

474.901
P153
C.3

75

NEW JERSEY STATE LIBRARY
PROPERTY OF
JAN 10 1976
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, 1974 - June 30, 1975)

Nat R. Arluke, Chief
Bureau of Parole

Domenick Sparaino
Supervising Parole Officer

New Jersey State Library

I N D E X

Introduction	Page 1
Goals and Objectives	Page 1
Developments	Page 2
Personnel	Page 3
Training	Page 4
Parole Resource Office and Orientation Facility	Page 5
Volunteers in Parole Program	Page 8
Specialized Caseloads Project	Page 10
The Community ReOrientation Program	Page 12
Parolee Earnings	Page 12
Discharged Prior to Expiration of Maximum	Page 13
Economic Opportunity Act	Page 13
Casebook Reviews	Page 13
Probable Cause Hearings	Page 14
Social Events	Page 14
Public Relations	Page 14
Caseloads	Page 15
Returns to Institutions	Page 16
Missing Cases	Page 16
Supervision	Page 17
Institutional Parole Activities	Page 17

INTRODUCTION

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

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

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1. Reduction of Caseload Size: Progress continues to be made in this area because of a continued lowering of intake of parolees, and by reason of the decision eliminating same sex supervision by parole officers thus equalizing caseloads [female caseloads were smaller], resulting in maintaining the ratio of parole officer to parolees of one to 53.

2. Improvement in Physical Facilities: All district office facilities remain under adequate lease contracts with the exception of the Atlantic City office, where negotiations for a new lease at a new location are still pending. Facilities at the Central Office have not improved.

3. Streamlining of Paper Work Processes continues at a rather slow pace. In order to accomplish our goal to expedite the process, to revitalize and update the many requirements, a full-time position should be created.

4. Improving Quality of Service to Clients and to the Community:
(a) Expansion of specialized caseloads from currently Federally funded nine caseloads to include special supervision based on specific parolee problems rather than geographical areas. (b) Increase in parolee supervision span to include continued supervision during other than regular business hours. (c) "Hot-line" emergency communication arrangement. (d) Inauguration of team supervision in each district [March, 1975].

5. Community Involvement: (a) Increased utilization of current Volunteers in Parole Program. (b) Expansion of community-based parole facility from the one in Jersey City to another, hopefully, in Central Jersey when funds become available.

6. Staff Selection and Retention: (a) Continue efforts to upgrade salaries competitive with other agencies in related fields. (b) Institute personality testing programs to eliminate persons who are unsuited to this type of employment. (c) Provide increased promotional opportunities to retain personnel who now are accepting other outside opportunities.

(d) Provide a program of professional development which will permit educational leave with full pay for up to two years, will provide a temporary replacement to cover the caseload of the person on leave, and then to offer a promotional opportunity in the Bureau following successful completion of the educational leave.

DEVELOPMENTS

Bureau Employees' Credit Union started two and one-half years ago, has continued its growth to include a membership of over 57 percent of the total Bureau staff and assets of \$37,000. Added privileges of members include special discounts on gifts, household items, special car insurance rates, and available immediate loans.

Caseload Size continued to fall during the year with an indication of a rising trend at the end of the year. It is anticipated that the total caseload will begin to climb steadily as the result of increased admissions to most of the correctional institutions.

Same Sex Supervision policy was reversed by a directive of Commissioner Ann Klein dated January 31, 1975, as follows: All parolees shall be supervised by parole officers without regard to the sex of the parolees or parole officers.

Security of Office Equipment continues as a potential problem as break-ins continue to occur. The unavailability of insurance coverage poses a problem when the necessity to replace stolen typewriters and dictating equipment becomes a reality.

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

Mini-Grant Program. On April 17, 1974, the Mini Grant Program commenced when \$1,500 was received from SLEPA, and apportioned to our nine district offices and PROOF. By December 31, 1974, the fund assisted 176 parolees - and was depleted.

On March 19, 1975, the Mini Grant Program was extended by a SLEPA grant in the amount of \$5,961 and this program was terminated on July 1, 1975. An additional 328 parolees were aided by grants.

The primary reason for granting assistance was transportation, either to seek employment or until first salary received. Other reasons were for food, rent, medicine, and clothing.

Federally Funded Project was approved and operational covering the title of Community Resource Specialist [a senior parole officer in each of the nine district offices]. In addition, one senior parole officer was funded for the short-term Community ReOrientation Project [assistance to those released without parole].

PERSONNEL

At the end of the prior fiscal year, there were 327 staff members in the Bureau. No new budgeted positions were granted for 1974-75; however, two parole officer trainee positions were assigned under the Federally funded C.E.T.A. program.

During the year six Federally funded parole aide positions were abolished when the funds were not renewed, and 17 budgeted parole officer positions were vacated because of the drop in the Bureau's caseload. We now have a total complement of 306 staff members as follows:

Chief	1
Supervising Parole Officers	7
Project Specialist (VIPP)	1
Parole Coordinator (VIPP)	1
Analyst-Director (Community Resource Project).	1
District Parole Supervisors	9
Assistant District Parole Supervisors	12
Senior Parole Officers	31
Parole Officers	153
Clerical	90
	<u>306</u>

Fourteen of the above 306 staff members are Federally funded positions as follows: Project Analyst-Director, nine senior parole officers - community resource specialists, one senior parole officer - community reorientation program, and one senior clerk-stenographer, plus the two C.E.T.A. parole officer trainees.

During the year there were no retirements, and 29 resignations were received from the professional staff for the following reasons:

Fifteen went to better paying positions in allied service agencies. Out of these, three went to Federal Parole and Probation and the rest went to related fields in the State, County, and Municipal agencies.

Three returned to graduate school.

Four resigned for personal reasons.

Five accepted employment in private industry.

Two moved out of State.

The total number of parole officer separations for all reasons amounted to 14 percent of the total number of professional staff, except for the 17 whose positions were certified against.

