

01
2432



**New Jersey
State Law
Enforcement
Planning Agency**

**Dissemination
Document
No. 30**

Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey- Applicants Guide 1980

State of New Jersey

BRENDAN T. BYRNE
Governor

STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

Governing Board

JOHN J. DEGNAN
Chairman

STANLEY C. VAN NESS
Vice Chairman

ROBERT N. WILENTZ
Chief Justice

WILLIAM H. FAUVER
KENNETH A. GIBSON
LILLIAN G. HALL
EDWARD G. HOFGESANG
CHRISTOPHER J. JACKMAN

PAUL KIERNAN, SR.
ANN KLEIN
JOSEPH A. LEFANTE
ROBERT D. LIPSCHER
RAYMOND MASS

CARMEN A. ORECHIO
CLINTON L. PAGANO
CHARLES A. RIZZI
JOHN W. ROBERTSON, JR.
PAULA ROSENBLUM
ARTHUR SANTUCCI

JOHN J. MULLANEY
Executive Director

(The 1980 Plan for Criminal Justice/Applicants Guide was prepared entirely by the SLEPA staff. Special acknowledgement is extended to all officials, institutions and agencies who willingly provided statistical data and guidance for program development. Thanks also is extended to private social service agencies and all others who shared information for the preparation of this Plan. This document is published and disseminated under U.S. Department of Justice Grant No. 80-FG-AX-0034 in accordance with the ongoing dissemination responsibility assigned to SLEPA by Public Law 96-157.)



State of New Jersey

STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

BRENDAN T. BYRNE
GOVERNOR
JOHN J. MULLANEY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

3535 QUAKER BRIDGE RD.
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625
TELEPHONE 609 292-5670

GOVERNING BOARD
JOHN J. DEGNAN
CHAIRMAN

May 5, 1980

TO: The Honorable Brendan T. Byrne, Governor of New Jersey; The Honorable Robert N. Wilentz, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey; The Honorable Joseph P. Merlino, President of the New Jersey Senate; The Honorable Christopher J. Jackman, Speaker of the New Jersey General Assembly; and the Honorable Chief Executives of New Jersey's 567 municipalities and 21 counties

This document represents the approved 1980 Criminal Justice Plan for New Jersey and the Applicants Guide. It is prepared as part of the application for federal funds under the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-157) and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-115) as administered by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration within the U.S. Department of Justice. Now in its twelfth year of publication, this plan, prepared in its entirety by Agency staff, reflects the input received by the Agency from State and local criminal justice agencies, as well as other sources.

The funding priorities incorporated in the Plan reflect major criminal justice needs and problems in New Jersey and establishes future program directions.

This document is also presented to officials of the criminal justice system in New Jersey, as well as to citizens engaged in prevention, juvenile justice activity and other endeavors related to the broad field of criminal justice as defined by the Crime Control Act.

John J. Mullaney
Executive Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLAN FOR NEW JERSEY/ APPLICANTS GUIDE 1980

Introduction	1
Problem Analysis	2
Allocations to Substantive Areas of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice	4
Action Programs Chart	5
Program Assignments by Operations Desk	6
Programs:	
A. Legislation, Support Services and Prevention	7
B. Detection, Deterrence and Apprehension	16
C. Diversion and Adjudication	20
D. Institutional and Non-institutional Rehabilitation	32
Agency Governing Board	Inside Front Cover
Agency Staff	Inside Back Cover

Criminal Justice Plan For New Jersey Applicants Guide 1980

INTRODUCTION

Due to the uncertainty of the continuation of the federal funding after fiscal year 1980 funds have been utilized, the *Criminal Justice Plan/Applicants Guide* is being printed in an abbreviated form this year. Requirements and procedures for the application and administration of grant funds have not changed substantially from the 1979 version of the *Applicants Guide* and applicants are advised to refer to that document for assistance.

Final approval for the 1980 criminal justice plan was not received until April, 1980 and the juvenile justice funds were awarded in May, 1980. The program areas which appear in this document were written with the assumption that continuation funding would be available in federal fiscal year 1981 and beyond. For this reason changes may have to be made in the number of years of funding for various programs and multi-year applications may also be entertained. Further policy statements and decisions will have to be made after Congress has completed deliberations on the 1981 Budget. It is possible that this would not take place until the fall of this year.

In a departure from past years, full program descriptions are being provided only for local projects that are open to competition for funds. Program areas where only one subgrantee is eligible are not being reproduced.

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

The 1980 Plan represents the final document for the three-year planning cycle begun in 1978. Fiscal Year 1980 is the last year of multi-year approval under the Crime Control Act of 1976 and is considered a transitional year from the old legislation to the Justice System Improvement Act of 1979. The next plan will be a three-year application covering Fiscal Years 1981 through 1983, which will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of the new legislation if funding is restored to the Budget.

Although the submittal of a comprehensive, fully developed Plan document was not required for Fiscal Year 1980, an analysis of New Jersey's crime situation and current crime problems was conducted to ascertain whether any significant changes or new developments had occurred in the State's criminal and juvenile justice systems during the previous year. This assessment, coupled with an evaluation of the 1979 problem analysis confirms that the problems identified in the 1979 Plan continue to be priority considerations for 1980 with only minor exceptions. Consequently, the Problem Analysis section, in addition to the Crime Analysis, Resources, and other smaller sections of the 1980 Plan submitted to LEAA in compliance with federal guidelines, has not been printed.

Two problems facing the adult criminal justice system surfaced in the input received from State and local agencies for 1980 which were not included in the 1979 Plan. These problems, which concern law enforcement officer stress plus the need for improved juror utilization and management, have been addressed in the Annual Action Program for 1980.

The nature of law enforcement work requires police and corrections officers to have the capability to respond effectively and professionally to crisis situations. With the job comes anxieties and frustrations which, if allowed to build up over time, begin to take their toll on the officer in the form of physical and mental stress. There are currently few training or counseling resources specifically designed to address the needs of law enforcement personnel who succumb to the stress and strain of their work. Funds are available under the Education, Training and Professional Development for Criminal Justice Personnel program to develop training projects to meet this need.

Current procedures for juror utilization have over the years become unmanageable, inefficient and unnecessarily expensive. As court trial caseloads increase, the expense and administrative

difficulties associated with jury management can no longer be borne by an already overworked court system. Moreover, because of the burdens that the time and conditions of jury duty impose upon the citizens summoned to serve, it has come to be regarded by citizens as a hardship to be avoided if at all possible. The needs of jurors have been addressed in part by SLEPA through the establishment of victim assistance centers which make information and services available to citizen participants in the justice process, including witnesses and jurors. For 1980, a separate program area has been added which will provide a small amount of funding for a demonstration project to improve juror utilization and management. Model activities to be considered include the "one day/one trial" system which has been successfully implemented in other states.

JUVENILE JUSTICE

For the most part, the 1980 juvenile justice-related program areas address the same or similar needs to those recognized under the 1979 Plan. However, the 1980 planning process for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programming did result in the identification of two new or expanded priorities which have been incorporated into the 1980 program areas. These are the need for a family oriented approach in the court system and the need for services for juveniles with alcohol problems.

The C-3 program area, traditionally devoted to making funds available for a variety of juvenile court services, has shifted its focus towards those which would enhance the ability of the court to concentrate on the needs of families as a whole. It was expected that a unified family court would be established through legislation during 1980 and that this program area would assist counties in meeting requirements and standards prompted by the new court structure.

The need for a family court has been identified because of the fragmentation that exists in the handling of juvenile and domestic relations matters. Decisions concerning child custody, support and visitation, child welfare, abuse and neglect and disposition of juvenile delinquency and status offender complaints are divided among the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts, Matrimonial Part of the Superior Court, Chancery Division and Municipal

Courts. It was felt that unification of these matters in one court would recognize their interrelationship and provide more effective handling and resolution of them.

The program area is devised so that even without the official creation of a family court, the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court structure may use program funds to begin to develop services and to reorganize so that the same goals may be achieved.

The second need is one previously identified in the 1979 programs but which continues to grow in significance. Alcohol abuse among teenagers and pre-adolescents was cited as a problem by a number of local and State agencies. National sur-

veys show that problem drinking has continued to increase within this population, particularly for those in the 7th-9th grades. Alcohol abuse appears to cut across communities, affecting urban and suburban areas as well as public and private schools, and the problems affect girls as well as boys.

The emphasis on responding to this situation is found in the Youth Services Bureau program which calls for specialized staff and in-service training for existing staff to recognize and assist in resolving the problems of youngsters who drink too much. The program also speaks of the identification of and referral to outside resources which can provide service to this population not offered directly through the youth service bureau.

ALLOCATIONS TO SUBSTANTIVE AREAS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

SUMMARY OF PART D ALLOCATIONS

Program	Police	Courts	Corrections	Juv. Del.	General Crime Prev.
A-1	\$ 8,575	\$ 8,575	\$ 8,575	\$ 8,575	\$
A-2	250,000	234,200	103,300	36,700	
A-3*					
A-5				500,000	
B-1					135,000
B-2					152,300
B-3	600,000				
B-4	330,000	625,800			
C-1				350,000	
C-2		20,000			
C-3		321,200			
C-4		50,000			
C-5		125,000			
C-6			240,000		
C-7				100,000	
C-8		160,000			
C-9		154,000			
C-10		144,500			
C-11		227,200			
C-12			75,000		
D-1			130,000		
D-2			370,000		
D-3			329,300		
D-4			231,000		
D-5			480,000		
D-6			374,200		
TOTALS	\$1,188,575	\$2,070,475	\$2,341,375	\$995,275	\$287,300
PERCENT OF PART D FUNDS (\$6,883,000)	17.3%	30.1%	34.0%	14.4%	4.2%

The above chart was prepared under the following assumption: that the classification "General Crime Prevention" includes only programs whose direct purpose is the prevention of criminal acts. The more narrowly focused programs that also hope to prevent the recurrence of crime, such as offender rehabilitation or pre-trial diversion services, are included under the other five column headings. The "Courts" designation includes also prosecution and defense but does not include probation.

NOTE: This chart is not identically comparable to previous years' charts in that, for previous years, only Part C funds were reflected. Special Part E funds for correctional programming was not included in earlier charts. For 1980, there is no special designation of Part E funds and consequently all action funds (Part D) are reflected in the above chart. As a result, the percentage of action funding for the corrections component appears to be larger this year than in the past. JJDP funds support programs A-4, A-6 and D-7.

*No funds allocated for this program.

ACTION PROGRAMS CHART

The chart below is a cross reference of the 1980 Action Programs to the 1979 Programs including the allocations to each program showing the source of funds (Justice System Improvement Act Part D, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act) and the distribution between state and local units of government. Assignments by Operations Unit desks follow.

1980 Program Number	Program Title	State	Local	1979 Program Number
A-A	Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Act Planning & Administration (JJDP)	\$101,644	\$ 60,262	A-A
A-1	Program Evaluation Activities (Part D)	34,300		A-1
A-2	Education, Training & Professional Development for Criminal Justice Personnel (Part D)	336,700	292,500	A-2, A-3 & A-5 combined
A-3	Improvement in the Promotion Process of Criminal Justice Personnel (Part D)	—0—		A-4
A-4	Supportive Services for the Retention of Students in Local Public Schools (JJDP)		150,000	A-6
A-5	Youth Service Bureaus \$500,000 (Part D) \$300,000 (JJDP)		800,000	A-7
A-6	Family Support Systems & Community Alternatives to Institutionalization (JJDP)		828,905	A-8
B-1	Police Patrol/Robbery Projects (Part D)		135,000	B-1, B-2
B-2	Police-Community Crime Prevention Efforts (Part D)		152,300	B-3
B-3	Implementation of the Statewide Police Emergency Network (Part D)	65,000	535,000	B-4
B-4	Specialized State/County Investigation Units (Part D)	735,800	220,000	B-5
C-1	Improvement of Police Services to Juveniles (Part D)		350,000	C-1
C-2	Juror Management & Utilization Projects (Part D)		20,000	New
C-3	Establishment of Family Court Services (Part D)		321,200	New, with Parts of C-3
C-4	Municipal Court Management & Improvement Program (Part D)		50,000	C-4
C-5	Improvement of Services to Victims of Domestic Violence (Part D)		125,000	C-5
C-6	Pre-trial Programs (Part D)		240,000	C-6
C-7	Improvement of Juvenile Detention & Shelter Care Practices (Part D)		100,000	C-7

C-8	Improvement of Criminal Prosecutions (Part D)		160,000	Part of C-8
C-9	Utilization of Technological Resources within the State Court System (Part D)	112,500	41,500	C-9
C-10	Office of the Public Advocate Activities (Part D)	144,500		C-10
C-11	Continued Support of Statewide Court Activities (Part D)	227,200		C-11
C-12	Support of Countywide Family & Neighborhood Dispute Settlement Centers (Part D)		75,000	C-12
D-1	Jail Programs (Part D)		130,000	D-1
D-2	Improvement of Juvenile Probation Services (Part D)		370,000	D-2
D-3	Corrections Support Programs (Part D)	324,300		D-3
D-4	State Correctional Education Programs (Part D)	231,000		D-4
D-5	Community Manpower/Adult Probation Programs (Part D)		480,000	D-6
D-6	Alternatives to Adult Offender Incarceration (Part D)	260,900	113,300	D-7
D-7	Program Efforts to Provide for Separation of Adult & Juvenile Offenders & to Insure Deinstitutionalization of Status & Non-offenders (JJDP)	579,189		D-8
	TOTAL	\$3,153,033	\$5,749,967	

PROGRAM ASSIGNMENTS BY OPERATIONS DESK

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

Programs A-A and A-1 are administered by the Planning Unit.

