

974-901

P153

C.2

PROPERTY OF  
NEW JERSEY STATE LIBRARY

APR 30 1971

185 W. State Street  
Trenton, N. J.

ANNUAL REPORT

State of New Jersey

Department of Institutions and Agencies

Division of Correction and Parole

BUREAU OF PAROLE

135 West Hanover Street, Trenton

(July 1, 1969 - June 30, 1970)

Fred E. Haley  
Supervising Parole Officer

Domenick Sparaino  
Supervising Parole Officer

Nat R. Arluke, Chief  
Bureau of Parole

## INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Parole has the responsibility to conduct investigations for both parole and clemency matters, to provide supervision and submit reports concerning persons paroled from training schools, correctional and penal institutions in New Jersey, and persons paroled from similar institutions of other states to reside in New Jersey. In addition, the Bureau is responsible for the periodical investigations and recording of inmates involved in the Work-Release program.

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

## DEVELOPMENTS

A. Night Reporting. The extension of the supervision and investigation processes beyond the normal working day, initiated three years ago informally on the district office level, continues to expand to the extent that each district office is involved, resulting in increased validity of reports, closer contact with family members of parolees, better relations with law enforcement agencies, and a respectful and in some cases a more appreciative attitude by parolees. This program supplements regular night office reporting hours for certain specified cases, or as the need for supervision require, but eliminates traditional office reporting as a condition of parole.

B. Community Residential Facility. The Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility opened in December, 1969, in a low-income housing project in Jersey City with a staff of five dedicated parole officers on a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week schedule.

The objective of P.R.O.O.F. is to provide a diagnostic prescription for the field district parole offices' use. Each individual received at P.R.O.O.F. has a special problem making the major role of P.R.O.O.F. that of observation and diagnosis as its staff set out to try to solve the immediate and sometime secondary problems of the individual through utilizing community resources and providing concentrated services through re-education and re-training with the goal in mind of returning the man to the community where he could involve himself as a productive element.

During the year, the services of P.R.O.O.F. were made available to 74 parolees who had been referred by the nine district parole offices. The greatest number were received from the Jersey City, Newark, and Atlantic City areas. The length of stay varied from less than one week to more than two months with the majority remaining for one month or less.

In addition to employment opportunities and room and board, services offered residents while at P.R.O.O.F. covered a wide area with specialized counselling the most frequently provided service. This, combined with the team approach and individual casework of the field officers, offers an opportunity to understand better the parolee and his problems so that his energies might be directed toward making him a better functioning citizen in the community. P.R.O.O.F. also serves as a training and orientation center for parole officers.

### C. Specialized Caseloads.

1. Narcotic Users (2 caseloads in different areas of New Jersey). This includes parolees from training schools for Boys, Jamesburg, Training School for Girls, Trenton, and the Youth Correctional Institution complex, living in Essex and Monmouth Counties, to include those who have a history of narcotic usage without regard for the actual adjudication (i.e. although the adjudication may have been for Juvenile Delinquency (Petty Theft), the narcotic involvement actuated the legal action). The program will provide intensive individual and group counselling with the parolee, supplemented by increased qualitative contacts with family members, employers, school officials, community treatment facilities, etc. The caseload is limited to 20 and will be compared with a randomly selected control group with similar backgrounds.

A comparison of the experimental caseload vis-a-vis the control caseload, shows (a) an arrest rate three to four times higher in the control group; (b) contacts with the client, family, friends, employer, school, etc., averaged almost three times as many for the specialized caseload; (c) almost a 30% increase in the employment record of the specialized caseload with a similar corresponding increase in the number enrolled and engaged in community-provided training programs.

2. Mothers of Out-of-Wedlock Children. This caseload is composed of female parolees from the Training School for Girls, Trenton, living in Essex County who, in addition to the reason for adjudication, are mothers of out-of-wedlock children. The program will provide intensive counselling and supervision with the accent on an attempt to stimulate re-education through public and private facilities available in the community in order to create healthier attitudes as they relate to their children, to the relationships with their boy friends, and with family members, and toward family services in general. The caseload is limited to 15 with a similar control caseload in an adjoining district office.