TRAINING

In-Service Training. A general in-service training program for professional staff was held at the New Jersey Correction Officers' Training Academy. The speakers included: the Chief of the Bureau, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Youth Correctional Complex, State Parole Board Hearing Officer, Director of Guidance and Counselling at Seton Hall University, and Project Analyst-Director of the Bureau.

The in-service training session for clerical staff was held at the Training School for Boys, Jamesburg. Speakers included the Superintendent of the Institution, Captain Preston Petersen of the U.S. Army, Charles Meyers and Phyllis Osal of the Department's Personnel Bureau, and Dr. Rodney Jurist of Rider College. The committee for this session consisted of clerical supervisory personnel.

Area in-service training programs were conducted throughout the year on a regional basis. Topics included functions of the various social agencies, alcohol resources available in New Jersey, Major-Medical plan, Drug Treatment programs, Hearing Officer functions in the institutions. Films were shown at the various sessions covering the topics of Preventing Venereal Disease, Boozers and Users, and Chalk Talk on Alcoholism by Father Martin.

Division Training Office conducted courses on Middle Management Training, First Line Management Training, and a Management II Development Institute. These courses were attended by various staff members of the Bureau.

The Division also sponsored an Executive Secretarial Follow-up Seminar and ABC Shorthand courses which were attended by selected clerical staff members.

A Middle Management Training Course conducted by the Department of Civil Service was also attended by a supervisory staff member.

Staff Development IV, conducted by the Bureau Training Officers for female parole officers, covered such topics as Juvenile Interstate Compact, Alcohol Studies, Social Security, Obstetrics and Gynecology, and the Functions of the Hearing Officer.

Orientation of New Parole Officers. Fifty-nine parole officers and parole officer trainees attended four orientation courses. These courses were conducted by the senior training officers of the Bureau.

Hand Defense Training. Approximately 90 members of the parole staff received this training by a member of the correctional staff from the Youth Correctional Institution at Annandale.

Group Counselling Courses. Specialized caseload staff and two additional senior parole officers attended this course conducted by a representative of the Division Office.

Counselling the Addict. Specialized caseload officers and senior training officers attended this session.

Correction Officers' Field Training. Approximately 100 correction officers spent a field day in district offices in order to be oriented to parole responsibilities.

Specialized Treatment Caseloads and Community Reorientation Program. Monthly in-service training sessions were held during the year for the staff involved in this project. Following the group counselling sessions, one review session was held in February and certificates were awarded to the participants.

Basic and advanced narcotic courses, conducted by the State Police Academy at Sea Girt, were attended by the staff involved in this project, and certificates were awarded to the attendees.

During the year various training programs were arranged for the project staff including: Lectures by staff members of the College of Medicine and Dentistry; Seminar conducted by Project Director of the Jewish Vocational Service, Multi-Phase Drug Treatment Center in Newark; "Counselling the Drug Abuser" by Division of Drug Abuse, Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, Newark; "The Involuntary Client" by a member of the Bureau of Parole; Alcohol/Drug Program by a Training Specialist from the U.S. Army; "The Client-Clinician Relationship in Alcoholism" presented by the Nursing Education Department, Trenton Psychiatric Hospital; Instructor's Training Course conducted by the Signal School, U.S. Army; Behavior Modification Course, Neuro-Psychiatric Institute [certificates awarded]; Conference on Ex-Offender Job Development at Rutgers University Institute of Management and Labor Relations, sponsored by the Garden State School District; Project Employ, National Alliance of Business, Somerset Chaplaincy Council and Middlesex County Work Release Program; and an Orientation Session conducted by Hudson County Vocational Service Center.

PAROLE RESOURCE OFFICE AND ORIENTATION FACILITY (PROOF).

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

PROOF is staffed by seven professional parole staff members and one clerical person on-site, under the responsibility and general supervision of a Supervising Parole Officer of the Central Office in Trenton. The professional staff work on a 24-hour rotating shift coverage. During

1975 a senior parole officer was added to PROOF as the on-site supervisor and provides the necessary accountability of both casework and facility operation. The balance of professional staff consists of four residential parole officers and two parole officers.

During the fiscal year 1975, 3,731 man days were spent by residents at PROOF. One hundred and thirty residents were housed at PROOF, an average of 28.7 days. Institutional breakdown of residents was: Training School for Boys - 4; Youth Correctional Institution at Annandale - 26; Youth Correctional Institution at Bordentown - 39; Youth Correctional Institution at Yardville - 29; State Prison Complex - 27; Out-of-state parolees - 5; Work Releasees - 7. District Office breakdown: DO#1, Clifton - 13; DO#2, East Orange - 24; DO#3, Red Bank - 10; DO#4, Jersey City - 34; DO#5, Elizabeth - 16; DO#6, Trenton - 4; DO#7, Camden - 5; DO#8, Atlantic City - 1; and DO#9, Newark - 16.

During the year staff used various community resources in our attempts to service our clients. Among the more frequently used for employment placements were the Vocational Counseling Service, NJSES, Rehabilitation Commission, Manpower Corrections, Staff Builders, Labor Pool, Handy-Andy, Jewish Community Services, U.S. Armed Services, and several direct referrals to private employers. Most residents who sincerely wanted to work and made a true effort to obtain employment, were successful in finding jobs.

Financial assistance was acquired for residents by utilizing the services of Jersey City Municipal Welfare, Gate Money and Mini-Grant programs. Many dollars were given to residents from the pockets of staff members. Donations from the community of clothing, soap, toothpaste, and food, were received on behalf of the residents.

Many residents availed themselves of free medical examination offered by the Jersey City Medical Center. The resources of local narcotic treatment programs, alcohol treatment programs, Mt. Carmel Guild and Salvation Army were used to the benefit of PROOF residents.

Recreational facilities were made available to PROOF residents by special arrangements with the YMCA at no cost.

One hundred and fifteen residents were terminated from the program for the following reasons: 63 residents were able to successfully relocate in the community without need for further assistance; 12 were placed in other programs more suited to their problems and needs; 18 absconded from PROOF and failed to notify the district office of a new address; 22 were terminated for failure to comply with facility regulations or for poor adjustment, including seven who are known to have been arrested on new charges.