A. LEGISLATION, SUPPORT SERVICES AND PREVENTION

PROGRAM AA: Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Planning and Administration

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Planning for the majority of projects is most often more effectively done at the local level. Yet even where local criminal justice planning units do exist, the primary thrust of the planning effort has been on the adult criminal justice system. Throughout the criminal justice system, the problems of adults have obscured the equally urgent needs of dealing with the juvenile offender. There needs to be a special emphasis on planning for the juvenile justice system in counties and municipalities.

When individuals and agencies respond to these needs for services, a program may be implemented without sufficient planning and analysis to determine its most productive role in the juvenile justice system. The vastly fragmented and dissimilar collection of data makes it extremely difficult to gather useful data for planning purposes. Community-based facilities, family counseling, juvenile court intake, family court, youth service bureaus, volunteers in probation and the deinstitutionalization of juveniles are concepts which have been considered for implementation within the juvenile justice system. There is no doubt that all of them have validity for a certain segment of the juvenile population and/or serve particular functions. But a program should not begin without a sufficient understanding of its potential impact upon a particular point in the juvenile justice system.

Objectives:

To provide for the development of a comprehensive plan for juvenile justice within the State.

To provide for the administration of funds received to carry out the objectives of the juvenile justice plan.

To aid the collection of statistical and needs assessment information on a county basis for both local and State planning purposes.

To assist the criminal justice planning units in the development of expanded research, planning and coordination efforts in the juvenile justice system.

To support at least 12 juvenile justice research and planning components within county and city criminal justice planning units.

General Strategy for Implementation:

In order to prepare a statewide plan for juvenile justice consistent with the requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, (JJDP Act), as amended, much information relating to the population in the juvenile justice system, the system's resources, needs and problems, should be compiled. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency has added staff members to concentrate on juvenile justice planning as well as to oversee the administration of juvenile justice funds and the implementation of the requirements of the JJDP Act.

On the local level, under the 1976 Plan, six counties participated in the juvenile justice planning program, hiring full-time planners or researchers to gather juvenile justice data, to develop uniformity in the collection of the data, to coordinate local input and to plan for programs which are responsive to the needs of the juvenile justice system within the counties. Under the 1977 Plan an additional seven county and two city units received initial juvenile staffing grants and four units were continued. Twelve county juvenile justice projects were continued under the 1978 Plan, as were projects in Jersey City and Newark.

It was anticipated that ten counties and Jersey City and Newark would participate under the 1979 planning program which required local matching funds of 50%. Cumberland, Morris and Somerset counties pursued other funding sources during 1979 to support their juvenile justice planning efforts. Atlantic and Bergen counties chose to initiate a juvenile justice planning effort through application for 1979 JJDP funds.

All projects will be eligible for continuation grants under the 1980 Plan. Currently non-participating counties with federally supported criminal justice planning units will also be eligible.

This program area also allocates \$11,250 to the New Jersey JJDP Advisory Committee as required under the JJDP Act.

Subgrant Data:

The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency will retain 60% of the funds reserved for planning and

administration purposes.

Only those county jurisdictions with State Law Enforcement Planning Agency supported criminal justice planning units and the Newark and Jersey City units will be eligible to apply for a 40% pass through of the total funds. The pass through represents the same proportion available to the units through Part B Planning funds under the Crime Control Act. Total amounts available to the State and local units and the Advisory Committee is as follows:

State: \$90,394

Local: \$60,262

JJDP Advisory Committee: \$11,250 (This amount is not included as part of the 7 1/2% allocated for planning and administration.)

Budget:

	LEAA	State Local or Other	Percentage of Match
Total JJDP	\$150,656	\$150,656	50%
Act Support	11,250	—0—	—0—
Program Total	\$161,906		

PROGRAM A-1: Program Evaluation Activities

Objectives:

To maintain an evaluation capability at the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency to meet the data collection and evaluation demands of the JSIA.

To develop measurable objective performance indicators for each program area to be funded with 1981-83 block grant funds.

To design the necessary data collection instruments by which funded projects must report progress toward achieving objectives, as measured by specific performance indicators.

To provide evaluation technical assistance to SLEPA staff, local planners, entitlement jurisdictions, criminal/juvenile justice agencies and subgrantees concerning the development and measurement of performance criteria and program evaluation.

To undertake intensive evaluation of specific programs where a need exists to ascertain the effectiveness, establish a record of proven success or establish through documentation a high probability of improving the criminal justice system.

To assist in the preparation of an annual assessment report based upon the evaluative activities undertaken.

Subgrant Data:

The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency will be the only eligible applicant.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$34,300

PROGRAM A-2: Education, Training and Professional Development for Criminal Justice Personnel

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Personnel in all parts of the criminal justice system must attain high levels of excellence in the performance of their many varied respective responsibilities. Because personnel in the criminal justice system, such as police officers, prosecutors, public defenders, judges and probation officers can have such a tremendous impact on the lives of other people, it is essential that quality programs to enhance professional development are available for all components of the system.

Education and training should serve to advance the administration of justice and to stimulate and effect substantial improvements in the court system. Initial efforts in the realm of judicial education have confirmed that a great need exists to continue the training of New Jersey's judicial and support per-

sonnel. Furthermore, it has become apparent that this need will be best met through the implementation of a consolidated training effort, administered by a centralized Judicial Training Coordinator located in the Administrative Office of the Courts.

The lack of regular in-service training for police remains a problem within New Jersey, although there has been some improvement since 1976. There still is no State requirement for in-service training for police officers; however, there is proposed legislation establishing standards and minimum curriculum requirements for in-service training. These requirements will need to be enforced by the State. For the present, this program area will help to provide training in areas where investigative techniques and service to the public must be constantly improved and where new court decisions and legislation have a significant impact on such routine

activities as proper search, arrest, evidence collection and presentation, surveillance and investigation. Assistance is also needed for an in-State crime prevention training effort to complement ongoing police crime prevention activities.

In response to the need for increased training resources, funds were made available in previous years' plans under three separate program areas: one to provide specialized training for patrol officers and administrators; another for court professionals and supporting judicial personnel and one program area providing specialized training activities for law enforcement, prosecution, defense, juvenile justice, delinquency prevention and corrections agencies. For 1980, all training activities will be consolidated under this program area, to facilitate a more coordinated and comprehensive training and professional development effort for New Jersey's criminal justice system.

Objectives:

To continue upgrading the performance of criminal justice personnel by providing specialized training experiences. Based on prior years' experience, it is estimated that 6,000 members of the criminal justice system will receive some form of training under this program area.

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

To enable the judiciary to stay current with the increasing volume of changes in the law by providing at least 20 specialized training activities, conferences, seminars and courses.

To provide special training programs for new members of the judiciary.

To continue the development of a New Jersey Judicial College.

To increase training and professional development opportunities for court support staff, probation staff and other non-judicial personnel.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Applications for projects submitted under this program area will be assigned to the SLEPA program desk most appropriate to the training subject matter. That desk (Police, Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, or Courts and Ancillary Services) will be responsible for monitoring projects that are funded.

Agencies of departments seeking training and professional development funds will be required to detail their plans for long-range, comprehensive training programs. These agencies will be required to outline how the proposed training interfaces with other training projects which have been or may be

available. Special priority will be given to training in criminal justice areas where training has been minimal in the past.

SLEPA will encourage the development of interdisciplinary training councils to establish priorities and to begin structuring comprehensive criminal justice training. Some in-service training projects may be developed and implemented by a college or university serving as a central resource. Coordination of training at the State level will be encouraged. Emphasis will be on regionalized or state-wide projects. Training projects centering on the recognition, handling and treatment of substance abusers will be encouraged.

The development of executive and organizational skills at the management and supervisory level will be encouraged as will a system of "training the trainers" to provide in-service training to other members of their departments or agencies.

Self instructional courses and college credit courses are excluded.

1. Police, Enforcement, Prosecution. Funds will be provided for the continuation of State Police training projects including juvenile officers training, instructors training and crime prevention officers training. Specialized local police training projects designed to meet a particular training need will also be supported.

Prosecutors training will include, but not be limited to, basic and advanced training in prosecutorial skills, training for prosecutors' investigators and detectives, prosecution management and financial transactions.

2. Public Defender. Funds will support specialized regional conferences for public defenders and support personnel.

3. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Funds will be provided for seminars, workshops and conferences for juvenile aid officers, conference committee members, shelter workers and other individuals responsible for assisting juveniles. Regional and State-level projects will be emphasized.

4. Court Professionals and Supporting Judicial Personnel. Funds will be provided to continue training efforts implemented by the Office of Judicial Education and Office of Probation Training within the Administrative Office of the Courts. The Office of Judicial Education will continue to oversee all aspects of the ongoing special training program for Superior Court and Municipal Court judges as well as Supreme Court and Appellate Division law clerks and other judiciary support personnel. It will also continue the development of a comprehensive New Jersey Judicial College. The Office of Probation Training, which responds to training needs perceived by individual probation departments and the

judiciary, will supervise the continuing program to upgrade skills and coordinate probation training activities within county probation departments. This Office will continue to plan, coordinate and evaluate orientation, administrative and supervisory training. A Guided Group Interaction training project will also be continued. Probation training projects dealing with the recognition, handling and treatment of substance abusers will continue to be encouraged.

5. Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation. Training projects for local and State correctional personnel will be funded. Types of training projects may include supervision, management and administrative development as well as specific skills improvement. Projects to develop skills in handling stress will also be considered.

Subgrant Data:

Funds will be combined with previously allocated 1979 funds. Approximately 35 to 40 projects will be funded. Efforts will continue to achieve a balanced training program for all components of the system. Appropriate endorsements from agencies affected by the training must be included in applications for funding.

1. Police, Enforcement and Prosecution. Specialized police and prosecution training projects will be eligible for \$100,000 in State-level funds and \$187,650 in local-level funds. Funding will be provided to continue Department of Law and Public Safety training projects including juvenile officers training, instructors training, crime prevention officers training and prosecutorial training, utilizing State-level and waived local-level funds where

necessary and agreed upon through local assent.

2. Public Defender. The Office of the Public Advocate will be eligible for \$11,900 in State-level training funds.

3. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. A total of \$36,700 is available for local jurisdictions to develop specialized training projects for personnel in juvenile justice and delinquency prevention agencies.

4. Court Professionals and Supporting Judicial Personnel. The Administrative Office of the Courts will be the sole eligible applicant for grants to improve training for the judiciary. A total of \$132,300 State-level funds is available to support the Office of Judicial Education and Office of Probation Training as well as to continue training efforts implemented by these offices. An additional \$52,350 in waived, local-level funds will be utilized for probation training. Funds will be combined with the 1978 and 1979 allocations.

5. Adult Corrections and Rehabilitation. Corrections training projects will be eligible for \$92,500 in State-level funds and \$15,800 in local-level funds. The Department of Corrections training initiatives for State and local corrections personnel will be eligible for continuation funding. Initial funding of a local corrections training project, possibly to address stress-handling, will be provided.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$629,200

PROGRAM A-3: Improvement in the Promotion Process of Criminal Justice Personnel

Objectives:

To implement an assessment center for evaluating the promotion potential of administrative and policy-making criminal justice personnel.

To reduce any cultural bias that may exist in current promotional testing procedures.

