs.

2. Resulting from the above formal interviews, the numbers, types and results of outside contacts made in satisfaction of immediate needs (e.g., family counseling, application for public defender, application for release on bail and R.O.R., provision of information for pre-sentence reports, treatment recommendation as alternative to sentencing, etc.).
3. The number of clients receiving formal classification at the institution and the resultant number and types of program placements made both within and external to the institution. The number of clients satisfactorily completing programs either prior to release or during the follow-up period. Information should be provided at least three and six months after program placement.
4. The number of clients provided with formal pre-release interviews and the resultant counseling sessions, community program placements, work/study/family care release placements and follow-up feedback information as in number three above.
5. Monthly reporting by the classification officer regarding the data system (as described above) to be maintained by that position. The first project month will be devoted to development and submission of the proposed data system for the joint approval of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and local criminal justice authorities.

## Program D-2: Improvement of Juvenile Detention and Shelter Care Practices

**Objectives:**

To increase the range of existing educational, recreational, volunteer and social services programs within detention and shelter care facilities that serve a potential annual population of 12,000 juveniles.

To increase to 13 the number of detention facilities where programs have been developed or expanded through assistance from this program area.

To increase to nine the number of shelter care facilities where programs have been expanded through assistance from this program area.

To assist detention and shelter facilities to meet standards of operation and administration.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

Emphasis will be placed on funding programs which enrich educational, recreational, volunteer and social services programs. Past experience with education projects in detention facilities indicates that a program which transcends a traditional academic approach and which utilizes a learning process based on experience appears to be an appropriate teaching method in the short term holding facility.

In keeping with recent regulations promulgated by the Department of Human Services, every juvenile shelter care facility must have a social worker on its

staff. Funds will be available to hire such a person who would act as advocate for a juvenile in his or her relationship with the court system, the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS), parents or guardians and other critical agencies and persons.

Funds will be available for both detention and shelter care facilities although programming may differ slightly in each. The funding of shelter care activities will be done in coordination with the staff of the Task Force on the Juvenile Code which has already implemented shelter projects through the administration of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration discretionary monies. Because of the great measure of freedom that a juvenile in a shelter has, the range of activities is wider. There may be more outside community involvement and, therefore, there is a likelihood of a larger volunteer services component in shelter programming.

Grants to enhance detention programs are continued generally on a yearly basis for a period of three years as long as they demonstrate their effectiveness and continue to fill a need within the facilities. Grants to shelter care facilities will be on a yearly basis for a period of two years. It is anticipated that after the demonstration period counties will assume all program costs.

Assistance in developing programs will be provided by State Law Enforcement Planning Agency program analysts who have worked with similar activities, personnel from already existing projects as well as staff from the Department of Human Services who are charged with insuring that facilities are meeting the standards set down by that agency.

**Subgrant Data:**

Monies will be available to continue second and third year funding for up to 15 county detention and shelter care programs and to begin up to three new programs.

Grant funds for the enrichment of detention programming will be available in amounts up to approximately \$30,000.

Grants to shelter care facilities will primarily provide staff support for educational and social service activities and will not exceed \$20,000.

**Budget:**

	<b>LEAA</b>	<b>State, Local or Other</b>	<b>Percentage State or Local Match</b>
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$187,750	\$20,862	10%
Total JJDP Act Funds	\$ 88,100	\$ 9,789	10%
Program Total	\$275,850	\$30,651	

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

The monitoring design for the program includes cooperative field visits by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the Department of Human Services Task Force, which are responsible for insuring that facilities are meeting standards developed by that agency. Monitoring requirements include submission of project activities and statistics as well as a narrative report on projects' progress on a quarterly basis.

Subgrantees will be required to submit data on the numbers of children served by a specific project as well as results of the particular activities. This information should include the age, sex and race of juveniles, as well as a list of agencies with which the detention center cooperates. Also included should be the number of volunteers who developed and participated in activities and the nature of those activities. Other data which substantiates the fulfillment of project objectives should also be included.

As the result of past monitoring information gathered through site visits and ongoing contact with detention and shelter care personnel, special educational needs have been addressed through the development of a grant for an educational coordinator as well as other education activities.

**Program D-3: State Corrections Support Program**

**Objectives:**

To continue the Disciplinary Hearing Officer project to complete the model program and to improve disciplinary hearings for an estimated 10,000 cases during a 12 month period.

To develop an improved inmate grievance procedure to process approximately 2,500 grievances per year for seven State correctional institutions.

To continue improvement in the management of two State correctional institutions, one in the adult and one in the youth complexes, by providing assess-

ment evaluation and technical assistance to the institutional administrators.

To establish a program of inmate advocacy at the local level of corrections to improve the handling of inmates and to provide investigative services to 1,130 complaints.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

All applications for funding under this program area must address the following criteria:

1. Identification of the existing staff resources

committed to the area of concern.

- a. The staff positions and the amount of time allocated to the area of concern.
  - b. Existing programs and procedures that address the area of concern.
2. The physical space required to implement the project and the availability and specific location of such space.
  3. A clear definition of authority and responsibility both within the project and within the departmental organization.
  4. A phasing and schedule for planned activities during the grant period indicating:
    - a. Regularly scheduled operational and reporting activities including the type of information to be included in reports and the relationship of such information to the purpose of the project.
    - b. All initially funded projects will provide a phased start-up schedule specifically including consideration for the time required to hire staff and to purchase equipment.

The following additional criteria must be considered in applications for funding of specific projects as indicated:

#### Legal Information Station Project.

The Legal Information Station project will maintain a staff not to exceed two attorneys, one bi-lingual legal para-professional and two clericals. Adequate office space must be provided that is suitable for conducting confidential client interviews and contains a secure area for equipment and files.

Procedures are to be developed and implemented to insure that all requests for legal services are received by project staff within 48 hours of submission. Institutional information, needed to determine the legal needs of the client and not infringing on the clients' right to confidentiality and privacy, will be made available to the Legal Station.

#### Disciplinary Hearing Officer Project.

Staffing for the Disciplinary Hearing program will remain at two hearing officers and one clerical person for the adjudicatory portion of the project. The 1976 grant will provide an investigative aide to be assigned to the project.

Purchase of services for an attorney from the New Jersey Bar Association will be available one day per month for each of seven institutions to continue the disciplinary adjustment committee training program. Scheduling of the training classes and monitoring trainee attendance to maintain eligibility to sit on disciplinary hearings is the responsibility of the project director.