But the most important aspect of the PROOF program is the in-depth counselling available to the residents by the professional staff. An intensive intake interview enables staff to evaluate the resident's

current situation and problems. A treatment program is then developed which is individually designed to help meet the resident's needs and meet his problems.

The Team approach, which is effectively used, assures that a sympathetic and knowledgeable staff member is always available when the resident most needs and wants to discuss what is on his mind. Countless counselling sessions during the early hours of the morning have enabled residents to gain insight into their situations.

Periodic Staff Case Reviews are held so that staff may share their expertise, opinions, and suggestions on each resident's situation. Case reviews also assure that all staff members approach the individual resident in the same manner thereby eliminating the confusion of conflicting advice.

Group sessions are held on a periodic basis with the range of topics covering everything from facility rules and employment prospects, to alcohol and drug abuse, family relations, and sex.

A weakness of the team approach, as presently used, is that it allows some staff members to get involved only marginally while more aggressive staff members tend to dominate. There has been no clearly defined division of labor so it has been possible for some to merely "react" to a situation while others initiate interactions with residents. A method designed to more actively involve each staff member is being developed and will be put into practice during the coming fiscal year.

A problem in the PROOF program is caused by a lack of adequate staff. With only seven professional staff members, we are able to schedule only one person on duty the majority of the time. This means that counselling sessions are constantly being interrupted by the other residents for opening doors, etc. Secondly, the officer on duty, since he is generally alone, can not leave the facility for purposes of job development, community relations, work, or simply to transport a resident to a job interview.

We feel that the addition of another parole officer and/or a parole aide would greatly increase our capabilities to service our residents' needs.

Hotline. A "Hotline" utilizing the PROOF telephone was established and put into operation on October 1, 1974. All parolees and many police and other community agencies have been informed of this number. Since that time, 58 phone calls have been logged. Requests for advice, information and assistance have been received from parolees, relatives, friends, police, and other concerned citizens. All calls are dealt with appropriately and are brought to the attention of the district office for follow-up.

Good public relations are essential to the operation of the facility. Staff is in almost daily contact with various employment placement agencies, social service agencies, medical facilities and private citizens. Every effort is made to assume the continued good rapport which has been developed with these agencies over the years.

Twelve Thanksgiving Day dinners were delivered to PROOF residents by the Jersey City Community Resources Office.

On December 20, 1974, a Christmas Party was held in cooperation with the Montgomery Gardens Housing Development Committee. Refreshments and presents were given to 450 neighborhood children. The presents were supplied by radio station WOR.

VOLUNTEERS IN PAROLE PROGRAM.

Fiscal year 1975 was the best ever in the history of the Volunteers in Parole Program. Exciting developments occurred in the areas of (1) funding of VIPP, (2) staffing of the program, (3) recruitment of volunteers, (4) matchup of volunteers with parolees, (5) monitoring of volunteer performance, (6) recognition of outstanding volunteers, and (7) evaluation of the impact of the program.

Funding of VIPP. The end of fiscal year 1975 coincided with the date originally set for the termination of SLEPA funding for VIPP and integration of the program into the regular budget of the Bureau of Parole. A one-month extension of the SLEPA grant postponed this transfer of financial responsibility for VIPP until August 1, 1975. Nevertheless, most of the groundwork for the takeover of the program by the Bureau of Parole was laid during fiscal year 1975 and the previous fiscal years. Fortunately, all the hard work paid off. The legislature retained VIPP in the budget which it passed, and when sufficient revenues were not available to balance that budget, the Governor and the Commissioner of Institutions and Agencies kept the program in the reduced budget. Hence, VIPP is now an ongoing program of the Bureau of Parole.

Additional Activities of the Staff. During the year, VIPP staff members continued to be active in organizations which promote volunteerism. The Staff Director was appointed by the New Jersey Supreme Court to be a member of its Committee on Volunteers in Probation, and also served as a member of the Management Committee of the American Bar Association's National Volunteer Parole Aide Program, and the Correctional Reform Committee of the New Jersey State Bar Association. The Parole Coordinator and Staff Director both served as Trustees of the Volunteers in Courts and Corrections Association of New Jersey.

Recruitment of Volunteers. Attorney volunteers were recruited throughout the year by means of letters to newly-admitted attorneys and talks to Bar groups. Members of the legal profession continue to indicate a great interest in VIPP, contrary to the Staff Director's expectation at the outset of the program that attorney interest would diminish after the initial years of VIPP. This is a very pleasant development. On the other hand, efforts to involve non-attorneys have been disappointing, despite extensive recruitment activities by the VIPP staff. During the year, a very close working relationship was established between VIPP staff and representatives of the Jamesburg Committee of the Lions Club. In fiscal year 1974, Lions Club leaders had expressed an interest in having volunteers from local Lions Clubs assigned to parolees from Jamesburg. A great deal of time and effort has been expended on this pilot project, both by

the Lions Club coordinator [Ted VanWinkle], and by the VIPP staff, but as of the end of fiscal year 1975 only five Lions Club members had volunteered their services. Despite the disappointing results to date, however, attempts to promote VIPP among the Lions Clubs throughout the state will continue in fiscal year 1976.

Numerous discussions were also held with state leaders of the Jaycees, regarding Jaycee participation in VIPP. Mike Arons, the State Chairman of the Jaycees' criminal justice program, has been very enthusiastic about VIPP, and he will assist the VIPP staff in recruiting volunteers from Jaycee chapters during fiscal year 1976.

In fiscal year 1975, for the first time in the history of the program, an ex-offender served as a VIPP volunteer. The ex-offender had been highly regarded by his parole officer while on parole, and it was through the parole officer's suggestion that he became a volunteer. His performance has been outstanding.

Matchup of Volunteers with Parolees. The program made major improvements during the year in the area of matchup of volunteers with parolees. This was the result of the Parole Coordinator's successful implementation of the pre-release matchup program, whereby cases are identified for assignment to particular volunteers while the inmates are incarcerated. This program had been started during fiscal year 1974, and it worked so well that it was the primary method of assignment employed in fiscal year 1975. Between July 1, 1974, and June 30, 1975, 115 pre-release matchups were effected by the Parole Coordinator.