To reduce the margin of error inherent in assessing oral examinations.

Subgrant Data:

The New Jersey Department of Civil Service will be the sole eligible applicant. The promotional assessment center project will be extended into additional areas of criminal justice. Carryover 1978 and 1979 funds will be utilized.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D	
Block Support	-0-

PROGRAM AREA A-4: Supportive Services for the Retention of Students in Local Public Schools

Objectives:

To provide a delinquency prevention specialist within four regional resource centers in order that school districts can obtain technical assistance, model program information and training to assist them in the development of programs for delinquent

and pre-delinquent youth.

To increase to 100 the number of school districts where educational improvements have been initiated through assistance from this program area.

To increase to 3,000 the number of students receiving services as a result of this program area.

To provide technical assistance, training and program development within local school districts to help reduce the number of students who are involved in vandalism, disruptive behavior, arbitrary suspensions, who are truant and who drop out from school. Emphasis will be placed on providing a positive learning environment for all students.

To encourage programs of community involvement within local public schools which provide alternatives for those juveniles who would otherwise be suspended or expelled from the ongoing school program.

To encourage supportive services within local

school districts which would encourage the educational progress of those unclassified students having difficulty adjusting in the traditional school setting.

Subgrant Data:

Continuation fundings of the four existing projects will be made available to continue the delinquency prevention specialist in each Educational Improvement Center.

Budget:

	LEAA
JJDP Act Funds	\$150,000

PROGRAM AREA A-5: Youth Service Bureaus

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Over the five year period between 1973 and 1977, juvenile arrests increased 13% as compared to adult arrests which increased seven percent. Community leaders in many municipalities in New Jersey have become aware of problems among their youth, manifested through drug and alcohol abuse, running away and a sharp increase in acts of vandalism. They are also concerned with taking the necessary action to prevent and reduce juvenile crime.

The potential for correcting conditions which can contribute to delinquent behavior is greatest when addressed as early as possible and prior to any justice system involvement. It is not uncommon to find among pre-delinquent and delinquent youth many who come from disorganized home situations with only one parent or where adults other than parents provide supervision and guidance. Therefore, it may well be that the prevention of a youth's introduction into the juvenile justice system is tied to effective parenting and the availability of a strong network of community services. This theory is supported by the Department of Education's Adolescent Study Commission which points out that the early accessibility of services may prevent involvement in the juvenile justice system.

When the family cannot meet the needs of its youth nor provide adequate supervision and guidance, services within the community should be available to fill the gap. There should be within a community a network of service providers equally accessible to all juveniles and their families. This should include individual and family counseling, vocational skills training and job placement, educational supports such as GED programs and tutorial programs, health and legal services. The Adolescent Study Commission has recommended that "brokers" be situated within schools to help students find out about these services. Because an increasing number of juveniles have problems associated with alcohol abuse, existing projects should be expanded

to include specific services to meet the needs of troubled juveniles who exhibit alcohol related problems. A network of services should span the needs of juveniles and their families at every point in the juvenile justice system. Youth service bureau resources should also be available to youth returning from correctional institutions and residential facilities who require some continued supports to ease the transition to a more independent living situation. Appropriate programs should also be available to juveniles outside of the system on a purely preventive basis to discourage any initial involvement with the juvenile justice system.

Objectives:

To continue up to 15 community youth service projects in the community that provide advocacy, crisis intervention counseling and other needed services to approximately 23,000 delinquent or delinquent prone youth.

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

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

To develop an intervention plan with the youth for each individual referred which includes counseling, recreation, vocational and educational services and information and referral.

To develop an information (tracking) system which enables project personnel to follow the treatment progress of each client, whether receiving services in-house or from an outside agency.

General Strategy for Implementation:

The need for community-based non-residential treatment and support projects for trouble-prone

youth has been recommended by the Standards and Goals for the New Jersey Criminal Justice System and by several national groups and studies. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency expects to meet this need by increasing the availability of such projects across the State.

Subgrantees will be expected to provide services through the establishment of projects based on the youth service bureau concept. Projects should not duplicate available 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, alcoholism, 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 and activities should be provided to meet the unique needs of the clients.

With the increasing incidence of juvenile alcoholism, one of the client groups for whom services should be available are troubled youth who exhibit alcohol related problems. Staff should be trained to handle alcohol abuse and youth service bureaus should coordinate the services of other agencies which deal with juvenile alcoholism.

Another client group for whom services should be available are youth recently released from correctional institutions, residential treatment centers and other out-of-home placement facilities. These services should include working with local parole officers to establish a more comprehensive parole plan for recently released youth.

Experience has shown that the successful adjustment of a youth in a given project 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 toward youth must ultimately involve the family of the juvenile if long-term results are to be anticipated. Diversion pro-

grams need the support and cooperation of family members. 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 not only include input from local agencies and organizations but also from youth, the community and citizens it will serve. Therefore, it is expected that an advisory board composed of representatives from the juvenile justice system, schools, social service agencies, youth and other interested groups, will be established prior to the development of the application to allow for its 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 project.

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. All funded projects must demonstrate that they will become an integrated part of the community's youth services system and not be an isolated agency project that would be discontinued when federal funding is no longer available.

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. The use of community people as staff and volunteers is highly desirable. Projects funded in communities experiencing high incidences of juvenile alcohol and/or drug abuse related offenses are encouraged to employ staff specifically trained in this area. In-service training and special institutes should be available to the bureau staff and volunteers to increase their skills particularly in the area of juvenile alcoholism.

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." One group working to gain State support is the New Jersey State Association of Youth Services. This pro-

fessional association of youth service bureaus and youth services bureau-type projects encourages the growth and development of services to youth and the community of people that serve youth.

Technical assistance is available to assist applicants in the development of their application. State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff 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 project.

The youth service bureau program area will be continued for a minimum of six years. Youth service bureau projects which have demonstrated their effectiveness as well as substantial efforts to obtain local assumption of program costs may receive Crime Control Act funds for a minimum of two years and a maximum of four years. Each project receiving four years of Crime Control Act funds may be eligible to receive two years of JJDP Act support providing it has satisfactorily met its goals and objectives, continues to meet the needs of the community(ies) it serves and has demonstrated significant efforts to develop other sources of funding support. No feder-

al support will be available beyond six years of funding. It is anticipated that following conclusion of federal assistance, continued support of youth service bureaus will be available as a result of current efforts to include these projects in the State budget and/or other funding sources.

For those projects receiving more than two years of Crime Control Act funds, it will be the policy of the Agency to have staff work with subgrantees to provide a reasonable level of assumption of project cost commencing with the third year of funding.

Subgrant Data:

Up to 15 grants ranging from \$20,000 to \$75,000 will be available for continuation of previously funded projects which have demonstrated success by meeting stated goals.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$500,000
JJDP Act Funds	\$300,000
Program Total	\$800,000

PROGRAM A-6: Family Support Systems and Community Alternatives to Institutionalization

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

There is growing awareness of the need to provide family-focused services to prevent juveniles experiencing family difficulties from being removed from the home and to keep their justice system involvement to a minimum. Early intervention and assistance will help enable families in crisis to overcome their difficulties, thereby preventing juveniles identified as in need of supervision or delinquent from being removed from the home.

New Jersey has an insufficient variety and number of community-oriented preventive and supportive services, both residential and nonresidential, for youth and families. Services are needed for families in crisis in order to encourage the retention of children in their natural home environment, prevent delinquent or acting out behavior from escalating into more serious delinquent or criminal activity and improve deteriorating family situations.

For those juveniles who cannot remain or return home, a greater diversity of residential placements is necessary to meet individual needs. The difficulty of locating appropriate residential placements for many juveniles results in their being confined to detention or shelter care facilities for months while awaiting a suitable placement. In many instances this placement is out-of-State.

The primary reason given for most out-of-State placements is that these youth have multiple handicaps or behavioral problems which make them difficult to handle and they are, therefore, not accepted by in-State facilities. Existing New Jersey facilities need assistance in developing specialized programs to serve these youth so that they need not be placed out-of-State far removed from their home environment.

There is also a need to provide supportive after-care services including transitional living arrangements for juveniles being released from correctional facilities and those who no longer require the intensive treatment and structure of the residential placement they are in. Individualized support services are necessary for these juveniles to enable them to make the transition from institutional living to independent living or return to the family.

Objectives:

To prevent family crisis situations from deteriorating into permanent or long-term separation of juveniles from the family through the provision of family crisis intervention, supportive follow-up services and, if necessary, temporary separation.

To encourage family unity by providing a spectrum of supportive services and assistance to vulner-

able families, including the families of juveniles returning from residential or correctional facilities and of juveniles in jeopardy of removal from the home.

To establish or augment existing alternatives to long-term, out-of-home placement of juveniles, to include short-term residential programs, day treatment programs, in-home assistance and advocacy programs.

To provide homelike placements and residential treatment services for juveniles unable to remain at home and who should not be placed or remain in an institutional or correctional facility.

To continue up to eight short-term residential or day treatment programs and to establish up to three additional projects serving from 500 to 900 juveniles.

To reduce the instances of out-of-State placements by expanding treatment resources within existing New Jersey facilities, thereby enabling them to accommodate the more difficult, "hard-to-place" child.

General Strategy for Implementation:

This program area will be geared toward programs specifically designed to prevent juveniles experiencing family difficulties from being removed from the home and keeping their involvement with the juvenile justice system to a minimum. Underlying assumptions for approaches suitable for funding under this program area are that problems of juveniles resulting from family crises are best dealt with immediately as they occur and in the context of the whole family. The target population for this program area is juveniles and their families who require services to prevent the juvenile's removal from the home or to facilitate the juvenile's return home; and, where such efforts prove unsuitable, juveniles who require an out-of-home placement. This target population would include juveniles involved in the juvenile justice system and those exhibiting behavior that would ultimately lead to juvenile justice system involvement.

A variety of projects providing intensive services to juveniles and their families would be suitable for funding under this program area. Together, these programs represent a spectrum of services to be made available to families in trouble, ranging from immediate crisis intervention to in-home services, temporary separation, day treatment of juveniles, short-term and longer-term out-of-home placements, aftercare and independent living. Projects may be implemented through either an existing residential facility or social service agency or sponsored independently of such a program. Existing private agencies such as YM-YWCA's, boys' clubs and girls' clubs are encouraged to develop projects.

Family crisis intervention proposals should demonstrate the capability to respond immediately and

intensively to crisis situations on a 24-hour, seven day a week basis. In addition to immediate, intensive handling of cases, such programs should provide in-home follow-up supportive services to enable juveniles and their families to overcome and cope with the difficulties that gave rise to the crisis situation. Services should include counseling or therapy with planned, short-term treatment goals; advocacy and brokerage; career development and vocational guidance; psychological evaluation and treatment and assistance in mastering skills necessary for successful functioning in society.

Projects patterned after the youth advocacy or family advocacy model would be appropriate for funding under this program area. Referrals could be obtained through area police departments, schools, social service and mental health agencies, youth service bureaus, court intake, the Division of Youth and Family Services and directly from juveniles and families. It is envisioned that the client population for crisis intervention/advocacy-type projects funded under this program area would be juveniles and families with specific, identifiable intervention needs who require intensive services and/or multiple contacts to bring the family to functional stability.

Under the family advocacy model, project staff would provide concrete, extended family-type supports to enable families to remain intact, develop a plan of in-home intervention geared to the nature of each unique family and assist families in obtaining needed community or governmental services. Under the youth advocacy model, youth in need of supportive relationships are matched on a one-to-one basis with youth advocates. These relationships become a foundation for the development and growth of individual strengths and capabilities.

Funds will also be made available to projects which provide for voluntary, short-term residences for juveniles who are temporarily unable to remain at home. Such projects could operate as a component of an overall family crisis intervention program or serve as an adjunct to such a program. A short-term crisis shelter will provide respite for children and families experiencing difficulty with one another, thereby averting crisis situations or the removal of youth from the home environment. Entrance would be voluntarily agreed to by the juvenile and the parents. Length of stay would be flexible, depending upon the individual family situation and the extent of separation warranted. Youth could alternate between living at the shelter and at home, with home stays increasing until the family is able to function as a whole unit. Lengths of stay at the shelter should not exceed 30 days.