#### Inmate Grievance Handling Project.

Consideration for continuation funding will be made for the pilot project to improve the handling of non-disciplinary grievances. Provision will be made for staff to survey existing methods available to inmates seeking redress for grievances. A report will

be prepared of existing procedures and reviewed with the Department of Corrections and the Correctional Reform Committee of the N.J. State Bar Association to develop procedures and monitor activities to insure that:

- a. Each inmate has the opportunity and understands the procedure for filing a grievance.
- b. The grievance is transmitted without delay or alteration to a reviewing authority who is independent of the correctional institution.
- c. A complete investigation is conducted.
- d. A report is prepared and submitted to the inmate filing the grievance and to the institutional authority with a recommendation or resolution within 72 hours.
- e. An appeal procedure is established if the recommendation is deemed inappropriate by either the inmate or the institutional authority.
- f. The inmate is not subjected to adverse action resulting from the grievance.

The survey review and procedural development phase of the project should be completed within 90 days of hiring of staff. The second phase will provide for implementation of the grievance procedures with a concurrent two-month assessment phase prior to conclusion of the grant period.

#### Administrative Assistance.

A project to provide assistance to institutional management will be considered for funding. The activities of the project will be applied to two State correctional institutions and will include the following:

- a. A review and analysis of existing operational procedures and management practices.
- b. An examination of the relationship between the administrative practices and operational procedures and the stated goals and objectives of the institution.
- c. Preparation of a report assessing the effectiveness of the existing institutional administrative and managerial functions and recommendations for implementation.
- d. Provision of technical assistance to institutional administrators during the implementation phase.

#### Inmate Advocacy Project.

Staffing for the County/Municipal Inmate Advocacy project will be maintained at two attorneys, one field representative and two clericals.

The results of investigations and of general information gathering will be reviewed by the Assistant Deputy Public Defender II who will, in turn, contact appropriate officials to first attempt administrative resolution and, should negotiations fail, follow through with litigation.

#### Planning, Management and Evaluation Unit.

The Planning, Management and Evaluation Unit will adhere to the guidelines described in the *Corrections Task Force Report*, p. 446, which include:

1. The established procedure open to as many

employees as possible for establishing and reviewing organizational goals and objectives, *at least annually*.

2. A research capability for adequately identifying the key social, economic and functional influences affecting that agency and for predicting the future impact of that influence.
3. The capability to monitor, *at least annually*, progress toward previously specified objectives.
4. An administrative capability for properly assessing the future support services required for effective implementation of formulated plans.

The management component of the P.M. and E. project will be a continuation, utilizing carryover funds, of the Correctional Services Project Coordinator project. The Coordinator will function in concert with the P.M. and E. project but will retain certain responsibilities according to project goals and objectives.

A project to provide assistance to institutional management will be considered for funding. The activities of the project will be applied to two State correctional institutions and will include the following:

- a. A review and analysis of existing operational procedures and management practices.
- b. An examination of the relationship between the administrative practices and operational procedures and the stated goals and objectives of the institution.
- c. Preparation of a report assessing the effectiveness of the existing institutional administrative and managerial functions and recommendations for implementation.
- d. Provision of technical assistance to institutional administrators during the implementation phase.

Support projects funded under this program are considered pilot demonstration projects with the exception of the Correctional Services Projects Coordinator grant. It is anticipated that funding will not exceed three grants whether monies are received from LEAA, S<sup>1</sup> EPA or a combination of both. Project phasing during the first grant period should include start-up and first operational phases.

The second grant period should include the evaluation and model adjustment phase.

The third grant will include the major productive operational phase and the final evaluation and report phases.

**Subgrant Data:**

The Department of Corrections and the Depart-

ment of the Public Advocate are the only eligible applicants.

Funding of the following projects will be considered within the amounts indicated: County/Municipal Inmate Advocacy Pilot Program, \$80,000; Disciplinary Hearing Officer Program, \$150,000; Planning, Management and Evaluation Unit, \$75,000 and the Grievance Handling Project, \$50,000. The Assistance for Institutional Management project may be funded depending on the availability of program funds.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part E			
Block Support	\$355,000	\$39,445	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Each project within the program area will be required to maintain statistical data to measure the volume of project activity (e.g. specific procedural changes recommended and adopted, numbers and types of cases handled, total and average time spent on case resolution at various procedural levels of the project and the numbers of cases resolved at the various levels).

A record will be kept of the numbers of formal complaints appeals, legal suits) filed at various levels beyond normal channels specifically provided for by the program (e.g. the number of legal suits filed for alleged violations of due process during institutional adjustment or hearing committee proceedings or the number of grievances not brought to satisfactory resolution at the appeal level provided for by the grant contract). This data will be compared chronologically with a similar time period prior to project implementation.

Data comparisons will also be made between similar institutions which have and do not have project services available to them (e.g. the number, types and handling of disciplinary charges at the Rahway and Trenton Prisons).

A portion of program evaluation is necessarily subjective and will involve feedback information from parties affected by project services, i.e. inmates, institutional Superintendents, Chief Deputies, Central staff to the Department of Corrections and the Inmate Council.

**Program D-4: State Correctional Education Programs**

**Objectives:**

To continue an annual research program in which

follow-up data will be collected and analyzed on 12,000 clients who have participated in educational programs. The study will include clients both during

the remainder of their stay within institutions and then upon their release to the community under parole supervision.

To provide each inmate entering a State Correctional Institution with educational testing, and individualized instructional plan and follow-up counseling sessions.

To analyze and evaluate existing educational programs and to formulate recommendations for continuance, improvement and/or redirection of ineffective or under-utilized program components, as well as to develop new programs.

To establish learning centers at each of the satellite units thereby increasing the static capacity of the learning centers from 175 to 350.

To provide learning disability diagnosis and evaluation for at least 2,000 inmates and to prescribe individual treatment plans.

To provide vocational awareness and training to at least 400 inmates.

To complete the development of a model correctional education program for both the institutional complex as well as the individual institution by December 31, 1977.

To provide learning disability services for 2,000 inmates by December 31, 1977.

#### General Strategy for Implementation:

The 1977 correctional education plan, in conjunction with the program directions outlined in the 1976 multi-year plan, consists of four related program components: a program development and assessment unit, inmate assessment and individualized learning, vocational awareness and training and support services. Applications for funding must address, but are not limited to, the following general criteria:

1. Emphasis will be placed on literacy, mathematics and learning disability testing, evaluation and individually prescribed programming. The learning centers will implement remedial programs and also provide specialized academic support to inmates entering vocational training shops.
2. Social and coping skills, such as consumer and family life education, will be included in both academic and vocational curriculum design. Emphasis will be placed on improving motivational and career counseling to increase inmate participation in programs by relating the potential benefits of education and training to the inmate's life situation upon release to the community. It is necessary that curriculum design provide methodology for encouraging the client in establishing goals and objectives, and developing an ability to defer achievement of goals, thereby reducing need for immediate satisfaction. Project curriculum and the manner in which the above considerations will be met

are to be included in each application.