Attempts were also made to increase the number of matchups made by the District Parole Offices. The VIPP staff was invited to participate in the training sessions for new parole officers. The staff explained the program and asked the parole officers to select subjects from their caseloads for assignment to volunteers. A number of matchups were accomplished in this manner. In addition, the designation of a "District Coordinator" in each District Parole Office to handle VIPP matters resulted in several matchups by the District Offices. Senior Parole Officer Robert Lintner of DO#1, Clifton, was especially helpful, not only in effecting matchups but also in recruiting volunteers.

Monitoring of Volunteer Performance. Great strides were made during the year in the monitoring of volunteer-parolee relationships. The VIPP staff now receives copies of the volunteers' monthly reports, and logs them on a master list. When no report is received from a volunteer, a reminder letter is sent. If there is still no response, personal contacts are made with the volunteer until the report is received. This procedure has greatly improved the regularity and promptness with which the volunteers submit their reports.

The VIPP staff also follows up on any problems which the volunteers mention in their reports. Guidance is provided on matters such as out-of-state travel requests, parolee arrests, employment opportunities, etc. In this fashion, the caliber of many volunteers' performance has been upgraded considerably.

In addition, the VIPP staff members serve as trouble-shooters whenever the personnel of the District Parole Offices experience any difficulties with the volunteers.

Recognition of Outstanding Volunteers. On September 7, 1974, the Volunteers in Courts and Corrections Association of New Jersey held a Recognition Dinner at which the first annual "Volunteer of the Year" award was presented to the outstanding volunteer serving in corrections, probation, or parole. In preparation for that event, the VIPP staff asked each District Parole Office to select its best volunteer, and the VIPP staff then chose the VIPP nominee for the award from among the names submitted. The 1974 nominee was Albert Rylak, Esq., of DO#6, Trenton. Al has been active in the program since its inception, and is now assigned to his third parolee. He has done an exceptional job, and is very highly regarded by all the parole officers and parolees with whom he has worked. Unfortunately, Al was not the recipient of the VCCANJ award, which went to a volunteer in corrections who has worked many years with inmates and apparently gave up a successful business career to do so. Nevertheless, Al was one of the three semi-finalists, and felt deeply honored to have been selected as the outstanding VIPP volunteer.

Evaluation of VIPP's Impact. During this fiscal year, at the insistence of the Bureau Chief and SLEPA, an analysis was made of the effect which the program has had on recidivism. A review was made of all cases handled by volunteers since the program began, and a calculation made of the number of participating parolees who were recommitted for parole violations or new offenses. The encouraging results are as follows:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Number of Participating Parolees</u>	<u>Number of Parolees Recommited</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1972	184	4	2.2
1973	231	18	7.8
1974	169	7	4.1
1975	208	16	7.7

In order to ascertain whether the favorable recidivism rate is attributable to the assistance of the volunteers, or whether the volunteers simply have relatively "easy" parolees to work with, the VIPP staff conducted a controlled study in which the experiences of VIPP parolees in an "experimental group" were compared with the experiences of similar parolees who were supervised by regular parole officers [the "control group"]. The control group cases were parolees who had been selected for participation in VIPP but who could not be placed in the program because of the unavailability of volunteers at the time.

Forty-two parolees comprised the VIPP group in the study, while 20 parolees comprised the control group. The backgrounds of the parolees in the two groups were quite similar. The mean age of the VIPP parolees was 20.4 years, while the mean age of the control group parolees was 21.8. The VIPP parolees had been on parole an average of 1.2 times, while the control group parolees had been on parole an average of 1.7 times.

The result as of August 5, 1975, indicated that the volunteers' assistance did significantly decrease the percentage of parolee failures:

	<u>VIPP Group</u>	<u>Control Group</u>
Recommitted [New Offense]	4 (9.5%)	3 (15%)
Returned as Parole Violators	3 (7.1%)	2 (10%)
Returned for Adjustment	0 (.0%)	1 (5%)
Totals	7 (16.6%)	6 (30%)

Statistical Summary. As of June 30, 1975, VIPP had a cadre of 250 volunteers available for assignment. One hundred and thirty-one of them were actively working with parolees on the street, and 27 others had been matched up with inmates pending the inmates' release from institutions.

SPECIALIZED CASELOAD PROJECTS

The Specialized Caseload Project, implemented in June, 1973, was continued with a SLEPA grant. The goal of this project is to provide total parole services to a limited number of clients (180) so as to prevent their return to custody, either by a new commitment or through violations of the conditions of parole. In addition, the program's intent is to keep the clients drug free and employed. The program recognizes that in order to attain these goals, staff must be capable of maximizing existing resources for the benefit of the client. Attempts have been made to provide the best possible ongoing staff training available.

In addition to offering individual and group counselling, assistance in such vital areas as housing, employment, medical, psychiatric and psychological services, the staff also gathered data on control group clients [those clients in the general parole population] so as to extract valid, meaningful data.

The impact of the Specialized Caseloads' intervention has been clearly positive in light of the following hard data:

1. Specialized Caseloads staff made 8013 contacts as compared to 4509 contacts made by the control group.
2. Specialized Caseloads staff spent 1671 hours with their clients as opposed to 772 half-hours spent by the regular parole staff with their clients.
3. The employment rate among Specialized Caseloads' clients was one-third higher than control group clients.
4. The calendar year 1974 verified earnings of the Specialized Caseloads' clients came to \$223,474 as opposed to \$95,400 earned by the control group clients.
5. Specialized Caseloads' clients were involved in 91 indictable arrests and 87 non-indictable arrests for a total of 444 points according to the Wolfgang

Delinquency Index Scale [modified for this project]. The control group clients were involved in 124 indictable arrests, 81 non-indictable arrests for a total of 655 points.