Crisis shelters must include provision for intensive follow-up supportive services for families. Referrals for temporary shelter would be received from the police, court intake, social service and mental health agencies, the Division of Youth and Family Services,

or any other source which would be contacted by a juvenile or family in crisis. Through the provision of counseling, family support and alternative placements that are both temporary and voluntary, such projects should also serve to prevent a signing of JINS or delinquency complaints against youth and the detention of youth in situations where the underlying problem is family distress.

Projects patterned after the day treatment model would also be suitable for funding under this program area. Services available at day treatment programs would be essentially the same as those available in residential treatment facilities except that program participants would continue to live at home. Services would, for example, be provided on a 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. basis, five or more days a week and would include academic programming; recreational, cultural and crafts activities; tutoring; vocational training, placement and supervision; counseling and therapy. Client populations for such programs would be youth from deteriorating yet salvageable family environments who, were it not for this program, would be removed from the home and placed in a residential program and youth who are ready to return home from an institutional or correctional placement and need supportive services to facilitate their reintegration into the family environment.

Attendance could be required through a contractual agreement with the youth, family and referral agency (perhaps as a condition of probation or parole) or as a voluntary agreement reached by the juvenile, family and referral source (court intake, Division of Youth and Family Services, social service agency). Day treatment programs should serve to prevent the removal of juveniles from the home or to facilitate their return home from residential or correctional institutions.

Funds will continue to be made available to establish a variety of residential alternatives for juveniles including but not limited to residential treatment centers, group care homes, group homes or independent living programs attached to more structured residential treatment facilities as aftercare components and short-term (up to six months) intensive residential treatment programs for youth. Funds are also available to assist existing residential treatment centers and group homes in upgrading

and supplementing their treatment services in order to accommodate the more difficult, "hard-to-place" child.

Youth who are ready to leave residential or correctional programs but do not have adequate family environments to return to are in need of supportive community links to promote independent living. Aftercare independent living programs should provide a gradation of services and support to enable youth to make the transition from institutional or group living to living on their own. Such programs should operate in conjunction with existing residential facilities by utilizing the services available at the residential facility on an as needed basis.

Family crisis intervention and supportive services and community residential programs making application for funds must be recommended and endorsed by their anticipated referral sources. Projects which operate on a purchase of service contract basis with referral agencies shall meet applicable guidelines and regulations established by the contracting agency. State Law Enforcement Planning Agency funds can be used for operating costs but facilities must be provided by the applicant agency.

Projects funded under this program area will be considered for continuation funding based upon a justified and documented need for continued assistance, a satisfactory evaluation and the availability of funding.

Subgrant Data:

In 1980, funds will be provided for the continuation of up to eight existing projects and for the development of up to three new projects. New projects will range from \$80,000 to \$100,000.

Projects appropriate for consideration under this program area 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 costs.

Budget:

	LEAA
JJDP Act Funds	\$828,905

B. DETECTION, DETERRENCE AND APPREHENSION

PROGRAM B-1: Police Patrol/Robbery Projects

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

The identification of law enforcement problems and the development of specific activities that patrol officers can use to solve these problems appears to be a most promising trend in patrol operations. Patrol can no longer be a random activity that fills the gaps between calls for service, but must utilize a carefully thought-out process. This process should combine police and community concerns through thorough problem analysis to identify and implement effective patrol strategies. The need to satisfy the ever-increasing demands for police services through the efficient allocation of resources is a crucial problem facing police administrators today.

In order to increase patrol effectiveness, police departments must continue to allocate limited resources as efficiently as possible and optimize existing manpower. Revised patrol deployment strategies as well as efforts which concentrate detection, deterrence and apprehension activities on specific serious crimes such as robbery are needed to have maximum impact and effect a reduction in crime.

The traditional police response to this problem has been to request more manpower and increase random patrol. In recent years, however, police agencies have experienced a reluctance on the part of local officials to increase police budgets each year. Whereas expansion had been characteristic of police budgets in the past, many departments now receive only marginal budget increases, while others have had to cut back service and personnel, to meet reduced budgets.

The development of crime and problem analysis techniques and the availability of this information to patrol supervisors is gradually leading to the displacement of random patrol with pre-planned patrol activities. Such patrol operations can be designed to address problems and situations which are believed to require more concentrated and coordinated attention than can normally be provided by random patrol in the deterrence of suppressible crimes and to increase the on-site apprehension of offenders.

Approaches to implement these patrol activities include intensive, concentrated visible patrol in those areas where crimes are most frequent and/or appropriate specialized patrols focusing on the types of criminal activity upon which such patrols would have the greatest potential for positive impact.

To be effective these techniques must be closely linked to accurate crime analysis and must have equal priority with calls for service as a patrol function.

In the past, this program area has supported a variety of resource allocation projects, including automated crime analysis systems. Another program area set aside funds for crime specific investigation units which concentrated detection, deterrence and apprehension efforts on particular crime priority targets such as sex crimes and robbery. For 1980, the crime specific program area is combined with police patrol efforts into one program area designed to improve resource allocation efforts and preventive patrol effectiveness.

Objectives:

To achieve an increase in the number of apprehensions and on-scene arrests through more efficient and effective deployment of police resources.

To establish an additional patrol project that will permit better utilization of patrol resources and accomplish more effectively the detection, deterrence and apprehension objectives of patrol.

To provide final continuation funding for two specialized robbery investigative units designed to stabilize the rate of robbery in their respective jurisdictions by utilizing crime analysis, patrol, follow-up investigations, public education and prosecution resources.

General Strategy for Implementation:

To enhance the role of the police in controlling and reducing crime, patrol strategies should be developed to effect a balance between the need to respond to citizen calls for service and the need for the patrol division to implement systematically and with regularity, effective prevention, deterrence and apprehension tactics. Patrol officers should be deployed according to workload demands and the officers' attentions should be directed to pre-planned activities.

Projects considered for funding to improve patrol deployment strategies should concentrate on providing increased patrol efforts against identified crime problems in specific geographic locations and at

specific time periods designated as peak crime hours. These projects will include systems for collecting and collating workload information to reschedule and reassign existing patrol resources and equipment in accordance with the planned activities.

Implementation of the revised patrol strategies will require a careful analysis of the time and place of expected demands and the relative severity of the various possible crime problems. Allocation of patrol resources and utilization of appropriate detection and deterrence strategies must be determined through crime data analysis. This analysis can be accomplished manually or by utilizing existing local automated data analysis systems. The critical factor will not be the level of sophistication of equipment or computerization, but the commitment of patrol administrators to match personnel deployment to workload demands.

Funds for patrol improvement efforts may be applied for: salary of a crime analyst; and equipment required as an incidental and necessary part of patrol reallocation projects. Consideration will be given for salary requests for patrol projects. Patrol improvement projects implemented with 1980 funds will be considered for reduced funding support in 1981.

Two specialized robbery units implemented with 1978 and 1979 funds will be eligible for final con-

tinuation funding at a reduced level under this program area. It is anticipated that project costs will be assumed upon completion of funding. The 1980 Plan will conclude SLEPA's funding support for specialized crime specific investigation units.

Technical assistance in this area will be available from SLEPA staff, and police departments in the State that have implemented successful patrol projects.

Subgrant Data:

A total sum of \$55,000 will be available for one new patrol-oriented project which employs practical, operational-oriented strategies to analyze, plan and implement a patrol program that utilizes available personnel resources to address crime activity demands. Priority consideration will be given to cities which have 50,000 or more in population, a crime rate indicative of a current problem and the patrol resources to insure proper program implementation.

The two specialized unit grants approved in 1979 will be eligible for a final year's funding at a maximum of \$40,000 per project if needed.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$135,000

PROGRAM B-2: Police/Community Centers

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

The law enforcement community has found that traditional approaches to reducing the opportunity to commit crime, such as foot and mobile police patrol, are not sufficient. Crime prevention activities are also required to supplement the traditional crime reduction techniques.

Crime analysis indicates that many property crimes can be prevented through "target hardening" (e.g. better locks, neighborhood block associations and other similar activities). There is a continued need to raise public awareness concerning crime prevention efforts, to enlist the public's cooperation and to educate citizens in ways to protect themselves and their property. It is also thought that a concentrated effort is required for senior citizens who are more vulnerable to crime. Recent national surveys indicate that although senior citizens are victimized at rates proportionate to the general population percentages, the impact of crime on senior citizens is more traumatic, and physical and financial recovery for them is always difficult and sometimes impossible. Therefore, there is a substantial need to

Crime Prevention Efforts-Resource

continue and expand the activities of these police/community efforts to address the general crime problem, and the specific problems confronting senior citizens.

In 1973, the Agency funded the first formally structured crime prevention units under the target hardening program area. In 1975, this program area was restructured into a crime prevention program that utilizes combined police/community efforts. The program was continued in 1976 through 1979. To date approximately 50 crime prevention projects have been funded. In 1980, it is anticipated that ten projects will be implemented.

Objectives:

To establish up to eight regional crime prevention projects to develop coordinated police/community efforts in target hardening and crime reduction evaluation programs.

To reduce the rate of increase for residential and commercial breaking, entering and larceny in each participating jurisdiction, and to achieve a 10% reduction in property losses to victims.

General Strategy for Implementation:

In an attempt to expand the impact of our initial efforts in this area, the 1980 Plan will attempt for the first time to establish up to eight regional resource centers to provide police/community crime prevention efforts.

From 1975 through 1978, this program area was structured to accommodate local crime prevention units. As a result of this approach, approximately 10 crime prevention units were implemented on a yearly basis. In addition another program area was addressing the problem of public housing and senior citizen security. About 12 senior citizen and nine public housing projects were implemented from 1973 through 1978. The approach for 1980 will be to establish demonstration projects in eight areas to provide on a regional basis, the resources needed to implement public education programs to include: film libraries for community crime prevention training programs, costs for printing and distribution of crime prevention literature, and other resources that may be required for public education regarding "target hardening concepts" for the general public and senior citizens. It is anticipated that these projects will be implemented through the respective county police training academies, however, consideration will be given to other agencies that can demonstrate the ability to meet the objectives of this program area.

To complement this effort, funds will be made available in Program Area A-2, to implement an in-State crime prevention training program for designated local crime prevention officers, who in turn will be responsible for in-service training at their local departments and/or county police academies. In prior years police officers from throughout the State have received this type of training at the University of Louisville's National Crime Prevention Institute and the Crime Prevention Training Center, at Southwest Texas University. It is anticipated that both specialist and generalist crime prevention training programs will then be available in New Jersey by 1982.

Technical assistance in this area will be available from SLEPA staff, the New Jersey Crime Prevention Association, and police departments in the State that have implemented successful projects.

Subgrant Data:

Up to eight projects will be eligible for grants to establish regional crime prevention/media resource centers to provide statewide coverage. It is anticipated that the projects selected for funding consideration will provide for the implementation of multicounty projects. The maximum amount for each subgrant will be \$25,000.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$152,300

PROGRAM B-3: Continuation/Expansion of The Statewide Police Emergency Network (SPEN)

Objectives:

To implement the second phase of the Statewide Police Emergency Network Task Force to include car-to-car inter-county/State communications.

To utilize radio frequencies more effectively.

Subgrant Data:

The maximum amount of funds available to implement Phase II of the Statewide Police Emergency Network will be \$535,000. Waivers of local funds by counties to the State will be requested in order to effect a centralized purchase of communications equipment. The use of one bid for all equipment purchases is considered to be the most efficient and

effective method of acquiring the necessary communications hardware. The realization of substantial savings in cost is anticipated. Except for the units allotted to the State Police, all equipment will be installed at county and municipal law enforcement agencies.

The State Frequency Coordinator will be eligible for a continuation grant of \$65,000. Funds will be utilized for engineering assistance, clerical support and transportation.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$600,000

PROGRAM B-4: Specialized State/County Investigation Units

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

The impact of arson, labor racketeering, and white collar crime on society has caused a burden that must demand the support of State and federal resources. Two separate problems remain a continual concern: first, criminal sophistication requires

a specialized investigation/prosecution capability. Second, although the public is aware of the cost and imminent dangers inherent in white collar crime, they must also be made aware of the ongoing financial support needed to combat these complicated offenses.

Funding over the previous years has addressed arson, labor racketeering and white collar crime on the State level through the creation of separate units which have operated with commendable effort to detect and apprehend principal offenders in each of these areas. In 1978, three county arson units were established to complement this effort.