3. Each vocational project application must contain a current vocational needs assessment of the inmate population, a job market analysis of existing or emerging occupations, potential restrictions to offender employment and a performance analysis which documents the skills and knowledge needed to acquire the occupation.

A Vocational Adjustment Unit will be established at one institution to focus on the antisocial inmate who is not prepared for direct vocational rehabilitation, academic education or job referral.

Vocational programs should be designed to allow a period of work sampling and should indicate the horizontal and vertical training and job placement options available to the inmate upon completion of the course, either at the institution or upon release to the community.

4. Emphasis will be placed on clearly described procedures to facilitate accurate and timely reporting of student participation and achievement data. Such reports should be tabulated monthly and included in the regular quarterly subgrantee reports to SLEPA.
5. The Garden State School District research and evaluation unit will be continued to develop and test educational evaluation models which will be applied to measure the effectiveness of the State Education Correction Program.

#### Subgrant Data:

The Department of Corrections and the Department of Education are the sole eligible applicants.

It is anticipated that the State will assume the cost, at the approximate level of \$345,000, to continue the following projects, all of which will have received a fourth SLEPA grant: Vocational Careers, YCIB; Learning Center, New Lisbon; Learning Center, YRCC; Medical-Surgical Technician Program; Mobile Vocational Training Program; and the Individualized Learning Approach (ILA) project.

Funding up to the amounts indicated will be provided to continue the following projects initiated or continued under the 1976 Plan: Vocational Training Program, Leesburg Prison Farm (\$100,000); Mobile Learning Center (\$100,000); Vocational Adjustment Unit (\$100,000); and a final funding for Project LEARNED (\$50,000).

Up to \$100,000 will be provided to expand and improve the Continuous Assessment Unit Program. This project is considered a new activity under the SLEPA funding schedule.

#### Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part E Block Support	\$450,000	\$50,000	10%

## **Evaluation and Monitoring:**

In addition to the normal SLEPA reporting requirements, project reporting will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:

1. The number of inmates received at each participating institution and the status of the inmates received, i.e., adult or juvenile offenders, parole violators, etc.
2. The number of inmates tested and provided with individualized educational plans. Indicate the institutions where the plans were initially developed in the case of transfers and the offender status of these inmates.
3. The number of inmates enrolled in educational or training courses, including the average number of attendees, and the number of students completing each course.
4. Levels of achievement as indicated through pre-

and post-testing, including feedback information from students and teachers subjectively evaluating the programs.

5. To evaluate the impact of individualized diagnosis and program planning, achievement should be tabulated separately for those inmates entering educational programs without or at variance to previously prepared individual plans.
6. Follow-up information should be obtained at periods of three, six and 12 months upon release of the inmate to parole supervision to determine the extent of impact of institutional educational programs on job placement and/or continuing of educational activities. Placement data should be compared to the initially projected availability of job or training opportunities and indicated discrepancies should be considered in light of such factors as the extent of program participation, client characteristics, unemployment rate, etc.

## **Program D-5: State Correctional Treatment Programs**

### **Objectives:**

**To continue development of the Administrative Segregation Unit program to provide treatment and/or educational services to a minimum of 300 inmates.**

**To initiate an Officer Counselor program to improve the custodial supervision of inmates assigned to treatment and/or educational programs.**

**To increase the referral of State inmates requiring treatment for alcoholism or drug addiction to community treatment programs by improving diagnostic, release planning and follow-up information available to releasing authorities.**

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Application for funding under the 1977 Plan must contain the following provisions:

1. Administrative Segregation Project. Program design will contain the elements of education and social work as adjuncts to the treatment process. Involvement of the Garden State School District is considered essential in program development and implementation.
2. Officer Counselor Project. Funding priority will be given to the upgrading of existing positions assigned to areas of treatment or education. The purpose of this project is not to initiate new staff positions, but to improve the functioning of existing staff positions by encouraging correction officers having attained a minimum of an associate degree level of education, or higher; to utilize both their correctional and academic experience in the offender rehabilitation process. An extensive program of orientation to treatment, academic and vocational education and

support service programs will be provided each officer.

3. Community Treatment Services Project. This program will be designed as a cooperative effort of the Department of Corrections and the Department of Health.

Although the proposed elements of client diagnosis and the provision of release planning information to institutional and releasing authorities has been an integral part of the institutional Special Offenders Treatment Teams project, there have been problems with effecting a smooth process for referral of releasees to community based treatment programs. This project will relate directly to the inmate having a history of substance abuse, will provide inmate screening, diagnosis, treatment plans and make referral recommendations to be implemented upon release while operating as adjuncts to the institutions treatment teams. Follow-up of client progress in treatment will be accomplished in conjunction with parole authorities.

### **Subgrant Data:**

The Department of Corrections is the sole applicant. Funding up to \$105,000 will be provided to continue the Administration Segregation Unit program at Trenton Prison and the Vroom Building. The Community Treatment Services Unit will be established in consultation with the Department of Health for a maximum grant of \$58,000.

The Officer Counselor project will be provided an initial grant within the maximum amount of \$116,000.

## Budget:

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State of Local Match
Total Part E			
Block Support	\$279,000	\$31,000	10%

## Evaluation and Monitoring:

This program area will utilize the model for intensive evaluation as developed by the SLEPA Evaluation Team and the subgrantee is advised to review the section for evaluation as contained in this Plan (See the Provision for Evaluation section of this document). Some modification of the evaluation guide may be necessary due to the varied program

emphases as described in the proposed projects, therefore the applicant is advised to consult with SLEPA staff, concerning necessary modifications, during the development of the application.

The following additional information should be tabulated monthly and submitted quarterly to the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency:

1. Quarterly schedules for the on-going staff development/training seminars identifying instructors, topics and curriculum where appropriate. Include an assessment of the training activities conducted during the previous quarter and such data as the number of staff attending and the dates of the sessions.
2. Feedback information required for model adjustment will be submitted to this Agency at least one week prior to the scheduled meetings.

## Program D-6: Development of Programs to Improve Assistance to Adult Offenders Released to the Community

### Objectives:

To continue two work adjustment units, thereby providing specialized vocational training to a minimum of 280 clients.

To continue one volunteer project to provide counseling and employment assistance to 300 releasees from the State Prisons.

To continue four manpower service center projects to provide assistance to at least 1,200 releasees from institutions, courts and probation.

To continue the isolation and identification of those factors which relate most effectively to job placement, placement with career advancement opportunities and successful reintegration to society through an intensive client follow-up program involving a minimum of 400 clients.

To provide parole officers with an expanded range of client-centered resources through the continuation of parole resource specialists in each of nine district parole offices. At least 4,000 parolees will receive assistance during this grant period.