A comparison of the experimental caseload vis-a-vis the control caseload, is rather disappointing as a result of a

number of changes in supervisory personnel and reorganization of the experimental and control caseloads, resulting in a lack of valid statistical information from which conclusions may be reached. Additional experience is required to determine the success or lack of success in this area. The only factor we can legitimately determine at this time is that discharge from parole supervision has been accomplished with the experimental group at twice the rate in the control group, indicating that response to the intensive helping and counseling program has produced more persons in the experimental group who are able to manage their lives in a socially acceptable manner.

3. Prior Parole Violators (3 caseloads in different areas of New Jersey). This caseload consists of male juvenile commitments on parole 16 years of age or older and not attending school, living in Essex and Monmouth Counties, who were on parole on a prior adjudication, but who were returned to the institution on that prior parole by reason of a new adjudication or for technical violations. Normally supersophisticated in the areas of police authority, the court process, institutional treatment, and parole supervision, it is felt that an intensive treatment process might be productive of an increased motivation to remain in the community. The caseload is limited to 20 with a similarly constructed control caseload.

Intensive supervision of the experimental caseload has produced an arrest rate approximately 70% lower than the control group, an employment rate 40% higher, home, office, school, family and employment contacts averaged five times as many as in the control group, agency referrals were 70% higher, while failure on parole was significantly higher in the control group. It is interesting to note that enrollment in high school and community colleges is obviously apparent in the experimental group with none enrolled in the control group.

#### D. Work-Release Program.

The introduction of the work-release program provided for the release of inmates to a community work program and return to the parent institution at the completion of the workday. This necessitated weekly reporting by a member of the Parole staff for a three-week period followed by a report every three weeks thereafter. It also required the prior investigating and reporting of the potential work opportunity and directed that potential opportunities be developed for future work-releesees. During the year, approximately 220 inmates in the program were reported upon from the district offices located in Red Bank, Elizabeth, Atlantic City and Trenton with the majority of the cases from the Trenton office.

E. Caseload Growth. During the year the total cases under supervision in New Jersey climbed from 5351 to 5759, a numerical increase of 408 (7.6%). The average percentage of growth each year over the past ten years was 3.4%. In addition to the 5759 cases under supervision in New Jersey, there were 264 cases being supervised in other states for New Jersey. The greatest increase in growth is in the Jersey City and Red Bank offices, with a lesser increase in Atlantic City, Camden and Clifton offices, a somewhat greater increase in the Newark offices, and a leveling off in the Elizabeth and Trenton offices.

F. Health Services Fund. Budgetary approval was granted of \$5,000 to fill the need for narcotic use detection costs as a result of unscheduled testing of parolees, to purchase clinical services for parolees (particularly in crises situations) in the community where a relatively long delay may result from non-fee clinical services. This fund was consumed in its entirety by the nine district offices and its value was confirmed as a positive use in the detection, treatment, and deterrant value of narcotic abuse cases and in the capability of continuing parolees in the community through the purchase of services rather than returning them to an institution as the only alternative.

G. Professional Development Program. This program was designed to provide full pay for a 16-month full time scholarship at Rutgers University leading to a Master's Degree in Social Work and was utilized by five staff members who are scheduled to graduate in December, 1970.

H. Capital Developments. After a year and a half of seeking for adequate quarters for the Camden Office, which was destroyed by fire, a new building was provided in May of 1970 and the office was finally occupied on that date.

I. Projects. In August, 1969, a request for funds was submitted for a project, "Proposal for an Exploratory Study in the Description of Parole Supervision Techniques." This project had as its objective to classify and measure parole techniques to determine the effectiveness of the various techniques either generally or with characteristics of specific parolees. Shortly thereafter, the project was funded and at the close of the fiscal year was still in operation.

At about the same time a proposal was submitted by the Department of Sociology of Rutgers University entitled, "The Socializing Effect and Capabilities of Wives and Girl Friends of Offenders." This was also approved and at the end of the fiscal year had not been completed.

## TRAINING

The Master Training Plan was tailored to produce a viable program at the level where it would have the greatest impact. It separated the training methods into groups involving seven levels of training activities, experience, materials and resources as follows:

Group I. Bureau orientation classes for new officers were scheduled twice during the year, on the basis of five full-day sessions which included tours of the correctional institutions. Contact was totally informational with, and accent on, audience exchange and participation, leaving processes and procedures for on-the-job training in the field district offices.

Division orientation of one day was attended by all new employees.