The State Police arson unit has sophisticated intelligence gathering capability sufficient to enable inter and intrastate agencies to depend upon information gathered. The labor racketeering unit has developed an intelligence system that collects, analyzes and disseminates intelligence related to the infusion of organized crime into legitimate business. Atomic power plants, casino gambling and statewide businesses employing union laborers have been the subjects of ongoing intensive investigations to surface organized crime activities and those responsible. The White Collar Crime Unit of the Division of Criminal Justice has investigated a variety of white collar crimes, especially in the areas of illegal chemical waste disposal and unemployment security fraud. The arrest of 30 individuals has revealed a ring defrauding the State in excess of 1.5 million dollars.

There is a continued need to address the problems presented by these crimes, particularly arson. This crime has become a critical concern in New Jersey, as the result of a recent increase in reported arsons resulting in both loss of life and millions of dollars of property.

Objectives:

To continue to provide New Jersey, through the Division of Criminal Justice, with the resources to identify, investigate and prosecute white collar crime in as comprehensive and effective manner as possible. Particular emphasis will be placed on the involvement of organized crime activities utilized to infiltrate legitimate businesses.

To continue the Labor Racketeering Unit of the State Police which has the responsibility to collect, collate, analyze and disseminate intelligence information relating to organized crime involvement in labor unions and legitimate business enterprises.

To continue activities of the State Police Arson Unit relating to investigation of suspicious fires resulting in loss of life or substantial property damage to determine if arson is involved and the subsequent identification and apprehension of arson suspects.

To improve capabilities for investigating major crime problems in selected counties by initiating up to three specialized countywide investigation units.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Funds for the Division of Criminal Justice, White Collar Crime Investigation Unit, will be available in

combination with Law Enforcement Assistance Administration discretionary funds for specialized resources to continue investigative and prosecutorial efforts directed against white collar crime. The unit will also provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies in their efforts against white collar crime.

During previous years, funds were awarded to increase the activities of the Arson and Labor Racketeering Units of New Jersey State Police. Funds for these units will be available to continue the present structure of five Division detectives and two civilian clerks for labor racketeering activities plus six detectives and three civilian clerks in the Arson Unit.

The State Police Arson Unit and Labor Racketeering Unit have established centralized intelligence banks. The information contained in these systems is made available to assist local investigation units upon request, with the understanding that federal and State guidelines regarding information dissemination must be followed. This information will save many local investigation hours usually devoted to this effort.

The Arson Unit will continue to maintain the Statewide Arson Network System and the Annual Fire/Arson Survey which afford law enforcement and fire officials with an overview of the total arson problem in New Jersey and help identify suspicious patterns and possible suspects involved in arson.

Local investigative capability for major crimes will be continued in this program area, with emphasis on arson. The funding will be at the county prosecutor level to insure the availability of necessary legal and/or technical expertise. Funds may be utilized for personnel, required equipment and training to assure the high level of expertise necessary for quality investigations and to provide the required expert testimony in court cases.

Projects funded under this program area will be required to contain an evaluation component which assesses effectiveness in relation to projected goals and objectives. Performance measures will include, but not be limited to the number of requests received for assistance, number of investigations initiated and completed, number of arrests made, indictments obtained, cases prosecuted and convictions obtained. Technical assistance will be available from both the State and local agencies receiving program area support.

It is anticipated that the three State projects will receive continued support in 1981, and that county units receiving initial funding in 1980 will be considered for reduced continuation funding in 1981.

Subgrant Data:

A total of \$370,800 will be available to the Department of Law and Public Safety, Division of Criminal

Justice to continue a program of activities to investigate and prosecute white collar crime, and \$365,000, to the Division of State Police, to continue the activities of the Labor Racketeering Unit, and the Arson Unit.

A total of \$70,000 will be available to provide a third and final funding for the three arson investigation programs in prosecutors' offices implemented with 1978 funds.

A total of \$150,000 will be available at the county prosecutor level to address the problem of major crimes with priority consideration for arson projects. The maximum amount of funding for each of these projects will be \$50,000.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$955,800

C. DIVERSION AND ADJUDICATION

PROGRAM C-1: Improvement of Police Services to Juveniles

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

In working with youthful offenders it is particularly important that the juvenile justice system be highly responsive, effective and efficient, and that the system not become overloaded or seriously backlogged. Those juveniles who can be successfully handled at the community level after contact with the police should be diverted from the juvenile justice process and referred to community services more in keeping with their needs.

A number of youth who come to the attention of the police are simply reprimanded or warned and no record of any kind is maintained. However, records which are kept show that 47% of the juveniles who came into contact with the police during 1976 were released to their homes. Twenty-seven percent of these arrests in 1976 were for minor offenses such as malicious mischief, runaway offenses and disorderly conduct. The majority of these youth were 16 years of age or less. Generally these juveniles would be amenable to some form of informal counseling intervention. Although the majority of juvenile matters are disposed of informally, local police departments should adopt guidelines, which are consistent with those developed jointly by the Office of the Attorney General and the County Prosecutors' Association for the informal handling of juveniles.

The role of the police in preventing delinquency is important since they are close to and familiar with the possible conditions which may contribute to delinquency. A juvenile's initial contact with the police is crucial because an officer's attitude and demeanor will frame, to a large degree, a child's conception of the judicial system. For this reason, police departments should be capable of providing professional short-term services such as counseling, on request, especially in situations where crisis in-

tervention is necessary. Special problems contributing to the youth's difficulties should be brought to the attention of other community agencies through referral services when necessary.

Although juveniles account for half of the arrest activity of many police departments and constitute a large segment of reported crime, most departments do not have a juvenile officer available on each shift. Moreover, many departments do not have designated juvenile officers. The importance of juvenile work and the need for specialization has drawn increased attention from police chiefs and executives. Delinquency control is an integral part of police work and effective control of juvenile crime requires police specialization in that area.

Objectives:

To continue projects within police departments that will promote a fair, consistent and understanding approach in the handling of juveniles. This approach should be supported through the development of written guidelines and accurate recordkeeping.

To continue separate juvenile aid bureaus as part of local police departments which have available counseling and referral services on a voluntary basis within the bureau for those juveniles who have had police contact but have no complaints signed against them.

To prevent future police involvement by those young people who participate in the counseling services.

To continue up to eight projects within police departments to serve a minimum of 900 juveniles per year.

General Strategy for Implementation:

The primary objective of this program area is to enable police departments to have available readily accessible services for those juveniles who have police contact. These are 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. Counseling and referral services are provided by professionally trained counselors responsible for the identification of specific juvenile problems. Juveniles are usually informed about the availability of services through police officers in the juvenile aid bureau.

Each project funded will be required to maintain statistics to determine the effectiveness of the project. In line with the Governor's Adult and Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee's recommendations, these statistics should provide some measure of the success of the project by indicating the number of young people successfully deterred from further system involvement. These statistics should give the number of juveniles involved in counseling who have repeat contact with the bureau in comparison to the number of juveniles not involved in counseling who have repeat contact with the bureau. In addition, all funded projects may be required to participate in evaluation efforts conducted by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

Applications are encouraged from local units of government and combinations of such units to improve juvenile aid bureaus through the implementation of projects that will serve those juveniles not referred to court. This program area does not include funds for police salaries, police equipment and police-juvenile relations projects in the schools.

Funding consideration will be given to the following:

1. The establishment of juvenile aid bureaus in communities with at least 30 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 be provided by social caseworkers or other professional staff and will include counseling and referrals.

3. The establishment of a regional juvenile bureau for several police departments having at least 30 sworn police officers among 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.

All police departments are encouraged to formulate police guidelines on the handling of juvenile offenders for police department personnel. These guidelines should include policies concerning community referrals and detention and court referral procedures. It is anticipated that these guidelines will cover the wide range of police alternatives and criteria for the appropriate disposition in the handling of juveniles. Police departments should make use of the Practices and Procedures Manual for Juvenile Officers published jointly by the County Prosecutor's Association of New Jersey and the Department of Law and Public Safety. This manual covers all areas of the juvenile justice system including an outline of juvenile statutes and court rules, police diversion of juveniles, investigation and handling of cases involving juveniles and the role of the police and the court. There are also sample forms and a list of community resources.

Police departments are also encouraged to develop training programs on juvenile matters for police personnel and are also encouraged to assign at least one full-time officer to work solely with juveniles. Training of police personnel should include a review of juvenile policy and methods of handling juveniles. Specialized training for police officers is recommended to introduce new techniques in the handling of juveniles as well as changes in policy and law in juvenile matters.

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 project during the third year.

Subgrant Data:

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

Up to three new projects will be funded at up to \$40,000 for each project depending on the need, population and existing services.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$350,000

PROGRAM C-2: Juror Management and Utilization Projects

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Despite the dramatic changes that have occurred in nearly every aspect of American life, the concept of trial by jury has remained intact for over 200 years. Its very longevity attests to the importance of this institution of American democracy.

As the volume of court trials and resultant demand for petit juries increase, the method of juror selection and utilization becomes more inadequate, costly and cumbersome, thereby threatening the integrity of our jury system.

Problems for the jurors stem from the traditional three-week term of service. Citizens who receive summonses can anticipate a prolonged absence from home, school, or business. The personal costs involved are hardly compensated by the nominal fee paid to jurors in most jurisdictions. Then there is the boredom and frustration of jurors who wait for days to be called or who must sit through long voir dire sessions (questioning and impaneling of a jury) even though they have already been rejected for actual service.

Courts and courtroom personnel face the problem of calling and maintaining a large enough jury pool to meet the heaviest possible jury need over a three week period. Although some days in court see the need for only a relatively small number of jurors, an entire pool might be present in the courthouse for the full period. While individual juror fees are low, the total paid to large pools is quite high, and a substantial amount of personnel time is spent in dealing with large jury panels.

Perhaps the most damaging of all are the costs to our system of justice. Many citizens are unwilling to accept the personal costs and seek excuses from jury duty. Aware of the hardship to jurors, court personnel often grant such excuses for less than urgent reasons. With fewer citizens participating in the jury system, juries may not be representative of the communities they serve, and our constitutional guarantee of trial by jury of one's "peers" may be undermined.

Objectives:

To utilize jurors' time more efficiently through the implementation of a one day/one trial system in a pilot county.

To initiate one basic jury management and utilization improvement project, thereby reducing costs.

To promote further study and improvement of the jury system.

To reduce juror hardship and widen citizen participation by more effective juror utilization.

General Strategy for Implementation:

One county project will be supported to improve the efficiency of juror selection and management. Attention will be paid to providing better informed and motivated jurors in a more cost effective manner. Studies for this purpose are excluded from consideration for funding.

The "one day/one trial" system, where tried, has substantially reduced the hardship often associated with jury duty. "One day/one trial" refers to a jury system wherein a citizen is only required to report for one day of jury duty unless he/she is selected to serve on a trial jury. If selected, the juror stays until the end of the trial; if the individual is not selected, the obligation is completed.

In addition to "one day/one trial" action projects, "telephone on-call" projects will be considered. Telephone call-in provides a variable number of prospective jurors corresponding to varying court needs. In these projects, jurors call a given number at a fixed time to determine whether or not they are to report the following morning.

Projects which implement other recommendations of the LEAA-funded Juror Utilization Study in Middlesex County, may also be considered. The goal of all of these projects is to make jury duty more rewarding and at the same time ensure that the needs of the court are fully met.

Technical assistance will be provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts, the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and by reference to LEAA-developed national models.

Subgrant Data:

One pilot county will be selected to receive funding in the amount of \$20,000. All applications for local funding will require Judicial Coordinating Committee approval.

As funds become available, other fundamental juror management improvement projects will be considered.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Support	\$20,000

PROGRAM C-3: Establishment of Family Court Services

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

The need for an integrated court system to handle family related problems has long been recognized within New Jersey. The Governor's Adult and Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee on Standards and Goals made the achievement of a Family Court one of its standards for the judicial system.

Decisions concerning child custody, support and visitation, child welfare, abuse and neglect, disposition of juvenile delinquency and status offender complaints are divided among the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts, Matrimonial part of the Superior Court, Chancery Division and Municipal Courts.

This fragmentation results in a waste of resources, confusion and lack of coordination. Records pertaining to a family which are located in one court and which bear on an action occurring in another court may not be transferred. This may limit effective decision-making.

As stated in the Final Report of the standards and goals effort, "As a result of the fragmentation of jurisdiction over family problems, no one court considers and resolves family problems as a whole. The court system, therefore, may ignore the interrelationship of juvenile delinquency, child abuse, the broken home, the troubled family, financial problems of the family, need for supervision of the juvenile, more than one child exhibiting antisocial behavior in a family and other factors."