To continue a system of follow-up to examine continued client participation in placement situations.

To continue to provide basic emergency financial support, such as clothing and dental, medical, psychiatric and psychological services for approximately 200 parolees.

### General Strategy for Implementation:

The following information is considered an essential component of those applications for manpower service center projects:

1. Identification of those existing resources in the geographical area to be served by the projects that have, as their prime responsibility, the

provision of such services as vocational testing and evaluation, career counseling, vocational training and job placement. Indicate the capacity and number of clients served by these resource agencies.

2. Functional description of the local and State criminal justice agencies releasing offenders to the geographical area to be served and the specific nature and extent of supervisory constraints, if any, placed on the released offenders.
3. A survey of the ex-offender population within the project area, determining the number of potential clients, categorized as applicable and describing in quantifiable terms the types of specific manpower needs. This survey should identify sources of information, such as criminal justice agencies and indicate the survey methodology utilized.
4. Documentation of the extent that existing service agencies are available to service the needs of this client group, including an assessment of the status of such service agencies.
5. A program design for client evaluation, referral, placement and follow-up assessment.
6. Objectives to be accomplished during the program development phase (short-term grant, if requested) and to be documented in the application for the vocational service center:
  - a. An agreement whenever possible that the MSC would function as a liaison among the various service agencies and between these agencies and the criminal justice system;
  - b. Identification of the sources and extent of financial and non-financial assistance

available to service agencies;

- c. Design for an on-going evaluation device to 1. improve project operations, and 2. assess identifiable client success factors.

The program activities to be undertaken either as a direct function of the MSC or through the placement efforts of the MSC project are:

1. Community Relations

Information will be provided to the public and the target client group concerning the services available and/or needed for ex-offender assistance. This activity may include the use of volunteers to implement an outreach service capacity as an extension of project activities.

2. Job Development and Training

When a client possesses a marketable skill or has achieved an educational level that has enough value in the labor market to qualify him for satisfactory full-time employment, job openings should be made available to him through a centralized job bank. For those clients requiring vocational or educational improvement, a resource bank of available training should be maintained.

3. Vocational Adjustment Unit

This unit will provide training in employment interview techniques, client diagnostics and evaluation and, if indicated, remedial work habits and skills development. This activity encompasses job-related remedial education for offenders and ex-offenders who have made a break with the traditional educational system.

4. Administrative Core Unit

Specific functions for the administrative staff include the following:

- a. Planning and coordinating the development of the program,
- b. Determining policies for implementation,
- c. Setting priorities for service delivery in line with the overall program goals and objectives,
- d. Monitoring referrals for specific services,
- e. Providing training and technical assistance to participating agencies, including on-loan and volunteers,
- f. Liaison with federal, State and local agencies involved with manpower programs,
- g. Supervision of intake, supportive services, referral and follow-up,
- h. Maintaining a central record keeping center for reporting and evaluation procedures;
- i. Implementing operational guidelines and control procedures for program management.

The manpower service center program will be supported with Part C funds.

Part E funds, as indicated in the Subgrant Data, will be provided to the Department of Corrections

to fund an administrative unit which will be assigned the responsibility to develop, monitor and evaluate the Parole Manpower Program. This unit will also act as the liaison between the Parole MSC and other criminal justice and service delivery agencies to ensure that the uniform operational standards and procedures are developed, client files are maintained and that project facilities are adequate.

**Subgrant Data:**

Part C funds from the 1976 Plan up to the amount of \$650,000 will be used to continue projects initially funded under the 1975 Plan with the exception of the Middlesex Anti-Recidivism Project, which will be considered for a final grant within a maximum of \$80,000. Maximum funding levels are indicated for those projects funded prior to the preparation of this Plan, as follows: Atlantic Vocational Service Center, \$100,000; Hudson Mini-project for Spanish Speaking Offenders, \$15,000; and the Community Affairs MW2 Project, \$150,000.

The 1977 Program provides both Part C funds for application by local units of government and Part E funds for application by the Department of Corrections. Funding data is provided, as follows:

Part C funds are provided for final funding of the following projects within the maximum amounts indicated: Atlantic Vocational Service Center, \$80,000; and the Community Affairs MW2 Project, \$90,000. The remaining funds will be used for continuation of projects yet to be funded under the 1975 and 1976 Plans. Applicants are advised that funding is presently available for a maximum of three funding periods and to anticipate a reduced level of funding for each continuation grant provided.

Part E funds are provided for initial funding of the Manpower Development Unit within the State Bureau of Parole. A maximum of \$40,000 is provided for this purpose. Final continuation funding of the Special Parole Project (Parole Resource Specialist) in the amount of \$105,000 will be provided.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Loal or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$450,000	\$50,000	10%
Total Part E			
Block Support	\$145,000	\$16,112	10%
Program Total	\$595,000	\$66,112	

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

For the Special Parole Project, the project evaluation will include the following statistical data for each district office:

- 1. Total number of requests for assistance made to the community resource specialist,

2. Number of cases requiring financial assistance and the type of assistance rendered (e.g., housing, tools, medical, etc.),
3. Number of cases provided non-financial assistance and the type of assistance rendered (e.g., job placement, educational placement, referral to community agencies, etc.),
4. Follow-up data concerning the percentage of clients continuing satisfactory participation in or completion of placements obtained through the project such as jobs, academic and vocational instruction, alcohol and drug detoxification and treatment, etc. Information should be gathered both three and six months following placement;
5. Number of referred cases not provided with assistance.

In addition to other evaluative data as may be requested, the subgrantee awarded a grant to implement a Manpower Service Center that will provide the following:

1. The number of offenders released to the community during each calendar quarter and the number contacting the project for assistance,
2. The type of service requested and the internal services i.e., interviews, evaluations, counseling

- sessions and referrals, provided,
3. The purpose of each referral made, the service agency contacted and whether or not the client was accepted into the program,
4. The number of clients evaluated for possible VAU enrollment and the number of clients enrolled and completing training,
5. The capacity of the job and educational/training resource banks,
6. The number of actual job placements which result in employment for one week, one month and three months,
7. The number of on-loan and volunteer staff assigned to the project. Data should be supplied on such factors as training provided, actual time provided to project activities and the turnover rate of such staff;
8. Data on the client undergoing intensive follow-up, such as the nature of the client's offense, needs assessment, referral made or services provided, type and frequency of contacts, re-arrest and assessment as to success or failure.

It is suggested that this information be tabulated monthly, but reporting requirements to SLEPA will be on the normal quarterly basis.