6. One hundred and seven in the special group were missing. One hundred and fifty-one clients in the control group were missing.
7. There were 25 convictions on indictable offenses and 34 convictions on non-indictable offenses for the special group.

In the control group, there were 23 convictions on indictable offenses and 35 convictions on non-indictable offenses.

8. There were 20 cases returned as parole violators in the special group. Twenty-five cases were returned from the control group.
9. Twenty-five cases were discharged from the special group and 24 from the control group.
10. In the drug testing category, 137 tests were positive and 417 negative for the special group.

In the control group, 29 tests were positive and 47 negative.

11. Two hundred and sixty cases were enrolled in drug outpatient programs in the special group as compared to 238 in the control group.
12. Seventy-four cases in the special group participated in drug in-patient programs as compared to 25 from the control group.
13. Seven hundred and ninety-seven referrals were made by special group staff as compared to 205 by the regular parole staff.
14. The special group staff spent 1380 hours in project training and 225 hours in non-project training.

The Specialized Treatment Caseloads Project funding was terminated at the end of the fiscal year on the basis of its being able to serve 180 clients. In its place, the Community Resources Specialist Project was instituted because of its capability of serving the entire parole population [8,000].

THE COMMUNITY REORIENTATION PROGRAM

The Community ReOrientation Program, instituted in June, 1973, completed its second year of operation.

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

Due to the reduced number of clients being held until their completion of their maximum term in custody [240 in 1973 as opposed to 120 in 1974], the Community ReOrientation Program staff was reduced from two senior parole officers to one senior parole officer.

From July 1, 1973 to June 30, 1975, 129 prospective clients were interviewed. Of the population seen, the following represents services rendered to the client:

Counselling	69
Employment	11
Financial	23
Housing	15
Medical	4
Transportation	25
Food	8
Clothing	4
Other	38

With the assistance and approval of the State Parole Board, a new Minimum Supervision Case category has been instituted. On the recommendation of the Parole Board counselors and with Community ReOrientation Program input, the State Parole Board has approved the release of clients for treatment purposes to the community 90 days prior to the actual expiration of the maximum sentences. This program is implemented on a very selected basis and to date has served only one client.

The Community ReOrientation Program was funded by SLEPA for fiscal year 1975-76. This program represents an attempt by the State to fulfill a moral obligation to the client who has served his maximum term in custody and who, in the past, has been released without being offered any organized, supportive services at a critical period in his life.

PAROLEE EARNINGS

During the calendar year 1974, 11,186 parolees under supervision earned \$20,659,073, an increase of \$594,492 over last year's earnings. Fifty-two percent (5,795) of the parolees under supervision during the year were classified as "employed," i.e. worked all or part of the period under supervision, which could be from one week to one year. Twenty-seven percent (3,081) were unemployed throughout their entire period of supervision,

although considered "employable." The remaining 21 percent (2,310) were classified as "unemployable" by reason of being missing or in custody, attending school, being engaged in homemaking, or being incapacitated. The critical unemployment situation in the State was reflected by a 5 percent decrease in those who were actually employed.

DISCHARGED PRIOR TO EXPIRATION OF MAXIMUM

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

State Prison Complex	19
Youth Correctional Complex - Yardville	204
- Bordentown	221
- Annandale	232
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	97
Training School for Girls, Jamesburg	40
Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton ...	<u>79</u>
Total	<u>892</u>

In this year there were a slightly smaller number discharged from each institution except for the Correctional Institution for Women, where there was an increase of one, and for the State Prison Complex, where there was an increase of five. In toto, there were 49 less discharged - 941 versus 892. The 892 discharged from further supervision would be the equivalent of an average size caseload in one of the larger district parole offices, and would require approximately 17 parole officers to supervise this number, at an average cost in salaries of approximately \$170,000.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

As the result of referrals to various agencies including the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Manpower Development and Training, etc., it was determined that at the end of June, 1975, 3,514 parolees had been accepted in one of the E.O.A. Programs. This represents an increase of 494 cases (16.4 percent) over last year.

CASEBOOK REVIEWS

Casebook reviews are considered a management tool of the District Supervisor in that it permits a check of actual recorded contacts on each case assigned against recorded activities of any specific day. Ideally, a spot-check of contacts recorded against a return visit to the contactee in the community would confirm the entries in the casebook. The check should be completed by a member of the supervisory staff with the parole officer who made the entries.

During the year, 181 reviews were completed, resulting in 20 (11 percent) unsatisfactory ratings. An unsatisfactory rating is to be followed for a 30-day period during which the opportunity may be provided to remedy the deficiencies with the ultimate resolution of termination of employment if the deficiencies are not corrected.

PROBABLE CAUSE HEARINGS

As the result of the Morrissey v. Brewer decision, the necessity for holding "probable cause hearings" was mandated. In order to accomplish this within the time limits prescribed, five supervising parole officers conduct the hearings on a regional basis.

The following tabulation resulted:

a. Hearing requested and hearing held	1557
b. Hearing waived and hearing held	145
c. No response from parolee and hearing held	655
d. Hearing waived and no hearing held	165
e. "Probable cause" found and formal revocation hearing to follow	1962
f. Continuation on parole recommended although valid violation(s) determined	497
g. Continued on parole - no valid violation(s) determined	12
h. Other	51
Total hearings scheduled [column a+b+c+d]	2522
Probable cause found [column e+f]	2459
No probable cause found [column g+h]	63 (2½%)

SOCIAL EVENTS

The first Bureau Dinner Dance since 1968 was held at the Old Yorke Inn, Hightstown, on April 26. Attendance was purely on a voluntary basis. Those who attended enjoyed a wonderful evening.

The Annual Parole Picnic was held on June 18. Members of the Bureau, families and friends met in a totally informal atmosphere to partake of good barbecuing, fun and games.

The Outstanding Parole Officer of the Year Award was presented to Robert Pantalena at a luncheon at Forsgate Country Club.

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Public relations continue to become a more important function of each member of the Bureau in view of the fact that in general the news media concentrates on the occasional failure of parole or a parolee vis-a-vis

the many successes [most of whom are not interested or desirous of publicizing their specific situations.]