It was anticipated that the State would enact legislation creating a Family Court part of the Superior Court prior to the beginning of the 1980 Court Year. Funds are available out of this program area to ease the transition to the new structure. The program area focus can be easily translated to provide programming for the existing Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, if it has not been superceded by a Family Court, at the time funds become available.

Objectives:

(The word "court" is used to represent the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court or the Family Court—whichever will be in operation at the time funds are available.)

To aid in the development of a court system which unifies its approach to handling complaints related to children and their families.

To make resources available to counties to implement anticipated standards promulgated by the Administrative Office of the Courts towards achieving a family court system.

To promote the creation of services which would enable the court to handle family oriented problems more efficiently and effectively.

To make available innovative disposition and diversion options to judges, probation and intake personnel which meet the needs of juveniles and families before the court.

To assist the screening of complaints filed in court which could more properly be disposed of through referrals to community social, medical, welfare, educational or mental health agencies.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Funds will be available to establish projects which make available to a newly created Family Court or the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court adequate services to enable it to deal effectively with the families and children under its jurisdiction. These programs should make use of probation and services available through already existing community social, medical or legal resources. Where possible, projects should handle family related problems informally before they require a court hearing for resolution. Such resources as crisis intervention services should be available to the court.

Referrals to these programs may be directed through court intake units which may base the referral decisions on information and recommendations growing out of pre-judicial conferences. Other recommendations may come from law enforcement agencies which have initial contact with the families.

Funds in this program area will also be available to provide disposition and diversion options to the court through the establishment of innovative programs which meet the needs of juvenile offenders and their families. Such projects as those which provide the court with an alternative to or operate in conjunction with traditional dispositions such as probationary services or correctional commitment could be considered for possible funding. This area will not support the domestic relations components of intake screening units. Counties should locate other resources to develop these services.

Funded projects will be required to maintain statistics to determine the effectiveness of the program. These statistics should reflect the degree to which the projects have met their goals and objectives. Where appropriate, recidivism measurement should be part of an evaluation. The program will also be expected to utilize technical assistance offered by the Administrative Office of the Courts in preparing an evaluation.

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 some project costs during the second year and one-half of the project costs during the third year. Continuation funding is also dependent on the availability of funds on a year to year basis.

Subgrant Data:

Funds will be available to up to three counties as continuation grants for projects previously funded with 1979 funds involving expanded disposition and

diversion options or other court improvements.

Funds will also be available to initiate two new projects at funding levels up to \$75,000 to improve Family Court services. Applicants will be required to obtain Judicial Coordinating Committee endorsement.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$321,200

PROGRAM C-4: Municipal Court Management and Improvement Program

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

For the average citizen, courtroom procedures can represent the most dramatic aspect of the criminal justice system. Within the criminal justice system, the criminal courts are responsible for a swift determination of the guilt or innocence of those persons brought before them. The courts are also charged with the sentencing of guilty offenders to insure their rehabilitation and to deter others from committing crimes. Upon the courts lies the burden of protecting the rights of the offender and of society.

In New Jersey, most criminal complaints enter the court system through the 527 municipal courts in the State. In New Jersey, the municipal courts handle the largest number of cases. They are the courts in which the average citizen has his most frequent contact; and, in most instances, the municipal courts may be the only contact with the judiciary for a citizen during his or her entire lifetime.

Despite the great volume of cases processed through municipal courts and the high visibility of these courts to the public, many municipal courts experience serious problems. They are often understaffed, lack sufficient court administration, are inadequately housed and function without sufficient hardware or equipment to handle their caseloads properly and professionally.

Projects funded in this area will concentrate on municipal court field representatives who will provide management and administrative capabilities, technical assistance and training development. Funds will also be utilized to provide innovative technological resources within the courts.

Objectives:

To provide two jurisdictions with the services of a municipal court field representative who will coordinate municipal court activities, provide technical assistance, training and additional management resources.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Municipal court field representative projects, implemented in the 1979 Plan, will be continued. Municipal court field representatives are responsible to the Assignment Judge and Trial Court Administrator; their jurisdiction is vicinage-wide. The responsibilities of this position include implementation of the Administrative Office of the Court's policy relevant to municipal courts, providing needed technical assistance, performing regular site visitations and offering special assistance in the areas of management and administration. They also ensure that all municipal court personnel within the jurisdiction are appropriately trained. The field representative's findings and recommendations are reported to the Trial Court Administrator on a regular basis and subsequently filed with the Administrative Office of the Courts Municipal Court Unit.

Improvements in case handling in the larger municipalities can often be made by upgrading outdated equipment. Justification may be made for the introduction of innovative technological resources in such areas as fiscal management or records retrieval to meet the requirements of one municipal court.

Technical assistance in developing these local grant applications will be provided by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Subgrant Data:

All applications for funding under this program area will require Judicial Coordinating Committee approval. Two vicinage-wide field representative projects of approximately \$25,000 each will be continued when justified, after which, it is anticipated that costs will be assumed locally.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$50,000

PROGRAM C-5: Improvement of Services to Victims of Domestic Violence

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Domestic violence is a problem for both law enforcement and social service agencies. Few of the many incidents of spouse battering, family fights or child abuse result in either arrest or prosecution. The common response of law enforcement is to control the immediate crisis without arrest. Most communities are unable to provide for the needs of the victims who are found to return to the same situation that precipitated the abuse. More shelters for temporary housing of the victims are needed and effective service programs to change the abusive conditions must be provided.

Objectives:

To continue five shelters for victims of domestic violence serving approximately 1200 victims.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Violence between members of the same household has traditionally been under-reported because of fear, embarrassment, lack of reasonable alternatives and community acceptance of some intra-family violence. Specific data are often not available. However, the few available estimates that have been made in recent years indicate that the incidence of domestic violence is substantial and that the burden to the criminal justice system in terms of police, courts and corrections activity is also quite substantial. The societal reaction to this problem to date has been limited and the needs of many of these troubled citizens have gone unmet. Spousal abuse and child abuse are often interrelated and become a part of a family's pathology from one generation to the next. Intervention in this cycle of violence is clearly

needed. Although the solution to the problem must come from many quarters, the criminal justice system has the same basic responsibility to protect victims of family violence as it does to protect citizens from crime between strangers. SLEPA funded the development of a battered women's shelter in Mercer County to serve as a model to a developing Division of Youth and Family Services supported network of shelters. At this time, SLEPA seeks to assist in the continuation of these shelters.

SLEPA funds, in conjunction with funds from other sources (such as Title XX, ACTION, CETA, private sources, etc.) will be provided for the continuation of a State and community-wide, coordinated approach to the establishment of shelters involving as many relevant public and private agencies as possible.

Technical assistance in the development of these projects will be provided by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency and the Division of Youth and Family Services.

Subgrant Data:

Five county or regional projects will be eligible for up to \$25,000 each in local-level funds to combine with funds from other sources, in order to continue to operate centers for victims of domestic violence. Sites will be selected with the assistance and endorsement of the State Division of Youth and Family Services. Subgrantee cooperation in complying with the data collection effort undertaken by the SLEPA Evaluation Unit is a prerequisite for continued funding.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$125,000

PROGRAM C-6: Pre-Trial Programs

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

As the volume of crime and defendants continues to increase, criminal justice system components and institutions become filled beyond capacity. Techniques which limit the flow of defendants through the system as well as programs which keep the number of pre-trial detainees within manageable levels are vital for the continued functioning of the system. Diversionary resources are necessary to respond to these needs and to remove from processing those defendants for whom alternative programs would be more beneficial.

During the past several years, projects have been implemented under this program area to address these needs. However, a continuing need exists to maintain full use of diversion options and expand alternatives to incorporate restitution and community service work proposals.

Problems and inequities in the bail system have been well documented. A greater, more equitable use of release alternatives as well as continued improvements in the application of bail are needed to minimize the use of pre-trial detention and problems associated with jail overcrowding.

The 1980 Plan reflects the final year of funding for pre-trial intervention projects. Priorities of this program area are refocused toward supporting the implementation of restitution projects to complement the basic PTI program.

Objectives:

To provide final continuation funding for one pre-trial intervention program.

To offer effective, constructive rehabilitative alternatives to incarceration and formal probation to 250 motivated defendants at the earliest stage of the criminal justice process.

To assist in the relief of presently overburdened criminal court calendars, and focus expenditures of criminal justice resources on matters involving serious criminality and severe corrections problems, by diverting less serious offenders from the court system.

To continue four and initiate two other pre-trial intervention restitution programs for 1,500 defendants.

General Strategy for Implementation:

All applications under this program area must contain an endorsement from the assignment judge of the jurisdiction serviced by the grant. Pre-trial intervention (*R. 3:28*) applications and proposals containing restitution components must include the prosecutor's endorsement.

In addition to the normal project statistical reporting on objectives and activities, it is important that program developers create appropriate data gathering mechanisms to collect the following:

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

b. Rearrest and conviction data for dismissed clients for a period of three years following dismissal. (To be gathered in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Courts, Pre-trial Registry System); and

c. Information consistent with evaluation requirements of the Administrative Office of the Courts. A summary of such information must be included in quarterly and final narrative reporting to SLEPA.

Funding for projects within this program area normally will be on a yearly basis for three years. Continuation funding will be contingent upon an acceptable evaluation at the conclusion of each grant period and availability of funds.

Applicants are encouraged to request technical assistance from the Administrative Office of the Courts and SLEPA staff in the development of project objectives, activities, methods, staffing and evaluation.

Subgrant Data:

The 1980 Plan will provide final continuation for one project under the pre-trial intervention program. The total amount allocated for this purpose is \$25,000.

Funds amounting to \$215,000 are made available for four continuation and two initial restitution projects.

Any application considered for funding under this program area will be subject to programmatic and/or fiscal modifications that may be deemed necessary to ensure conformance to Administrative Office of the Courts rules and guidelines. All applications under this program area require prior Judicial Coordinating Committee approval.

Budget:

	LEAAA
Part D Block Support	\$240,000

PROGRAM AREA C-7: Improvement of Detention and Shelter Care Practices

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Juvenile detention and shelter facilities, by law, are for the temporary care of juveniles pending court disposition. Detention facilities are legislatively responsible for the temporary holding of juveniles awaiting court action on a delinquent offense, while shelter facilities are primarily for juveniles who are awaiting a hearing for a status offense, such as truancy, incorrigibility or running away. Shelters are also used for the temporary care of juveniles charged with minor delinquency offenses.

Responsibility for the evaluation and monitoring of detention facilities lies with the Department of Corrections. For shelter facilities this responsibility lies with the Department of Human Services. Evaluation of detention and shelter facilities consists primarily of a physical inspection of the facilities' buildings and grounds and also of an examination of the educational, recreational and social service programs which are offered to juveniles within these facilities.

A number of difficulties exist within juvenile deten-

tion centers and shelters. These difficulties include the inappropriate holding of children awaiting residential placement, the lack of availability of education, social service and other programming, and variation in the quality of such programming. Studies on the status of juveniles placed in these facilities show that a significant number of juveniles are not awaiting court adjudication or dispositional hearing, but rather are awaiting placement in a residential facility. Lengths of stay in these temporary facilities may range from a few days to several months.

Until quite recently not all detention facilities had education programs. There is still a substantial gap, in some instances, between the education which would be available in public school and what a child can receive in a detention or shelter care facility. Operational standards have been developed for detention and shelter facilities and the implementation of these standards is reviewed by staffs from the Department of Corrections and Department of Human Services. Other than these efforts, there is little else to insure uniformity and quality of programming within the facilities. Disparity among facilities extends to recreation, social services and disciplinary measures as well. Critical problems have existed in centers ranging from a dilapidated physical plant to the lack of an education program to severe overcrowding. With the implementation of detention and shelter standards and with funds provided through this program area by the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, it is anticipated that the quality and availability of services within detention and shelter facilities will continue to be improved.

Objectives:

To complete the provision of funding assistance to enable detention and shelter facilities to meet existing State standards of operation and administration.

To increase the range and quality of existing educational, recreational, volunteer and social services projects within county detention and shelter care facilities that serve a potential annual population of approximately 20,000 juveniles.

To increase to 17 the number of detention facilities where activities have been developed and expanded through assistance from this program area.

To increase to 17 the number of shelter care facilities where programming has been improved through assistance from this program area.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Funds will be available for detention and shelter care although programming may differ slightly for each. The funding of shelter care and detention activities will be coordinated with the Departments of Human Services and Corrections respectively which are responsible for the evaluation of the physical and programmatic aspects of these facilities in ac-

cordance with standards promulgated by the Departments.