## **Program D-7: Community Based Adult Residential Facilities and Programs as Alternatives to Incarceration**

### **Objectives:**

**To provide graduated community re-entry to approximately 220 offenders released from State correctional institutions by continuing the adult Pre-release Service Center established under the 1975 Plan and funding the initial phase of one new service center.**

**To maintain a population of at least 45 residents in the service center and to provide each resident with continued employment and other support services necessary for re-integration.**

**To purchase client slots within community residential treatment programs on a pre-release basis, thereby providing short-term re-integration support for approximately 25 male and female inmates of State correctional institutions.**

**To provide the court with an additional alternative to incarceration by establishing three adult-community-based residential centers to serve at least 300 offenders who would otherwise have been sentenced to a correctional facility.**

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Part E Block funds will support the development and operation of the pre-release center which will be modeled after the Essex Service Center under the supervision of the Department of Corrections. The new center is anticipated to be located in Paterson,

servicing Passaic County, and will utilize monies remaining under the 1975 Plan due to non-utilization of purchase of service arrangements and State assumption of the costs of operating the Essex Center. Since the Coordinator of Community-Based programs position was eliminated because of the small number of programs within the Bureau of Community Services, funds will be provided for the development phase of the new center. Activities which must be demonstrated during the start-up project include: hiring the project director, locating and preparing the facility for occupancy, gaining the necessary approvals for occupancy, recruiting center staff and gaining community support and referral source commitment. No funding is planned for additional juvenile treatment centers.

Part E funds will additionally support the purchase of residential pre-release client slots for inmates of State correctional institutions.

Part C Block funds will support the establishment and operation of four adult residential service centers, thereby providing the court with a treatment alternative to incarceration for offenders potentially benefiting from a semi-custodial, treatment oriented setting based on the premise that such a setting would prove more rehabilitative and less disruptive in terms of continued employment, family contact and the availability of problem oriented counseling.

The following must be provided for either by the center or through community agency referral:

1. Educational, vocational and recreation programs,
2. Job development and placement services,
3. Treatment programs for problems associated with alcoholism, drug addiction and mental or physical health;
4. Counseling programs for problems arising from marital, employment, financial or social responsibilities.

Each community-based facility will require the endorsement (quantified statement of need) of the assignment judge and the county chief probation officer.

**Subgrant Data:**

The State Department of Corrections is the sole eligible applicant for the 1976 Part E monies used to support this program area. A total of \$340,000 is available.

Up to \$465,000 of 1976 Part C funds will be made available to local units of government for grants establishing a total of four community-based residential facilities. Local input to the 1977 Plan indicates that the following counties are planning to make application for grants to establish projects. Funds up to the amounts indicated will be made available from the 1976 Plan: Morris, \$100,000; Atlantic, \$160,000; Hudson, \$120,000 and one additional new center, \$85,000.

Continuation funding will be provided under the 1977 Plan for one project within a maximum amount of \$80,000.

**Program D-8: Improvement of Parole Decision-Making**

**Objectives:**

To continue the Youthful Parole Revocation Representation project and thereby provide representation for 650 youthful offenders.

**General Strategy for Implementation:**

The 1977 program will provide a mechanism to react to funding priorities identified; as measures are undertaken to implement reform in parole decision-making. It is anticipated that unexpended carryover monies from prior plans will be used to fund new projects where appropriate.

**Subgrant Data:**

Funds up to \$150,500 will be considered for the Public Advocate to continue the Youthful Parole Revocation Representation project.

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$80,000	\$8,889	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

The project monitoring level of evaluation will require each residential facility to maintain at least the following statistical information:

1. The number of clients accepted into the program, tabulated by source of referral,
2. The number of clients successfully completing the program,
3. The number of unsuccessful participants and the reasons for termination,
4. The type and extent of supportive service rendered to each client by project staff (e.g., job placement, counseling sessions, treatment referrals, etc.),
5. The number and types of referrals made to each outside service agency,
6. Follow-up information concerning client progress through continued contact with outside services agencies;
7. Follow-up data on clients for a period of one year following successful program completion (e.g., continued employment, rearrest, reconviction, etc.).

**Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local or Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total Part C			
Block Support	\$150,500	\$16,723	10%

**Evaluation and Monitoring:**

Project statistics and on-going evaluation will be based on the following data:

1. Case histories
2. Investigation reports
3. Number of cases and types for each institution
4. Attorney's caseload and time spent
5. Number of parolees who waived their right to a hearing

6. Disposition of cases based on the following decisions:
- a. Number continued on parole
  - b. Number rescinded revocation
  - c. Number returned for adjustment
  - d. Number sustained revocations

- e. Number revoked
  - f. Number revoked for absenteeism
- Additional funded projects will require data instruments adequate for determining project effectiveness, impact and efficiency.

## **Program D-9: Alternatives to Enable Separation of Juvenile from Adult Offenders in State Correctional Institutions and to Insure Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders**

### **Objectives:**

To review the status of juvenile commitments to the youth correctional institution complex and to continue to plan for the development and evaluation of projects to encompass this population.

To continue to develop projects which will bring to approximately 210, the number of program slots for juveniles who would otherwise be mixed with adults in the State's correctional institutions.

To continue an expanded monitoring capability to insure appropriate commitments to juvenile detention and State correctional facilities.

### **General Strategy for Implementation:**

Grants available from this program area will be awarded to the Department of Corrections. They will provide for projects which further the implementation of the requirements to separate juvenile from adult offenders and to deinstitutionalize status offenders. The projects will include administration, research, planning and monitoring capabilities as well as the development of specific programs for the two target populations. The activities will include services such as intensive therapy, group counseling, education, vocational instruction and recreation.

### **Subgrant Data:**

Funds will be made available to the Department of Corrections for the following purposes:

- \$ 60,000 — For the continuation of a youth administrative and monitoring unit.

\$322,250—To develop up to three projects to continue the separation effort.

### **Budget:**

	LEAA	State, Local and Other	Percentage of State or Local Match
Total JJDP			
Act Funds	\$382,250	\$42,473	10%

### **Evaluation and Monitoring:**

The projects in this area will be monitored by the youth administrative unit, as well as members of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention staff.

Both the achievement of overall goals of complete separation and deinstitutionalization will be assessed as well as specific goals attached to individual projects.

Information to be requested from project personnel for monitoring and evaluation purposes will include total number of juveniles involved; characteristics breakdown including sex, age and race of offenders, offense upon which adjudication was based, offense history and short and long term treatment goals with periodic progress reports on the status of these goals.

Information gleaned from the quarterly narrative, site visits and youth administrative unit staff will shape the directions to be pursued in developing and/or continuing projects which will further the goals of separation and deinstitutionalization.