Group II. In-service training sessions for all parole officers with less than five years of experience were held on a regional basis during the months of September, November, February and April to provide the means, methods and preparation for achieving immediate goals.

Group III. Forty-two officers and trainees participated on a selective basis in the third grouping of training activities that developed the decision-making process by involving the officers in a variety of specific roles, requiring analysis, evaluation and comment (feed-back).

Twenty-eight members of the Division Line Employees Training Program spent "a day with a parole officer" in one of the various parole districts.

Group IV. The Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility was utilized for a graduate level credit course entitled, "The Community: Its Social and Organizational Structure," tuition free, one evening a week for nine parole officers, two Hudson County Probation officers, two Jersey City policemen, a lieutenant from the Hudson County Sheriff's Office, and the Superintendent of the Hudson County Youth House.

Quarterly training meetings of the entire institutional parole staff of each institution were held to standardize approach and to provide opportunity to resolve difficulties through experiences of the group.

Eight officers participated in the Division Group Counseling Workshop Series. The Rutgers School of Alcohol Studies, three weeks scholarship, was utilized by several officers.

Bi-monthly meetings of the senior parole officers, responsible for training, were held at P.R.O.O.F. for the purpose of coordinating and accenting the importance of the task to structure their active involvement in the training process.

Training Activities - Five parole officers attended a course on Alcohol and Narcotics Education which was sponsored by the Department of Criminal Justice out of Trenton State College with L.E.E.P. funds.

Group V. The New Jersey Welfare Council's Annual Institute at Asbury Park, New Jersey, was attended by 23 selected staff members. The Annual Health Education Workshop in Montclair was attended by 12 staff members of the two Newark offices.

There was one parole officer selected by the Bureau and the Rutgers Admissions Committee for the Professional Development Program leading to a Master's Degree in social work, who received his MSW.

Group VI. Great emphasis was placed on involving all supervisory personnel in Management Training Programs, using as resources: the Civil Service sponsored Management Course, Division sponsored Management Training Seminar, and University and College institutes.

Mr. Arluke was appointed as a member of the Project Training Advisory Board to develop models of in-service training for staff dealing with juveniles, and preventive, rehabilitative and control settings.

Group VII. A Civil Service sponsored inter-departmental secretarial training and refresher course was offered to the stenographic staff.

## PERSONNEL

On July 1, 1969, there were 103 budgeted parole officer positions in the nine districts (an increase of four over last year), 5 parole officer positions in the institutional parole offices (no change over last year), and 3 parole officer positions assigned to P.R.O.O.F., the community residence facility in Jersey City, totaling 111 positions of which 11 were females.

The supervisory staff was composed of the Chief, 5 supervising parole officers (an increase of one), 9 district parole supervisors (no change), 11 assistant district supervisors (no change), 7 senior institutional parole officers (no change), and 9 field senior parole officers (an increase of 5 as a result of Federally funded specialized caseloads).

The clerical staff was comprised of 6 principal clerk-stenographers, 13 senior clerk-stenographers (an increase of one), 46 clerk-stenographers (an increase of one), and 3 clerk trainees (an increase of 3), totaling 68 (an increase of 5).

During the year there were 32 resignations (an increase of 4) of professional staff as follows: 13 accepted higher paying positions with other allied agencies or in private industry; 1 promoted to a position in Division of Correction and Parole; 5 returned to graduate school; 3 moved out of state; 1 returned to teaching position; 3 not suited for parole work; 2 replaced from temporary employment; 4 personal reasons.

### Personnel Chart

	<u>Chief</u>	<u>SPO</u>	<u>DPS</u>	<u>ADPS</u>	<u>Sr.P.O.</u>	<u>P.O.</u>	<u>PCS</u>	<u>SCS</u>	<u>CS</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>Total</u>
C.O.	1	5					1	2			9
DO#1			1	1	1	11	1		4		19
DO#2			1	2	1	16	1	1	5		27
DO#3			1	1	1	12		1	5		21
DO#4			1	1	1	12	1		5		21
DO#5			1	1	1	9		1	3	1	17
DO#6			1	1	1	10		1	4		18
DO#7			1	1	1	10	1		4		18
DO#8			1	1	1	8		1	3		15
DO#9			1	2	1	15	1	1	5	1	27
Sub-totals	1	5	9	11	9	103	6	8	38	2	192
IPO-SHB					1	1		1	1		4
IPO-SHG					1				1		2
IPO-RA					1			1			2
IPO-NJR					1				1		2
IPO-YRCC					1	2		1	1	1	6
IPO-RFW					1				1		2
IPO-NJSP					1	2		2	2		7
Sub-totals					7	5		5	7	1	25
PROOF						3			1		4
Grand Total	1	5	9	11	16	111	6	13	46	3	221