Emphasis will be placed on funding projects in both shelter and detention facilities which enrich educational, recreational, volunteer and social services programs. Because of the greater measure of freedom that a juvenile has in a shelter, the range of activities should be wider. There may be more outside community involvement and, therefore, there is a likelihood of a larger volunteer services component in shelter programming. All programming should be supportive but should not have long-term rehabilitation as its goal. There should be emphasis on maintaining the short-term nature of the holding. Project objectives should include efforts to return a child to his home or bring about the prompt discharge of juveniles to more stable situations.

Experience with education projects in detention and shelter facilities indicates that programs which transcend a traditional academic approach and which utilize an affective learning process appear to be an appropriate teaching method in a temporary holding facility. These projects could be based on the child's experiences and should be designed to promote a positive self image.

Social workers may be hired to provide services to juveniles to help them adjust to their situations within the shelter and detention facilities as well as to act as liaisons between the centers and other agencies such as the court and the Division of Youth and Family Services. They or other staff may also be involved in the development of volunteer participation in the centers, to provide additional activities within the facilities as well as to coordinate programming within the community. Volunteers may be utilized especially to provide tutoring assistance to juveniles held in shelter facilities since many will continue to attend public schools. Surveys taken of juveniles in both detention and shelter facilities showed poor achievement in school and a high incidence of truancy to be common.

Funds will be available to complete programming to conform to standards established for detention and shelter care facilities by the Departments of Corrections and Human Services. Grants to enhance detention and shelter 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. It is anticipated that counties will assume all project costs after the demonstration period. Continued funding is based on the year-to-year availability of funds.

Assistance in developing projects 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 Departments of Corrections and Human Services.

Subgrant Data:

Monies will be available to continue second and third year funding for up to six county detention and shelter care projects.

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:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$100,000

PROGRAM C-8: Improvement of Criminal Prosecutions

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Many prosecutors' offices have insufficient resources to deal with the increases in crime. There is an increasing public concern for the expeditious processing of criminal cases, especially those cases involving career criminals. Priority must be given to prosecuting those who are guilty of habitually committing dangerous and violent crimes. Specialized units are necessary to determine cases which should receive high priority for prosecution and to assume major responsibility for evidence collection and the preparation of cases.

Objectives:

To coordinate prosecutorial efforts to identify and prosecute the offender who habitually commits violent crimes by continuing or establishing career criminal units in four counties.

To reduce pre-trial, trial and sentencing delays by 10% in those counties served by career criminal units.

To reduce the number of dismissals for reasons other than the merits of the case, where career criminal units are operational.

To demonstrate that the rate of commission of crimes may be reduced in a jurisdiction by more effective interruption of the habitual criminals' careers.

To reduce the number of pre-trial releases, bail decisions and plea bargains made without knowledge of other cases pending or without information on the defendant's past criminal history.

To increase the number of convictions on the most serious charge in instances involving multiple charges.

General Strategy for Implementation:

County "Career Criminal Prosecution Units" which identify and prosecute dangerous repeat offenders, will be continued. These units attempt to reduce the number of violent crimes in a given jurisdiction by concentrating on the prosecution of individuals with the propensity for committing murder, rape, arson,

armed robbery, serious assault and other "fear producing" crimes. The Institute for Law and Social Research (INSLAW), a non-profit, LEAA-supported research corporation, has developed data in several jurisdictions indicating that a disproportionate amount of serious crime is committed by relatively few "career criminals." Prosecutors may, therefore, be justified in focusing resources on the prosecution of recidivists.

It is anticipated that a significant reduction will continue to be made in serious, assaultive crimes by refining the identification process and by expediting the prosecution process. Career criminal units consist of experienced assistant prosecutors who concentrate on cases where the alleged offender meets certain criteria including a past history of serious crimes, more than one open charge and apparent resistance to past rehabilitation efforts.

These projects are designed to improve evidence collection, case preparation and the prioritization of cases. They concentrate on the reduction of delays to ensure "speedy trials." The prosecutors assigned to career criminal cases are involved in cases from the screening process through sentencing.

Technical assistance for these projects will be provided by the Prosecutors Supervisory Section, New Jersey Department of Law and Public Safety.

Subgrant Data:

One county will be eligible for final (second year) support for a career criminal project, ranging from \$50,000 to \$60,000 after which, costs will be assumed locally. Two new projects will be funded. (Selection for the sites of these projects will be made on the basis of a combination of such factors as crime rates, population, number of recidivists and the mechanism for identifying career criminals.)

The Prosecutors Supervisory Section of the Division of Criminal Justice will assist in the selection of participating counties for these projects.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$160,000

PROGRAM C-9: Utilization of Technological Resources Within the State Court System

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Delay in the processing of criminal cases is certainly one of the more serious law enforcement problems today. Some of the principal causes of delay are the lack of manpower, funds and modern management tools to handle the crushing volume of cases. One such management tool is a central source to which courts, prosecution, probation and defense can turn for reliable information upon which to base administrative decisions to improve case processing.

In the opinion of the Administrative Office of the Courts, more "hard case data" is needed, if specific causes of delay are to be identified and eliminated. The Judicial Management Information System needs to be expanded to include all courts in the State, so that the ultimate goal of unification can be achieved administratively as well as jurisdictionally. Recognizing this need, the Judicial Management Information System is in the process of developing a network of computerized data systems which will allow a more swift and accurate tracking of the progress of cases.

There is also a need to provide judges, law clerks and attorneys with information to be used in solving legal problems such as full textual citations of published cases. An automated legal research project should be implemented to readily provide this information.

Objectives:

To generate, on a statewide basis, the development of comprehensive, uniform, reliable and timely data as well as planning and research statistics which will result in more efficient court administrative and management information.

To interface the Statewide Judicial Information System with county projects.

To continue to develop a Probation Management Information System to assist the judiciary in standardizing probation procedures with resulting improvements in probation services to clients.

To continue to develop a computer-aided transcription service for the courts.

To continue to develop a statewide Automated Legal Research project to reduce delays by minimizing research time.

General Strategy for Implementation:

The Administrative Office of the Courts will continue the development of a Probation Management Information System (PMIS). This system generates

reports on caseload information for all sections of the probation system, including personnel reports, in addition to statistical and analytical reports. PMIS provides information accounting for individuals sentenced and placed on probation, the demographic characteristics of probationers (in anticipation of developing a classification system), as well as sentencing trends. The system contains information about probation officer skills, caseload size and types of caseloads. The project develops predictive data to assist in determining the type of supervision needed. Attempts are made to cross-tabulate recidivism with probationer characteristics. Supervisional classification methods will be improved leading to the development of a sophisticated, weighted caseload system. (Relevant juvenile intake data and pre-trial intervention data is also collected and interpreted.) The system provides the Administrative Office of the Courts with information needed for comparison, analysis and planning. The case-oriented PMIS component of the project will be expanded to additional counties.

In an effort to maximize the utilization of limited judicial resources, the Administrative Office of the Courts continues to develop a State-level Judicial Management Information System. Although the original JMIS and the modular systems already developed will be assumed with State and local resources, there is a need to expand this to include all courts in the State as funds become available. Such an expansion of data availability will further the judiciary's goal of unification. There is a continuing need to provide coordination and supervision of the county systems. Inasmuch as local and State court administrators are dependent upon the availability of reliable and timely data, the continued development of information systems is a primary concern of the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Upon completion of a report by the National Center for State Courts, the Administrative Office of the Courts began development of a computer-aided transcription project. The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency will support the further implementation of this activity in additional counties. The present cost of transcription is in excess of \$5 million annually; the cost in terms of delay is also considerable. The prompt preparation of accurate transcripts is a prerequisite to any substantial backlog reduction.

The Administrative Office of the Courts will continue the development of a full-text Automated Legal Research system. This project began as a pilot project in four localities; initial evaluation justifies an expansion into a statewide service for prosecutors and defenders as well as the courts. Terminals will be housed in centralized locations to permit access

by all components of the criminal justice community. It is anticipated that this project will have a direct impact on the reduction of court delay. This is a primary objective of the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency.

Subgrant Data:

The Administrative Office of the Courts will be the sole eligible applicant for State-level funds under this program area. All applications will require Judicial Coordinating Committee approval. Funds in 1980 will be combined with funds allocated in the 1979 Plan to continue the ongoing Probation Man-

agement Information System, the Statewide Judicial Information System, Computer-Aided Transcription Project and the Automated Legal Research Project. State-level funds amounting to \$112,500 and local-level funds up to \$41,500 will be available. The Computer-Aided Transcription and Automated Legal Research projects may be developed as joint state/local projects.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$154,000

PROGRAM C-10: Office of the Public Advocate Activities

Objectives:

To continue a comprehensive child advocacy project within the Department of the Public Advocate to promote new court rules, legislative enactments, executive directives and procedural changes where necessary.

To provide a comprehensive plan for child advocacy within the Office of the Public Defender.

To promote child advocacy in the State by participating in 50 investigations annually.

To aid the Public Defender Trial Regions and Appellate Section in the identification and resolution

of major, unusual and/or complex legal issues.

To centralize the function of providing assistance and advice to other criminal justice agencies in policy planning.

Subgrant Data:

The Department of the Public Advocate will be the sole eligible applicant.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$144,500

PROGRAM C-11: Continued Support of Statewide Court Activities

Objectives:

To continue to support a statewide review of court facilities and to produce guidelines for the design of new courtrooms and court buildings.

To promote further court unification and the development of a statewide family court system.

To continue to provide the judiciary with a Judicial Information Service to promote community support and understanding of the judicial branch of government.

To study and improve the present jury system.

To continue to supervise county-level probation projects, such as family and neighborhood dispute settlement centers, bail units, and adult restitution programs.

To correct deficiencies in the present municipal court system.

To promote fundamental administrative and management improvements in the Appellate Division of the Superior Court.

To support the Central Appellate Research Staff in

its effort to reduce backlog and delay in the handling of appeals.

To preserve valuable legal research materials and opinions and ensure their availability to all judges on a statewide basis.

Subgrant Data:

The Administrative Office of the Courts will be the sole eligible applicant for funds under this program area.

The Court Unification project will receive \$61,000 in funds. The Judicial Facilities project will be allocated \$36,000 and the Appellate Research Bank, \$32,000. The Judicial Information Service will also receive \$32,000 and the Consolidated Pre-trial Services project will be continued with \$56,000. Funds amounting to \$10,800 will be available for a new project, such as a Centralized Juror Management initiative or a Municipal Court Improvement project. Applications require prior Judicial Coordinating Committee endorsement.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$227,200

PROGRAM C-12: Support of County-Wide Family and Neighborhood Dispute Settlement Centers

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Within New Jersey, the greatest volume of complaints are processed through the municipal courts. In the past 27 years the total work of the municipal courts has increased over 600 percent from 559,497 cases in 1950 to the present total of nearly four million. A substantial number of cases can be diverted from the formal court calendar through the use of family and neighborhood dispute settlement centers which can provide a way for those individuals involved in disputes to reach a resolution without the necessity for a formal court hearing.

Objectives:

To improve municipal court efficiency by screening out minor disputes informally and voluntarily. Three regionalized family and neighborhood dispute settlement centers will be operated for this purpose.

To increase the level of services to disputants who may profit more by mediation and arbitration than by the traditional court process; as many as 3,000 cases will be resolved informally.

General Strategy for Implementation:

SLEPA has supported the establishment of family and neighborhood dispute settlement centers within high volume municipal courts and within county probation departments. These centers provide an alternative to a formal municipal court proceeding. In addition to diverting a substantial number of cases from the formal calendar, these units provide an alternative for those involved in disputes to achieve a resolution without the necessity of incurring official sanctions.

The centers strive to prevent a certain amount of crime, by providing a settlement resource. In some instances, the resolution of a minor irritation may deter possible criminal activity.

A further advantage of these units is that by diverting relatively minor matters from the court, more attention can be concentrated on serious criminal complaints.

Experience has shown that these teams are cost effective in that they conserve valuable bench time. Experience has also shown that these projects are most effective when regionalized. Administrative ov-

erhead can be reduced and a high degree of professionalism of services maintained by locating these projects within county probation departments. Several courts can be serviced in this manner, with more consistency in case handling.