5. EQUIPMENT RECEIVED DURING QUARTER:

6. PROJECT DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS:

---

TYPED NAME AND SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR

---

DATE

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

DETAILED COST STATEMENT – CASH REPORT/CASH REQUEST  
(SUBMIT IN TRIPLICATE)

1. Unit of Government \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. Implementing Agency \_\_\_\_\_  
 3. Project Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 4. Subgrant # \_\_\_\_\_  
 5. Project Duration:  
 From \_\_\_\_\_  
 To \_\_\_\_\_

6. Date of this Report: \_\_\_\_\_  
 7. Report # \_\_\_\_\_  
 8. Report for month of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 a. Other period:  
 9. Remarks:

94

BUDGET CATEGORIES	SECTION 1 APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET			SECTION 2 THIS REPORT PERIOD'S EXPENDITURES			SECTION 3 CUMULATIVE EXPENDITURES			SECTION 4** CURRENT UNPAID OBLIGATIONS		
	SLEPA (FEDERAL)	REQUIRED HARD CASH MATCH		SLEPA (FEDERAL)	REQUIRED HARD CASH MATCH		SLEPA (FEDERAL)	REQUIRED HARD CASH MATCH		SLEPA (FEDERAL)	REQUIRED HARD CASH MATCH	
		STATE BUY-IN PROVISION	* STATE LOCAL		STATE BUY-IN PROVISION	* STATE LOCAL		STATE BUY-IN PROVISION	* STATE LOCAL		STATE BUY-IN PROVISION	* STATE LOCAL
A. Salaries & Wages												
1. Regular criminal justice personnel												
2. Other Staff												
3. Fringe Benefits												
B. Purchase of Services												
C. Travel, etc.												
D. Consumable Supplies												
E. Facilities, etc.												
F. Equipment												
G. Indirect Cost												
TOTALS												

\*CHECK THE APPROPRIATE SOURCE OF MATCH FUNDS.

\*\*REQUIRED ON ALL REPORTS. AMOUNTS MUST BE ENTERED ON REPORT FOR LAST PROJECT MONTH IF ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES ARE ANTICIPATED.

Implementing Agency \_\_\_\_\_ Subgrant # \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title \_\_\_\_\_

CASH REPORT

	SLEPA FUNDS (ONLY)	STATE BUY-IN FUNDS (ONLY)	STATE SHARE (ONLY)
1. Project Status: <input type="checkbox"/> Ready to begin <input type="checkbox"/> In operation <input type="checkbox"/> Completed			
2. Cash on hand – beginning of period	\$ _____	_____	_____
3. ADD: cash received during period	_____	_____	_____
cash in-transit	_____	_____	_____
4. SUBTOTAL: Cash available during period	_____	_____	_____
5. DEDUCT: cash disbursed during period	_____	_____	_____
6. SUBTOTAL: cash on hand	_____	_____	_____
7. DEDUCT: current unpaid obligations	_____	_____	_____
8. BALANCE: unobligated cash on hand	\$ _____	_____	_____

CASH REQUEST

9. Anticipated expenditures* of cash during the period of _____ *(DO NOT INCLUDE OBLIGATIONS FROM #7 ABOVE)	\$ _____	_____	_____
10. DEDUCT: unobligated cash on hand	_____	_____	_____
11. Cash requested from SLEPA	\$ _____	_____	_____

FAILURE TO SUBMIT FORM 100 SIGNED (Space labeled "Payee Signature") WILL DELAY ADVANCES.

SUBGRANTEE CERTIFICATION: I certify that this information is taken from the Books of Account and that such costs are valid and consistent with the terms of the Grant.

PROJECT DIRECTOR	FINANCIAL OFFICER
Contact for information and corrections _____	
Name	Telephone

FOR SLEPA USE:

12. Cumulative funding, including line 11 above      \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Posted: \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

# INSTRUCTIONS FOR DETAILED COST STATEMENT, CASH REPORT, CASH REQUEST SLEPA FORM 107

The purpose of these instructions is to explain the procedures to be followed by each subgrantee in reporting to SLEPA on:

- The expenditure of funds in connection with the activities under each subgrant.
- Cash activity during the report period and the resulting cash status.
- The funds required in the immediate future to begin, continue or complete the approved activities under each subgrant.

The subgrantees are to use a revised three-part form in reporting to SLEPA. The sections of this report are:

- Detailed Cost Statement
- Cash Report
- Cash Request

The procedure for completing each section is covered in these instructions:

## I. Frequency and Dates for Reporting

The required reporting frequency is on a calendar month basis for all sub-grants throughout the project duration, also including any grant extension period.

All reports are due 5 working days after the end of the reporting period, in triplicate.

Reports must be submitted for each active subgrant, even if additional funds are not being requested.

## II. Detailed Cost Statement

The purpose of the Detailed Cost Statement is to provide SLEPA with necessary information on the expenditure of federal funds and matching State and/or local funds in connection with each subgrant. This report also is to provide SLEPA with necessary information on expenditures by approved cost categories and to compare expenditures to the approved project budget.

The information submitted in the Detailed Cost Statement, as well as the supporting accounting records, is subject to both federal and State audit for accuracy, completeness and compliance with the terms of the subgrant award.

The following explanations are to assist in the preparation of the Detailed Cost Statement.

1. The Approved Project Budget amounts must agree with the budget application approved by SLEPA. Any pending requests for budget modifications are not to be included until they are approved in writing by SLEPA.

2. Budget categories for reporting expenditures are the same as those on the project budget.

3. This report must show the expenditure in each category of SLEPA funds, State Buy-in funds, State Share, and subgrantee funds.

4. The section on cumulative expenditures must show all expenditures by cost category and by source of funds, since the beginning of the project.

5. The section on current unpaid obligations must show all unpaid obligations, by cost category and by source of funds, during the current report period.

The following guidelines should be considered when reporting unpaid obligations:

**Category A, Salaries**—Employee salaries earned but not paid during the report period are unpaid obligations.

**Category A, Fringe Benefits**—Any charges for fringe benefits not paid at the end of the report period are considered unpaid obligations.

**Categories B, D, E and F**—Unpaid obligations in these categories can be represented by signed purchase orders or contracts, especially when an encumbrance of funds is involved. Also, unpaid obligations must reflect any costs of services or goods received, but not paid at the end of the report period.

**Category C, Travel**—Unpaid obligations exist in the travel category when actual expenses have been incurred but not paid at the end of the report period.

6. Expenditures must be made from the source of funds (i.e. SLEPA, State Buy-In, State Share, Local) identified in the approved budget. As the end of the project period approaches, an analysis of the actual and projected expenditures by fund source should be made to insure that statutory minimum match funds will be expended. For example, in a 90/10 subgrant, a minimum of 10% of the total actual and projected expenditures must be from matching fund sources.

## III. Cash Report

The purpose of the cash report is to provide SLEPA with necessary information on the receipt and disbursement of funds, and on existing cash balances.