SPO - Supervising Parole Officer  
 DPS - District Parole Supervisor  
 ADPS - Assistant District Parole Supervisor  
 PCS - Principal Clerk Stenographer  
 SCS - Senior Clerk Stenographer  
 CT - Clerical Trainee

DISCHARGED PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF MAXIMUM

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

State Prison Complex .....	16
Youth Correctional Institution - Yardville .....	52
- Bordentown .....	136
- Annandale .....	142
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg .....	130
Training School for Girls, Trenton .....	74
Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton .....	27
	<u>577</u>

In addition to the 577 discharged by recommendation, 1233 parolees completed their maximum sentences on parole, and supervision was terminated on 1435 by reason of new commitment, return as parole violator, and death.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

As a result of referrals to agencies including Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Rural Youth Conservation, Manpower Development and Training, etc., it was determined that as of the end of June, 1970, 730 parolees had been accepted in the various E.O.A. Programs. This represents an increase of 66 cases over last year.

PAROLEE EARNINGS (CALENDAR YEAR 1969)

During the calendar year 1969, 8323 parolees under supervision in New Jersey earned \$12,137,984, an increase of \$1,082,099 over the earnings of 1968. The number of individuals under supervision in 1969 increased by 194 over 1968.

Sixty-four per cent (5,316) of those under supervision during the year were classified as employed (worked all or part of period under supervision which period of supervision could be from one week to the full year) and 17% (1,453) were unemployed throughout their entire period of supervision, although employable. The other 19% (1,554) were classified as unemployable by reason of being missing or in custody for the entire period of supervision during the year, or attending school, being engaged in homemaking, or being incapacitated. The rates for the past five years follow:

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Employed	68%	68%	64%	63%	64%
Unemployed	14%	14%	16%	15%	17%
Unemployable	18%	18%	20%	22%	19%

It should be noted that 39% of the 8,323 parolees supervised were under supervision for a period of from 10 months to

the full year in 1969; 17% from 7 months to 9 months; 20% from 4 months to 6 months; and 24% from 1 day to 3 months.

From facts available it is impossible to establish a meaningful average of parolee earnings, but for comparative purposes the average earnings of employed parolees are presented:

1965 - \$1,608   1966 - \$1,723   1967 - \$1,925   1968 - \$2,143  
1969 - \$2,283

### GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Current limited experience with the operation of the parole community residential facility would indicate that expansion of this type of operation brings into focus round-the-clock supervision, intensive interaction, and total community involvement of parolee and parole officer.

Experience with specialized caseloads accenting parolee characteristics and specific treatment techniques indicates that much more may be accomplished.

The expanding of work hours outside of the normal routine hours, conducted on a limited experimental basis, offers a further expansion of the potentialities of increasing the quality of supervision.

Minimum fund requirements are being investigated in order to initiate a career-oriented program for the use of Parole Aides and of Community Volunteers.

### CASELOADS (SEE TABLES #1 AND #1A ATTACHED)

As of June 30, 1970, the Bureau was responsible for 6025 parolees, an increase of 424 cases on the same date the previous year. Yet, totally, the Bureau handled 152 more cases during the year than the preceding year (9444 in 1969-70 as against 9292 in 1968-69). The total cases handled in 1969-70 is an increase of 11.7% over those handled in 1965-66.

A. Under Supervision in New Jersey. At the close of fiscal year 1968-69, there were 5362 parolees under supervision in New Jersey, to which were added 3642 during the year 1969-70, for a total number of 9004 parolees supervised. This was an increase of .6% over the total number supervised in New Jersey the year before. This figure shows that the trend of increased cases each year continues to exist.

#### B. New Jersey Cases Being Supervised by Other States.

During fiscal year 1969-70, 163 cases were added to the 197 already under supervision in other states, for a total of 360 supervised during the year. This was an increase of 33% supervised the prior year. On June 30, 1970, there were 216 parolees from New Jersey under supervision in other states. This reverses the trend in the decreasing number of New Jersey cases supervised out-of-state which has existed since 1964.