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

Camden County Community College
Lions Club, Jamesburg-Trenton
Board of Trustees, Youth Correctional Institution Complex
County Prosecutors Association
Glassboro College
Upsala College
Vineland Women's Club
Cape May County Bar Association
Brookdale Community College
Pathroads Organization
Kean College
St. James High School, Carney's Point
Gloucester Township Police Training Program
Trenton State College
Newark Services Corporation
Cedar Ridge High School, Old Bridge
Monmouth County Jail Inmate Council
Essex County Community Information Referral Service
State Police Bureau of Identification

CASELOADS [See tables #1 and #1A attached.]

The long established trend of increasing caseloads in New Jersey was broken last year for the first time since 1968. This year there was another reduction, more substantial than in any other previous year on record.

On June 30, 1975, there were 7464 cases under supervision in New Jersey, a decrease of 584 cases [7.3 percent] from the preceding year. In addition, there were 490 New Jersey cases being supervised by other states for New Jersey and 126 New Jersey cases in the Central Office Special File, making a grand total of 8080 cases for which the Bureau had responsibility.

Significantly, both the number of cases supervised in other states and the number of cases in the Central Office Special File increased from 464 to 490 [in other states] and from 106 to 126 (Central Office Special File), yet the over-all bureau responsibility decreased from 8618 to 8080 cases as of June 30, 1975, [-538 or -6.2 percent].

The total number of parolees supervised during the fiscal year 1974 also decreased from an all time high of 13,609 [last year] to 13,061, the first drop since 1961.

Under Supervision in New Jersey. At the end of 1973-74 fiscal year, there were 8048 cases under supervision in New Jersey. During 1974-75, 4074 cases were added, making a total of 12,122 cases supervised throughout the year, [a decrease of 5.2 percent.]

New Jersey Cases Being Supervised in Other States. During the fiscal year 1974-75, 293 cases were added to the 464 being supervised in other states for a total of 757 cases supervised during the year. At the close of the year there were 490 parolees from New Jersey under supervision in other states, or 5.6 percent more than a year ago.

Central Office Special File. This category was composed of cases not the responsibility of any New Jersey District Office or any other state. The responsibility, therefore, is assumed by Central Office. This group is composed of cases paroled to other states who subsequently absconded, persons paroled to out-of-state warrants, cases incarcerated in out-of-state and Federal institutions with no parole plan in New Jersey, and deportable cases. There were 106 cases in Central Office Special File at the beginning of fiscal year 1974-75. An additional 76 cases were handled throughout the year and 56 were removed resulting in a total increase of 15.9 percent over the previous year. As of June 30, 1975, there were 126 cases remaining in this category of which 65 [51.6 percent] were missing cases.

RETURNS TO INSTITUTION [See tables #2, #2A and #3B].

Returns to institutions by new commitments and technical violations during the 1974-75 fiscal year increased 0.3 percent in relation to the total caseload [13.5 percent as compared to 13.2 percent in 1973-74].

Significantly, the number returned by court commitment decreased to 5.0 percent from 5.9 percent, whereas the number returned by the paroling authority increased from 7.3 percent in the fiscal year 1973-74 to 8.5 percent in fiscal year 1974-75. During the five-year period under study, court commitments ranged from a low of 5.0 percent in 1975 to a high of 6.7 percent in 1973; technical violation returns ranged from a low of 6.1 percent in 1973 to a high of 10.2 percent in 1971. The combined total returns varied from a low of 12.6 percent in 1973 to a high of 16.3 percent in 1971. [See table #2B].

MISSING CASES [See tables #3, #3A and #3B].

Although the number of missing cases decreased to 911 from the 1973-74 all time high of 935, the percentage of missing cases in relation to the Bureau caseload increased from 10.8 percent in fiscal year 1973-74 to 11.3 percent. [See tables #3A and #3B].

Parolees from the Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown, accounted for the largest percent of missing cases [15.6 percent] in relation to respective caseloads, followed by the Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton @14.3 percent]; Training School for Girls

[11.8 percent]; Youth Reception and Correction Center, Yardville [11.2 percent]. In descending order the other institutions show the following: Psychiatric Hospitals [sex offenders] 10.5 percent; State Prison 10.2 percent; Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale 9.9 percent; and the Training School for Boys, Jamesburg 9.3 percent. [Table #3].

SUPERVISION [See table #4].

In the performance of their assignments in 1974-75, parole officers made 324,220 supervisory contacts and 24,614 investigatory contacts. This was an 0.4 percent decrease from the total number of contacts made in the previous year. On the basis of the number of field parole officers in service, each officer made an average of 2,565 contacts as compared to an average of 2,484 contacts in the previous year.

Included in the total figure of contacts from 1974-75, there were 62,554 home visits [compared to 65,608 in 1973-74], 87,166 community contacts, other than employment or school contacts, as compared to 81,350 last year; 4,178 employment visits [3,411 last year]; 506 school checks [753 in 1973-74].

The efforts of the parole officers resulted in the submission of 59,254 written reports including 51,519 supervision reports and 7,735 investigation reports in 1974-75, as contrasted to 58,108 total reports, 50,067 supervision reports, and 8,041 investigation reports in 1973-74.

The districts reported travelling 873,730 miles in the performance of their duties as compared to 765,244 miles in 1973-74.