Cash balances must be kept as close as possible to actual cash needs for the succeeding period.

The following explanations refer to items on the Cash Report form.

1. Cash on hand—beginning of the period. This amount must agree with the SLEPA, State Buy-In, and State Share cash on hand (item #6) on the previous report. (State Share pertains ONLY to State Agency grants.)

2. SLEPA, State Buy-in and State Share cash

received during the period. Consideration must be given to funds in-transit. This would include those funds requested on the prior months report but not yet received.

3. SLEPA, State Buy-in and State Share cash disbursed during the period. The amount (item #5) must agree with the reported expenditures of SLEPA State Buy-in and State Share funds reported on the accompanying Detailed Cost Statement.

4. Current unpaid obligations (item #7). This amount must agree with the reported current unpaid obligations of SLEPA, State Buy-in and State Share funds reported on the accompanying Detailed Cost Statement.

The last report submitted in the program period must include any unpaid obligations. These unpaid obligations will be reported as expenditures as they occur during the ninety (90) liquidation period following the project termination.

#### **IV. Cash Request**

The Cash Request is the basis for SLEPA disbursement of both Federal, State Share and State Buy-in funds to subgrantees. To insure that adequate funds are provided to cover the needs of the project, but that cash balances are not in excess of the project needs, subgrantees must report to SLEPA on their anticipated expenditure of funds. This information after cash on hand is deducted, will be the basis for cash disbursements from SLEPA.

It is necessary that all subgrantees estimate their expenditures of SLEPA, State Buy-in and State Share funds in the following manner:

1. Initial funding (SLEPA, State Share and State

Buy-in). Expenditures should be estimated for the first two months of the project. That is, for a project initially funded in June, expenditures should be estimated for June and July.

2. Subsequent funding—Expenditures should be estimated for the next two months. For example, on the Request submitted by July 5 which covers June activity, expenditures should be estimated for July and August. Similarly the August 5 request would have expenditures estimated for August and September.

3. Anticipated expenditures should not include the amount for unpaid obligations reported in the Cash Report section, allowances for unpaid obligations are considered when determining the unobligated cash balance.

4. The unobligated cash on hand is to be deducted from the anticipated expenditures.

#### **V. Certification**

Each report is to be certified by the Project Director and the Finance Officer designated in the approved project application. This certification covers all three sections of the report.

#### **VI. Address for Submitting Reports**

The report is to be sent to the following address:

Fiscal Officer  
SLEPA  
3535 Quakerbridge Road  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

BUDGET REVISION/GRANT EXTENSION REQUEST  
(Submit in Triplicate)

BUDGET CATEGORIES	APPROVED PROJECT BUDGET			PROPOSED TRANSFERS			REQUESTED OPERATING BUDGET		
	SLEPA (FEDERAL)	REQUIRED HARD CASH MATCH		SLEPA (FEDERAL)	REQUIRED HARD CASH MATCH		SLEPA (FEDERAL)	REQUIRED HARD CASH MATCH	
		STATE BUY-IN PROVISION	STATE/LOCAL CASH		STATE BUY-IN PROVISION	STATE/LOCAL CASH		STATE BUY-IN PROVISION	STATE/LOCAL CASH
A. Salaries & Wages									
1. Regular criminal justice personnel									
2. Other Staff									
Fringe Benefits									
B. Purchase of Services									
C. Travel, etc.									
D. Consumable Supplies									
E. Facilities, etc.									
F. Equipment									
G. Indirect Cost									
<b>TOTALS</b>									

86

- 1. Unit of Government \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Implementing Agency \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Project Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Subgrant # \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Project Duration:  
From \_\_\_\_\_  
To \_\_\_\_\_

- 6. Date of Request: \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. GRANT EXTENSION REQUEST  
From \_\_\_\_\_  
To \_\_\_\_\_
- 8. Subgrantee Certification:  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
PROJECT DIRECTOR  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
FINANCIAL OFFICER

FOR SLEPA USE  
Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## INSTRUCTIONS

As stated in the General Conditions attached to all SLEPA grants, the subgrantee is permitted to transfer funds between or within budgetary categories, provided the transfer does not affect any category by an amount in excess of \$100. Any transfer of funds between categories that will exceed \$100 limitation requires prior written approval from SLEPA on this form (SLEPA 108). Any change made to the budget allotment within the discretionary limits of the grantee should be explained on the remarks section of the cash request report which reflects the changes.

The following explanations are to assist in the preparation of the Budget Revision/Grant Extension Request.

1. Budget categories for reporting expenditures are the same as those on the project budget.
2. This request must show proposed changes in each category of SLEPA funds and required cash.
3. When completing the Budget Revision/Grant Extension Request, the columns under the heading *Approved Project Budget* should be used to depict the *present operating budget*. The present operating budget should be either that budget initially approved by the SLEPA Governing Board or, if prior revision(s) have been requested, the latest approved budget modification.
4. Columns headed *Proposed Transfers* are to be used to reflect dollar amounts and categories to be affected by the fund transfer (example: Category A +\$100; Category B -\$100). Changes in the subgrantee share as well as requested transfers of SLEPA funds must be reflected. Note that transferred amounts should total zero.
5. Columns headed *Requested Operating Budget* should reflect the newly proposed budget in its entirety. The total budgeted under SLEPA share should agree with the amount budgeted under *Approved Project Budget*.
6. Upon receipt of written approval of the Grant Revision and/or Extension Request, the proposed budget will become the project's new operating budget. New budgets amounts should be reflected on the subsequent Detailed Cost Statement. Do not report proposed changes prior to receipt of the written approval by SLEPA.

**BUDGET REVISION NARRATIVE:** Subgrantees should add as many continuation pages as necessary to relate the proposed changes to project activities and complete the required justification and explanation of those changes. Explain the sources to be utilized for any additional matching contributions. Enumerate those proposed changes of expenditure items that require prior approval, as specified in Bureau of Budget *Circular A-87, LEAA Financial Guide*, and *SLEPA Applicants Guide*, so prior approval may be considered at the time the request for budget revision is made.

Line items within categories which will be affected by the proposed fund transfer should be detailed in the narrative. Purchase of additional goods or services resulting from the budget modification should be itemized and explained. Goods or services to be deleted or continued at a reduced level in order to accommodate the proposed fund transfer should also be itemized and explained.

**GRANT EXTENSION NARRATIVE:** If a request for grant extension will also involve budget modification, instructions for the budget revision narrative should be followed. Additionally, the extension request must be forwarded to SLEPA prior to termination of the approved subgrant period. In an effort to aid analysis of the extension request, subgrantees are also encouraged to include in the narrative a projection of expenditures through the final approved month of the project. Such a projected cost schedule will provide SLEPA and the subgrantee with a financial basis for determining the length of the extension period.

STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

CONSULTANT REPORTING FORM

Title of Grant \_\_\_\_\_

Subgrant No. \_\_\_\_\_

Unit of Government \_\_\_\_\_

Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

Grant Period

\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Project Director \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

**CONSULTANT**

Agency Name \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant Contact Person \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant Contract Attached  
for SLEPA Approval

Yes  No

Consultant Contract Previously  
submitted for SLEPA Approval

Yes  No

\_\_\_\_\_ If both answers No,  
\_\_\_\_\_ please explain

Consultant Contract Period: \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant Contract Amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

This form to be completed and submitted to the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency by the Subgrantee prior to engaging the services of a Consultant.





**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING**  
**“REQUEST FOR LOCATION OF EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY” FORM:**

**TO:** As shown. For further information call the General Services Administration at 212-264-2620.

**FROM:** Enter requesting agency's name and address.

**CONTACT/PHONE:** Enter the name and telephone number of the person in the requesting agency to be contacted.

**DATE:** Enter the date the form is being submitted to GSA.

This section will be completed by the implementing state/local agency.

**CONTACT DATE:** Enter the date requested for response by GSA.

**ITEM:** Number each different item of equipment sequentially.

**QUANTITY:** Enter quantities for each item.

**UNIT:** Enter standard unit for each item, i.e., ea for each, dz for dozen, etc.

**DESCRIPTION:** Give complete description of each item requested.

This section will be completed by the Federal General Services Administration, Excess Personal Property Division, and the entire form will then be returned to you.

**NOTE:** If additional space is needed to complete the front of this form, kindly submit additional forms.

Request # \_\_\_\_\_

Functional Category \_\_\_\_\_

**REQUEST FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

1. Name of Organization – Address:
  
2. Specific Problem to be Addressed:
  
3. Type of Assistance Needed: (Training, publications, studies, conferences, on site consultation, etc.)
  
4. Expertise, Qualifications, Special skills required if need is for Professional Service:
  
5. Estimated number of Technical Assistance person days needed: \_\_\_\_\_
  
6. Date when Assistance Needed: \_\_\_\_\_
  
7. Organizations, if any, whose concurrence or cooperation is required:
  
8. Expected results:
  
9. Recommendations for Organizations or Sources of Assistance:
  
10. Funds available if assistance requires payment for service:
  
11. Your Agency Contact Person for Technical Assistance:  
  
Name:  
Address:  
  
Phone:

STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

MONTHLY REPORT OF PROGRAM INCOME

Subgrantee

Subgrant No.

Amount of Program Income Earned for this Period \_\_\_\_\_

Amount Previously Reported \_\_\_\_\_

Total Program Income Earned to Date \_\_\_\_\_

Less: Expenditures made over and above the Subgrant Budget paid with Program Income Fund

A. Salaries and Wages

1. Regular Criminal Justice Personnel \_\_\_\_\_

2. Other Staff \_\_\_\_\_

Fringe Benefits \_\_\_\_\_

B. Purchase of Services \_\_\_\_\_

C. Travel \_\_\_\_\_

D. Consumable Supplies \_\_\_\_\_

E. Facilities \_\_\_\_\_

F. Equipment \_\_\_\_\_

G. Indirect Cost \_\_\_\_\_

Amount of Program Income Available \* \_\_\_\_\_

\*All Program Income not utilized for grant purpose during the grant period will be applied as a reduction of total project costs after the termination of the grant.

Subgrantee Certification

\_\_\_\_\_  
Project Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Financial Officer



# NEW JERSEY STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

JOHN J. MULLANEY  
*Executive Director*

HAROLD F. DAMON  
*Deputy Director*

## ADMINISTRATION UNIT

RONALD D. SOST  
*Assistant Director*

Ronald J. Pizzullo  
Chief Fiscal Officer  
Frederick P. Schrenk  
Assistant Fiscal Officer  
Vincent M. Pennacchi  
John J. Roman  
Technical Specialist  
Venita Broughton  
Research Assistant

**Auditing Section**  
Robert J. Caccese  
Supervisor  
Michael J. Boccanfuso  
Kathleen Coury  
George J. Gallon  
Catherine L. Keegan  
Ann L. Osborn  
Cynthia L. Rogers

**Bookkeeping Section**  
Raymond E. Elmer  
Lois M. Hackney  
Ervin J. Kovacs  
Gert T. Kowalski  
Linda T. Dunn  
June Connor  
Claudia Currie  
Mary L. Martinez  
Jean Anderson

**Office Administration & Supplies**  
Martin J. Wallace  
Supervisor  
Luke J. Horvath  
Assistant

## OPERATIONS UNIT

BERNICE L. MANSHEL  
*Assistant Director*

### Adult Corrections & Rehabilitation

Ulric A. Brandt  
Chief  
Rosemary Dempsey  
Richard Lettiere  
Ernestine Ingram  
Charles Leone

### Police

Thomas J. O'Reilly  
Chief  
Alan P. Beck  
Alvin J. Beveridge  
Karl Koehler  
Edward Rowland  
Communications  
Specialist  
Frank Devine

### Courts/ Ancillary Services

John H. C. West  
Chief  
Felix M. Cabarle  
William Bostic

### Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention

Terry L. Edwards  
Program Supervisor  
Wilma Solomon  
Planning Supervisor  
Arnold Cohen  
Giles T. Dunn  
Dennis O'Hara  
Margaret Williams  
Karen Walsh

### Standards & Goals

Edward P. Strapp  
Project Director  
S. Deon Henson  
Martha A. Lackey  
Curtis A. Woods

## PLANNING UNIT

DONALD J. APAI  
*Assistant Director*

B. Randolph Linthurst  
Coordinator of Public  
Information  
Lorrie Wendruff  
Research Assistant

### Planning Section

Stephen B. Faluvegi  
Supervising Planner  
Planners  
William J. Hoffman  
Robert A. Muller  
Joyce G. Salisbury  
Kenneth Modzelwski

### Evaluation Team

William J. Brennan  
Principal Researcher  
Gary J. Walters  
Linda Woltman  
Stefanie M. Barth  
Mark Geller

## SECRETARIAL STAFF

Verna N. Byrne, *Executive Secretary*

Julie M. Anderson  
Roseann M. DiGaetano  
Ann DeMuzio  
Lillian Edolo  
JoAnn Haney  
Elizabeth A. Innocenzi

Nelida Lopez  
Dolores A. McPhillips  
Corinne Innocenzi  
Arlene Rowland  
Joyce Robers  
Celeste C. Russo

Sharon M. Senzick  
Jean M. Tafrow  
Diane Cardaciotto  
Karen Costello  
Ellen Beth Middleton  
Chris Pompei