C. Central Office Special File. This category includes those cases not the responsibility of any New Jersey District Office, or any other states, thus responsibility falls upon the Central Parole Office. In this category are cases paroled to other states, but became missing, those paroled to out-of-state warrants, certain cases incarcerated in out-of-state institutions, and deportation cases. During the fiscal year 1969-70, 28 cases were added to the 52 in this category at the beginning of the year, for a total of 80 cases. At the end of the fiscal year, there were 50 cases in this category, showing a decrease of 10 cases from the previous year on the same date.

D. Average Caseload in New Jersey. One hundred and three field parole officers supervised 5759 parolees as of June 30, 1970. The male portion of this caseload (5386 cases) was supervised by 92 male parole officers for an average caseload of 58. The female caseload (373 cases) supervised by 11 female parole officers, averaged 34 cases per officer. Six senior parole officers supervise an average caseload of 20 specialized cases under a Federally funded program. In addition to caseload supervision, each officer is required to complete pre-parole investigations, special investigations, occasional pre-sentence reports, and clemency investigations.

The average caseload for the male parole officer increased from 55 to the present 58, and the female caseload decreased from 44 to 34 in the past year.

## SUPERVISION

To discharge their responsibilities in supervising parolees and in completing assigned investigations, parole officers in 1969-70 made 418,657 contacts as compared to 396,979 contacts in 1968-69. This represents an increase of 5.4%. On the basis of the number of field parole officers in service, these figures show the average number of contacts decreased from 4348 to 4064 contacts per parole officer.

Included in the total figure of contacts from 1969-70, there were 51,159 home visits (compared to 50,235 last year);

52,157 community contacts, other than employment or school (46,711 last year); 3,244 employment visits (3,191 last year); and 1,071 school visits (1,527 last year).

The efforts of the parole officers resulted in the submission of 38,755 reports, including 32,100 supervision reports and 6,655 investigation reports in 1969-70 as contrasted to 39,024 total reports, 32,962 supervision reports and 6,062 investigation reports in 1968-69.

The districts reported traveling 511,023 total miles in supervision of parolees and in completing investigations.

In meeting their responsibilities, the institutional parole offices accounted for 5149 pre-parole interviews, 2925 inmate requested interviews, 922 report encapsulations for the Boards of Managers, 939 violator interviews, 2014 admission reports, 451 parole classes, and 105 orientation classes.

### RETURNS TO INSTITUTIONS (SEE TABLES #2, #2A, AND #2B)

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during the year 1969-70 showed there was a 1.5% increase in relation to that year's caseload (14%) as compared to 1968-69 (12.5%).

The year 1969-70 had the lowest per cent of returns for new commitments (5.4%) in the last 5 years, as compared to the highest rate (7.6%) in 1965-66 period. Conversely, the year 1969-70 had the highest rate of returns for technical violations (8.7%) in the past five years as compared to the lowest rate during this period (6.6%) in 1967-68 and 1968-69.

In 1969-70 female parolees (6.9% of female caseload) received fewer commitments (1.0%) and less returns for technical violations (5.9%) than male parolees (14.6%). New commitments for males accounted for 5.7% of the returns, and technical violations accounted for 8.9%.

### MISSING CASES (SEE TABLES #3 AND #3A)

The number of missing cases continues to increase. For the past three years as of June 30, missing cases rose from 462 to 499 to 530, representing respectively 8.2% of the total Bureau caseload to 8.9% to 9.1%. Parolees from the Training School for Girls accounted for the largest per cent of missing cases (21.0%) in relation to respective caseloads, followed by Correctional Institution for Women 17%, and State Prison 13.1%. In descending order, the other institutions show the following:

Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown - 12.1%; State Hospitals (sex offenders) - 8.5%; Training School for Boys, Jamesburg - 6.7%; Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale - 5.4%; and Youth Reception and Correction Center - 5.0%.

jm  
3-30-71  
Att.