INSTITUTIONAL PAROLE ACTIVITIES

Parole staff members are assigned on a permanent basis to each of the penal and correctional institutions and the training schools to act as liaison between the incarcerated client and the community. The following listing by institutions reflects major activities of the staff exclusive of such items as training, staff conferences, maximum release interviews, etc.:

	<u>Preparole Interviews</u>	<u>Inmate Requested Interviews</u>	<u>Released On Parole</u>	<u>Parole Classes</u>	<u>Violation Summaries</u>
NJSP	2808	1495	1161	383	315
YRCC	1879	1757	786	90	
YCIB	1128	1009	724	83	47

	<u>Preparole Interviews</u>	<u>Inmate Requested Interviews</u>	<u>Released On Parole</u>	<u>Parole Classes</u>	<u>Violation Summaries</u>
YCIA	922		753	30	
TSB-J	155	180	116	19	7
CIW	272	453	173	53	
TSG	<u>16</u>	<u>96</u>	<u> </u>	<u>16</u>	<u>3</u>
Totals	<u>7180</u>	<u>4990</u>	<u>3713</u>	<u>674</u>	<u>372</u>

NJSP - New Jersey State Prison Complex
 YRCC - Youth Reception and Correction Center, Yardville
 YCIB - Youth Correctional Institution, Bordentown
 YCIA - Youth Correctional Institution, Annandale
 TSB-J- Training School for Boys, Jamesburg
 CIW - Correctional Institution for Women, Clinton
 TSG - Training School for Girls, Jamesburg

jm
 December 15, 1975
 Att.

TABLE # 1

TOTAL CASES UNDER SUPERVISION - 1974-1975 (By Institutions)

	IN NEW JERSEY				IN OTHER STATES				CENTRAL OFFICE SPECIAL FILE				TOTAL
	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/74	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1974-1975	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/75	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/74	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1974-1975	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/75	UNDER SUPERVISION 7/1/74	TOTAL CASES ADDED	TOTAL NO. SUPERVISED 1974-1975	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/75	UNDER SUPERVISION 6/30/75
Training School for Girls	55	18	73	32	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	34
Correctional Institution for Women	373	161	534	319	23	16	39	24	3	6	9	6	349
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	314	136	450	232	5	5	10	3	0	1	1	1	236
Youth Correctional Institution Complex													
Annandale	1,669	747	2,416	1,450	58	34	92	56	5	14	19	8	1,514
Bordentown	1,975	854	2,829	1,811	114	66	180	116	28	17	45	25	1,952
Youth Reception & Correction Ctr.	1,390	771	2,161	1,305	83	63	146	98	22	11	33	23	1,426
State Prison	1,789	1,143	2,932	1,855	175	109	284	189	48	26	74	62	2,106
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	37	0	37	35	5	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	38
Out-of-State Cases in N. J.													
Female	13	19	32	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Male	433	225	658	405	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Total	8,048	4,074	12,122	7,464	464	293	757	490	106	76	182	126	8,080
Under Supervision 7/1/74	8,048				464				106				8,618
Total Cases Added		4,074				293				76			4,443
Total No. Supervised 1974-1975			12,122				757				182		13,061
Under Supervision 6/30/75				7,464				490				126	8,080

TABLE # 1A

NUMBER OF PAROLEES SUPERVISED
5 Year Comparison - (1971-1975)

1970 - 1971	1971 - 1972	1972 - 1973	1973 - 1974	1974 - 1975
10,410	11,684	12,852	13,609	13,061
+10.2%	+12.2%	+10.0%	+5.8%	-4.0%
+25.5%				

TABLE #2
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS
BY DISTRICT AND SEX
Based on Total Number Supervised
1974 - 1975

Male

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED DURING YEAR*	NUMBER AND PER CENT OF VIOLATORS				TOTALS	
		COMMITTED OR RECOMMENDED		RETURNED AS TECHNICAL VIOLATOR		NUMBER	PER CENT
1. Clifton	1,545	141	9.1%	75	4.9%	216	14.0%
2. East Orange	1,280	59	4.6%	97	7.6%	156	12.2%
3. Red Bank	1,621	94	5.8%	134	8.3%	228	14.1%
4. Jersey City	1,585	97	6.1%	141	8.9%	238	15.0%
5. Elizabeth	1,117	45	4.0%	151	13.5%	196	17.5%
6. Trenton	1,095	34	3.1%	123	11.2%	157	14.3%
7. Camden	1,218	55	4.5%	145	11.9%	200	16.4%
8. Atlantic City	898	40	4.5%	123	13.7%	163	18.2%
9. Newark	1,342	84	6.3%	84	6.3%	168	12.6%
10. In Other States	717	1	.1%	9	1.3%	10	1.4%
11. Central Office (Special File)	172	4	2.3%	7	4.1%	11	6.4%
TOTAL MALE	12,590	654	5.2%	1,089	8.6%	1,743	13.8%

Female

1. Clifton	105	2	1.9%	7	6.7%	9	8.6%
2. East Orange	71	1	1.4%	6	8.5%	7	9.9%
3. Red Bank	105	3	2.9%	11	10.5%	14	13.3%
4. Jersey City	44	1	2.3%	2	4.5%	3	6.8%
5. Elizabeth	51	0	0	3	5.9%	3	5.9%
6. Trenton	66	0	0	6	9.1%	6	9.1%
7. Camden	49	1	2.0%	2	4.1%	3	6.1%
8. Atlantic City	54	0	0	3	5.6%	3	5.6%
9. Newark	109	3	2.8%	4	3.7%	7	6.5%
10. In Other States	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Central Office (Special File)	10	0	0	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
TOTAL FEMALE	704	11	1.6%	45	6.4%	56	8.0%
GRAND TOTAL	13,294	665	5.0%	1,134	8.5%	1,799	13.5%

*Figures include inter-office transfers of cases.