**TABLE #1**

**TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - 1969 - 1970 (By Institutions)**

	IN NEW JERSEY			IN OTHER STATES				CENTRAL OFFICE SPECIAL FILE				TOTAL	
	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/69	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1969-1970	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/70	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/69	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1969-1970	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/70	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/69	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1969-1970	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/70	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/70
TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS	224	58	282	179	1	1	2	0	1	2	3	2	181
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN	239	100	339	178	13	13	26	16	3	3	6	3	197
TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS, JAMESBURG	704	379	1083	669	4	4	8	5	3	0	3	0	674
YOUTH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION COMPLEX													
ANNANDALE	950	731	1681	1053	20	17	37	16	2	2	4	3	1072
BORDENTOWN	1326	797	2123	1341	48	37	85	53	9	6	15	10	1404
YOUTH RECEPTION & CORRECTION CTR.	465	615	1080	805	17	27	44	30	5	2	7	3	838
STATE PRISON	983	709	1692	1066	86	61	147	88	28	13	41	29	1183
PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS (Sex offenders)	60	5	65	59	8	3	11	8	1	0	1	0	67
OUT-OF-STATE CASES IN N. J.													
FEMALE	21	12	33	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
MALE	390	236	626	393	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	393
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5362</b>	<b>3642</b>	<b>9004</b>	<b>5759</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>6025</b>
UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/69	5362				197				52				5611
TOTAL CASES ADDED		3642				163				28			3833
TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1969-1970			9004				360				80		9444
UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/70				5759				216				50	6025

**TABLE #1A**

**NUMBER OF PAROLEES SUPERVISED  
5 Year Comparison - (1966 - 1970)**

1965 - 1966	1966 - 1967	1967 - 1968	1968 - 1969	1969 - 1970
8,454	8,773	8,988	9,292	9,444
+ 2.2%	+ 3.8%	+ 2.9%	+ 3.4%	+ 1.6%
+ 11.7%				

**T A B L E # 2**

**NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS  
BY DISTRICT AND SEX**

**Based on Total Number Supervised**

**1969 - 1970**

*M a l e*

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED DURING YEAR	NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS				T O T A L S	
		COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED		RETURNED AS TECHNICAL VIOLATOR		NUMBER	PER CENT
1. CLIFTON .....	952	84	8.8%	77	8.1%	161	16.9%
2. NEWARK (1) .....	1163	46	4.0%	101	8.6%	147	12.6%
3. RED BANK .....	1176	43	3.6%	172	14.6%	215	18.2%
4. JERSEY CITY .....	1173	91	7.7%	77	6.6%	168	14.3%
5. ELIZABETH .....	826	44	5.3%	108	13.1%	152	18.4%
6. TRENTON .....	782	68	8.7%	35	4.3%	103	13.0%
7. CAMDEN .....	782	43	5.4%	61	7.8%	104	13.2%
8. ATLANTIC CITY .....	688	38	5.5%	72	10.4%	110	15.9%
9. NEWARK (2) .....	1117	58	5.1%	84	7.5%	142	12.6%
10. IN OTHER STATES .....	332	2	0.6%	15	4.5%	17	5.1%
11. CENTRAL OFFICE (Special File) .....	71	1	1.4%	8	11.2%	9	12.6%
<b>TOTAL MALE</b>	<b>9062</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>1328</b>	<b>14.6%</b>

*F e m a l e*

1. CLIFTON .....	83	3	3.6%	1	1.2%	4	4.8%
2. NEWARK (1) .....	102	1	0.9%	11	10.7%	12	11.7%
3. RED BANK .....	81	0	0	4	4.9%	4	4.9%
4. JERSEY CITY .....	49	0	0	5	10.2%	5	10.2%
5. ELIZABETH .....	58	1	1.7%	3	5.1%	4	6.8%
6. TRENTON .....	86	1	1.1%	2	2.3%	3	3.4%
7. CAMDEN .....	51	0	0	3	5.8%	3	5.8%
8. ATLANTIC CITY .....	59	0	0	6	10.1%	6	10.1%
9. NEWARK (2) .....	114	1	0.8%	6	5.2%	7	6.1%
10. IN OTHER STATES .....	28	0	0	2	7.1%	2	7.1%
11. CENTRAL OFFICE (Special File) .....	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FEMALE</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>6.9%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>9782</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>1378</b>	<b>14.0%</b>