TABLE #2A

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

By District

1974 - 1975

DISTRICT OFFICE	TOTAL NUMBER SUPERVISED	COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED	TECHNICAL VIOLATORS	TOTAL
1. Clifton	1,650	8.6%	5.0%	13.6%
2. East Orange	1,351	4.4%	7.6%	12.0%
3. Red Bank	1,726	5.6%	8.4%	14.0%
4. Jersey City	1,629	6.0%	8.8%	14.8%
5. Elizabeth	1,168	3.9%	13.2%	17.1%
6. Trenton	1,161	2.9%	11.1%	14.0%
7. Camden	1,267	4.4%	11.6%	16.0%
8. Atlantic City	952	4.2%	13.2%	17.4%
9. Newark	1,451	6.0%	6.1%	12.1%
10. In Other States	757	.1%	1.2%	1.3%
11. Central Office (Special File)	182	2.2%	4.4%	6.6%
TOTAL	13,294	5.0%	8.5%	13.5%

TABLE #2B

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

5 Year Comparison

1971 - 1975

COMMITTED OR RECOMMITTED					TECHNICAL VIOLATORS					TOTAL				
1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
6.1	6.7	6.5	5.9	5.0	10.2	8.5	6.1	7.3	8.5	16.3	15.2	12.6	13.2	13.5

TABLE #3
RECORD OF MISSING CASES
By Institution
1974 - 1975

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
INSTITUTION	TOTAL ON PAROLE ON 6/30/75	MISSING AS OF 6/30/74	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/74 AND 6/30/75	TOTAL MISSING	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/74 AND 6/30/75	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/75	PER CENT OF DIFFERENCE	PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/75
Training School for Girls	34	14	3	17	13	4	-71.4%	11.8%
Correctional Institution for Women	349	46	64	110	60	50	+ 8.7%	14.3%
Training School for Boys, Jamesburg	236	28	31	59	37	22	-14.3%	9.3%
Youth Correctional Institution Complex								
Annandale	1,514	153	221	374	224	150	- 2.0%	9.9%
Bordentown	1,952	313	283	596	292	304	- 2.9%	15.6%
Youth Reception & Correction Ctr.	1,426	172	178	350	191	159	- 7.6%	11.2%
State Prison	2,106	203	108	311	96	215	+ 5.9%	10.2%
Psychiatric Hospitals (Sex Offenders)	38	4	0	4	0	4	0	10.5%
Out-of-State								
Female	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Male	405	2	10	12	9	3	+ 50.0%	.7%
TOTAL	8,080	935	898	1,833	922	911	- 2.6%	11.3%

TABLE #3A
RECORD OF MISSING CASES

By District
1974 - 1975

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
DISTRICT	CASELOAD ON 6/30/75	MISSING AS OF 6/30/74	BECAME MISSING BETWEEN 7/1/74 AND 6/30/75	TOTAL MISSING	ACCOUNTED FOR BETWEEN 7/1/74 AND 6/30/75	TOTAL MISSING ON 6/30/75	PER CENT OF DIFFERENCE	PER CENT OF MISSING IN RELATION TO CASELOAD ON 6/30/75
1. Clifton	984	132	159	291	177	114	-13.6%	11.6%
2. East Orange	839	100	125	225	125	100	0	11.9%
3. Red Bank	1,070	104	58	162	71	91	-12.5%	8.5%
4. Jersey City	953	128	168	296	173	123	-3.9%	12.9%
5. Elizabeth	743	79	46	125	47	78	-1.3%	10.5%
6. Trenton	703	56	101	157	66	91	+62.5%	12.9%
7. Camden	756	112	79	191	98	93	-17.0	12.3%
8. Atlantic City	492	71	39	110	56	54	-23.9%	11.0%
9. Newark	924	104	83	187	85	102	-1.9%	11.0%
10. Central Office (Special File)	126	49	40	89	24	65	+32.7%	51.6%
11. Central Office (N.J. Cases Out-of-State)	490	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8,080	935	898	1,833	922	911	-2.6%	11.3%

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

1970 - 1971	1971 - 1972	1972 - 1973	1973 - 1974	1974 - 1975
8.9%	9.8%	9.1%	10.8%	11.3%

TABLE # 4

SUMMARY DAILY RECORD OF ACTIVITIES

Fiscal Year 1974 - 1975

DISTRICT NO.	FIELD AND OFFICE CONTACTS												REPORTS SUBMITTED						SUMMARIES SUBMITTED					HOURS		MILEAGE	
	TYPE OF CONTACT (1)							SUPERVISION (2)			INVESTIGATION (3)		SUPERVISION (4)		INVESTIGATION (5)		(6)					OFFICE	FIELD	STATE	PERSONAL		
	C	E	H	N	O	S	T	P	PO	R	P	N	F-19	F-21	AR	PP	SR	DR	OA	PV	TR	TS					
DO 1	8085	211	6148	1969	7807	4	8090	11948	17431	1673	1263	480	2766	4170	13	641	238	124	4	191	93	178	15976	16421	118149	1467	
DO 2	7985	218	4954	2160	5578	27	9529	11398	15905	1261	1087	1086	2741	2822	3	526	123	97	23	267	151	156	13849	13082	45318	3377	
DO 3	11822	404	9130	2622	9821	40	11600	15690	24743	1856	2678	875	3137	3165	97	682	472	132	15	180	168	146	13900	15818	168589	303	
DO 4	10488	251	6660	3041	8156	27	11950	15449	21355	2849	1250	474	2741	3289	36	581	344	146	18	286	96	131	16174	16005	78653	737	
DO 5	10260	533	7485	2362	6060	60	8837	11593	19514	1127	1679	1690	1957	3212	1	437	137	32	45	221	126	88	11056	11322	74169	52	
DO 6	9679	804	7462	2050	5527	77	9059	11543	19781	1810	975	452	2088	2226	7	481	286	71	20	209	133	103	10401	12618	91771	598	
DO 7	12576	660	6276	2566	6522	123	15941	13679	28425	4076	625	339	2437	6052	35	568	156	46	20	250	104	168	12002	13538	122531	812	
DO 8	7362	768	4964	1750	6492	94	4660	8521	13616	2210	1245	673	1103	1493	2	387	66	105	58	210	81	65	7461	10625	133273	-	
DO 9	8909	329	9475	1648	8293	54	5726	10842	21337	1708	6489	1254	2813	3307	-	788	628	39	13	256	127	130	12640	19739	32767	1164	
TOTAL	87166	4178	62554	20168	64256	506	85392	110663	182107	18570	17291	7323	21783	29736	194	5091	2450	792	216	2070	1079	1165	113459	129168	865220	8510	
GRAND TOTAL	324220							311340			24614		51519		7735			5322					242627		873730		

Legend:

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

Nat R. Arluke,
Chief, Bureau of Parole

By *D. Sparaino*
Dominick Sparaino
Supervising Parole Officer