**T A B L E # 2 A**

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

**By District**

**1969 - 1970**

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED	COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED	TECHNICAL VIOLATORS	TOTAL
1. CLIFTON .....	1035	8.4%	7.5%	15.9%
2. NEWARK (1) .....	1265	3.7%	8.8%	12.5%
3. RED BANK .....	1257	3.4%	14.0%	17.4%
4. JERSEY CITY .....	1222	7.4%	6.7%	14.1%
5. ELIZABETH .....	884	5.0%	12.0%	17.0%
6. TRENTON .....	868	7.9%	4.0%	11.9%
7. CAMDEN .....	833	5.1%	7.0%	12.1%
8. ATLANTIC CITY .....	747	5.0%	10.0%	15.0%
9. NEWARK (2) .....	1231	4.7%	7.3%	12.0%
10. IN OTHER STATES .....	360	0.5%	4.7%	5.2%
11. CENTRAL OFFICE (Special File) .....	80	1.2%	10.0%	11.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9782</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>14.0%</b>

**T A B L E # 2 B**

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

**5 Year Comparison**

**1966 - 1970**

COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED					TECHNICAL VIOLATORS					T O T A L				
1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
7.6	6.6	5.8	5.9	5.4	6.9	7.0	6.6	6.6	8.7	14.5	13.6	12.4	12.5	14.0

**TABLE #3**  
**RECORD OF MISSING CASES**  
**By Institution**  
**1969 - 1970**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I N S T I T U T I O N	MISSING AS OF 6/30/69	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/69 AND 6/30/70	TOTAL MISSING - COLUMNS 1 PLUS 2	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/69 AND 6/30/70	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/70 - COLUMN 3 LESS COLUMN 4	N E T DIFFERENCE	P E R C E N T O F I N C R E A S E	P E R C E N T O F M I S S I N G I N R E L A T I O N T O C A S E L O A D O N 6/30/70
TRAINING SCHOOL FOR GIRLS .....	47	19	66	28	38	- 9	-19.1%	21.0%
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN .....	33	32	65	34	31	- 2	- 6.0%	17.0%
TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS, JAMESBURG .....	35	79	114	69	45	+10	+28.7%	6.7%
YOUTH CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION COMPLEX								
ANNANDALE .....	52	107	159	102	57	+5	+9.6%	5.4%
BORDENTOWN .....	151	209	360	197	163	+12	+7.9%	12.1%
YOUTH RECEPTION & CORRECTION CENTER .....	12*	73	85	38	47	+35	+ 291.6%*	5.0%
STATE PRISON .....	136	94	230	90	140	+4	+2.9%	13.1%
PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS (Sex offenders) .....	3	4	7	2	5	+2	+66.6%	8.5%
OUT-OF-STATE								
FEMALE .....	0	3	3	2	1	+1	+100.0%	0.6%
MALE .....	3	19	22	19	3	0	0	0.7%
<b>T O T A L</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>1111</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>+58</b>	<b>+12.2%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>

\*Youth Reception and Correction Center was opened 1/2/68.

**TABLE #3A**

**RECORD OF MISSING CASES  
By District  
1969 - 1970**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DISTRICT	MISSING AS OF 6/30/69	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/69 AND 6/30/70	TOTAL MISSING - COLUMNS 1 PLUS 2	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/69 AND 6/30/70	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/70 - COLUMN 3 LESS COLUMN 4	NET DIFFERENCE	PER CENT OF INCREASE	PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/70
1. CLIFTON .....	57	94	151	99	52	- 5	- 8.7%	5.0%
2. NEWARK (1) .....	71	106	177	98	79	+8	+11.2%	6.2%
3. RED BANK .....	55	47	102	51	51	- 4	- 7.2%	4.0%
4. JERSEY CITY .....	70	97	167	84	83	+13	+18.5%	6.7%
5. ELIZABETH .....	40	72	112	51	61	+21	+52.5%	6.9%
6. TRENTON .....	34	37	71	33	38	+4	+11.7%	4.3%
7. CAMDEN .....	21	39	60	31	29	+8	+38.0%	3.4%
8. ATLANTIC CITY .....	25	21	46	25	21	- 4	- 16.0%	2.8%
9. NEWARK (2) .....	75	100	175	86	89	+14	+18.6%	7.2%
10. CENTRAL OFFICE (Special File) .....	24	26	50	23	27	+3	+12.5%	54.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>1111</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>+ 58</b>	<b>+12.2%</b>	<b>9.1%</b>