Cases are screened in these units by project staff, usually with the cooperation of municipal court clerks. If the case can be processed informally (according to uniform guidelines promulgated by the Administrative Office of the Courts), the individual bringing the matter to the attention of the court is given the option of making a formal complaint or taking advantage of the services of the project. If the latter option is exercised, a convenient hearing date is set. Many hearings are held in the evening hours, and often bilingual hearing officers are available. During the hearing, which is conducted by a trained counselor, the nature and cause of the dispute are discussed in an effort to develop a solution. In some cases, crisis counseling suffices; in other instances, referrals are made to appropriate community agencies. If it appears that the matter cannot be resolved by the hearing center, the case is referred to the municipal court. Information obtained at an unsuccessful hearing is not made part of the record at the time of subsequent court hearing.

Initial assessments of these projects confirm their value as an additional court resource.

Technical assistance for these projects will be available from the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, the Consolidated Pre-trial Services unit of the Administrative Office of the Courts and from national models developed by LEAA.

Subgrant Data:

Funds in the range of \$25,000 to \$30,000 will be made available to implement three county-wide family and neighborhood dispute settlement centers within probation departments. These projects will be funded for two years, at which time local assumption of costs is anticipated. All applications within this program area will require Judicial Coordinating Committee approval.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$75,000

D. INSTITUTIONAL AND NON-INSTITUTIONAL REHABILITATION

PROGRAM D-1: Jail Programs

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Local correctional facilities face a number of unique problems, many of which stem from the special character of the inmate population. There is diversity in the seriousness of the offenses charged or committed as well as in the age and sex of the population. In most jails, individuals are housed in the same facilities regardless of whether they are awaiting trial, been convicted and are pending transfer or serving a sentence. Since space is often in short supply, it becomes impossible to segregate the various types of inmates.

Because of its diversity, the inmate population in local jails requires a wide range of services. It is also important to provide vocational and academic needs assessment for the inmate population to support the attempted reintegration of the inmate into the community upon release.

The State Law Enforcement Planning Agency has focused on the need for modernization of jail management philosophy and techniques and improved decision-making techniques based on inmate classification. Additional key elements include the development of service delivery programs and an evaluation design to provide data for administrative decision-making and building model jail programs.

The program emphasis for 1980 continues toward the development of a management-oriented classification program in each of the State's county jails and local correctional facilities. The development of correctional service delivery systems having the capacity to meet the needs of inmates through improved administration and management of the jail program is also pursued.

Objectives:

To continue five jail treatment and classification projects.

To provide classification and social assistance services for 11,500 incarcerated defendants and inmates.

To continue to provide pre- and post-release referrals to community service agencies for approximately 4,500 clients and to maintain a follow-up survey on the progress of these referrals up to three months after the referral is made.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Applicants are advised that the following elements are considered essential to a jail program. Applications should include a narrative (statistical when appropriate) description of existing program elements as well as a needs assessment for those elements contained in the application:

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, to update case records, must be gathered from external sources and from such internal reports developed from interviews, testing and client follow-up information.
 - b. A valid method of assessing needs of the offender and defendant in terms 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 and defendant should be provided maximum involvement in determining the nature and direction of the programmatic decisions provided and a mechanism to appeal such decisions.
2. A basic staff orientation and training 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 and defen-

dant 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 and detainee 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 including a project position which may be identified as a classification officer. 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 such forms and data gathering procedures as are necessary to implement proper management of jail population;
- b. Analyzing trends in the jail population composition for the purpose of predicting future jail populations and allocating jail resources;

- c. Administering the inmate classification system; and
- d. Evaluating the effectiveness of those psychological, vocational, social and academic programs designed to impact on the offender and defendant.

Funding for projects within this program area normally will be on a yearly basis for three years. Continuation funding will be contingent upon an acceptable evaluation at the conclusion of each grant period and availability of funds.

Applicants are encouraged to request technical assistance from SLEPA staff in the development of project objectives, activities, methods, staff and evaluation.

Subgrant Data:

Continuation funding will be provided for the following counties: Camden, \$40,000; Monmouth, \$15,000; Cape May, \$20,000; Hudson, \$30,000; and Essex County, \$25,000.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$130,000

PROGRAM D-2: Improvement of Juvenile Probation Services

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

Probation supervision is the most common disposition utilized by the judges of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. Almost one-third of the adjudicated juveniles were placed on probation during court year 1976. Despite the obvious importance of probation as a juvenile court disposition, many departments suffer from a shortage of personnel and a lack of services to deal adequately with the many problems juveniles may encounter such as family deterioration, alcoholism, drug addiction, poor health and unemployment.

Probation officers must supervise probationers and attempt to provide the individualized services to meet particular problems. Yet they are also involved in preparing disposition reports. Caseloads are very high, affecting the quality of both the supervision and predisposition investigation responsibilities of probation officers. Because of the importance of probation there is a need to increase the capacities of local probation departments to better enable them to provide necessary services to juveniles placed on probation.

Objectives:

To improve the range and quality of services available to probation departments to enable them

to fulfill more effectively their mandated responsibilities in relation to juveniles adjudicated by the court.

To develop and implement innovative programming 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 for those probationers participating in a project's activities when compared to those juveniles under regular supervised probation.

To expand the number of counties providing specialized treatment, serving a minimum of 2,500 juvenile probationers per year.

General Strategy for Implementation:

Applications are encouraged from county governments interested in experimenting with innovative experiences for juvenile probationers which provide specialized services for these juveniles and their families. Services should include the utilization of mental health and other service agencies to provide treatment and evaluation for juveniles. Grants will also be available to develop day long supervised treatment units for juveniles on probation. Participation in these projects would be a condition of

probation for juveniles who would otherwise be committed to a correctional facility. Project activities should include work experience enhanced by intensive counseling.

Projects presently operating which might be used as models for applicants include a Bergen County project which utilizes parent-effectiveness training concepts in group workshops primarily for the parents of juvenile probationers and a Camden County project which provides counseling, educational services and job placement for juvenile probationers. In addition, Burlington County implemented an adolescent treatment program that provides mental health, psychological and/or psychiatric services for juveniles as a condition of probation. The project has served as a model for other counties and similar programs have been established in Somerset County, Ocean County, Hunterdon County, Morris County and Atlantic County. Funding has also been used for volunteer programs which recruit and train citizens to counsel juvenile probationers.

Projects funded will be subject to programmatic modifications that may be necessary to be in conformity with Supreme Court and Administrative Office of the Courts rules and guidelines and they will also be 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 its effectiveness.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the project, subgrantees will be required to compare recidivism rates between project participants and a comparable group of youths under regular probation supervision. Recidivism is defined as a subsequent appearance as a defendant in a court hearing.

The subgrantee will also be expected to utilize technical assistance offered by the Administrative Office of the Courts in preparing an evaluation.

Funding consideration will particularly be given to the following:

1. The establishment or expansion within probation departments of intensive service techniques which result in innovative projects.
2. The establishment of Adolescent Treatment Units that provide community-based, outpatient mental health treatment services for juvenile probationers as an integral part of the probation experience.

As a general policy, projects in this area will not be funded for more than three years. Continuation funding is also dependent on the availability of funds on a year to year basis.

Subgrant Data:

Up to six probation projects will be considered for continuation funding.

One new project designed to improve probation services will be funded at up to \$80,000 to provide innovative services for youngsters on probation as a condition of probation. Applications are required to contain prior Judicial Coordinating Committee endorsement.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$370,000

PROGRAM D-3: Corrections Support Programs

Objectives:

To continue a program of inmate advocacy at local correctional institutions and jails. To conduct investigations of approximately 300 inmate complaints, to conduct inspections of conditions in 13 of the 28 local correctional institutions and to visit all 28 institutions to investigate complaints.

To continue providing representation for approximately 600 youthful parolees at final parole revocation hearings.

To continue an inmate grievance handling mechanism at Leesburg State Prison to review approximately 300 cases per year.

To continue the legal services coordinator pro-

gram to provide para-legal training to inmates.

To expand the Planning, Management and Evaluation unit or to develop new projects to meet emergent needs.

To increase the referral of State inmates requiring treatment for alcoholism or drug addiction to community treatment programs by improving diagnostic and release planning information to releasing authorities. To develop over 500 treatment plans and recommendations to releasing authorities. To secure commitments by community treatment programs to accept inmates for placement after release.

To improve and expand institutional treatment and social service programs for inmates.

Subgrant Data:

The Department of Corrections will be eligible for \$134,300 and the Department of Public Advocate will be eligible for \$190,000.

Final continuation funding is provided for the following projects: Youthful Parole Revocation, County/Municipal Inmate Advocacy, Community Treatment Services and the Grievance Mechanism at Leesburg. Continuation funding is also provided for the Legal Services Coordinator Project. The

Department of Corrections is provided funding either for expansion of the Planning, Management and Evaluation Unit or for the development of new projects to meet emergent needs.

Budget:

	LEAA
Total Part D Block Support	\$324,300

PROGRAM D-4: State Correctional Education Programs

Objectives:

To continue providing each inmate entering a State Correctional Institution with: orientation as to vocational and educational programs, educational achievement testing, individual education and/or vocational plans and educational performance counseling.

To continue the evaluation of all academic and vocational programs offered by the Garden State School District. The evaluation will include the average grade level achievement of students, number of students successfully completing programs, progress toward meeting program objectives and recommendations for continuance, improvement and/or redirection of ineffective or under-utilized program components as well as to develop new programs.

To continue providing individualized education and training to 280 inmates at the Leesburg State Prison Farm Unit.

To provide 200 youth at the Jamesburg Training School for Boys and Girls with vocational

assessment, work orientation, training and/or career guidance.

To continue to provide vocational awareness, training and education programs to inmates.

Subgrant Data:

The Department of Corrections and the Department of Education shall be joint applicants for these projects, all of which operate through the Garden State School District Central Office.

The following projects are provided final continuation funding: The Leesburg Education Training and Assessment Project and the Research and Evaluation Unit.

Continuation funding is provided for six Continuous Assessment Programs and the Vocational Development Project - Jamesburg.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$231,000

PROGRAM D-5: Community Manpower and Adult Probation Programs

Relationship to Problem Analysis:

The most effective form of adult, non-institutional rehabilitation is considered to be the offering of comprehensive vocational assistance and employment accompanied by necessary counseling, treatment and other supportive social services. In the past, however, these efforts at the local community level have been fragmented, not coordinated with the few community resources that were available and have lacked adequate funding.

In response to the need for identifying and providing employment and vocational counseling and assessment activities, the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency has established a comprehensive program to improve services available for defendants and offenders released to the community from

jails and prisons or while on pre-trial intervention, probation, and parole. This program has assisted in the reintegration and rehabilitation of project clients through the improvement of manpower service delivery systems.

To meet these needs, the Vocational Service Center (VSC) concept has been developed within a variety of host agencies such as probation departments, parole offices and non-profit private corporations. The VSC consists of administrative, job development, counseling, client evaluation and referral staff, and may utilize the services of on-loan staff from other interested agencies serving client needs. A direct benefit of the Vocational Service Center program for the local jurisdiction is the improved capability to manage its manpower service delivery program.

The strengthening of probation is also an important concern of this program area. Probation continues to be the most frequently used sentencing alternative, but excessively high caseloads have hampered supervision efforts and lessened the overall effectiveness of probation. There is a great demand for probation services despite the fact that available probation resources are not sufficient to meet these demands.

Contract probation emerged as a new project concept in the 1979 Plan which is designed to increase the effectiveness of probation efforts. The 1980 Plan will continue in this direction in an effort to enhance probation department efforts to rehabilitate and provide assistance to clients.

Objectives:

To continue funding five vocational service center projects providing ex-offenders and alleged offenders with preplacement job counseling, job placement and post job placement counseling. A minimum of 800 parolees, probationers, pre-trial intervention participants and jail releasees will be provided with these services.

To continue projects which provide parolees, probationers, pre-trial intervention participants and jail releasees with emergency food, clothing, shelter and transportation. Approximately 700 ex-offenders and alleged offenders on release pending trial will be eligible for emergency assistance.

To continue to provide education and training tuition assistance to ex-offenders and alleged offenders on release.

To continue one existing and develop an additional contract probation project to increase the capacity of probation departments to rehabilitate their clients. To place offenders on probation contingent upon their participation in a treatment, work, educational or other task.

To continue one existing and develop an additional project to provide modern and efficient caseload management for two probation departments. To utilize computerized management and scheduling methods in probation offices.

General Strategy for Implementation:

The following information is considered an essential component of all applications for funds under this program area:

1. Identification of existing resources in the geographic area to be served by the project that have as their prime responsibility, the provision of services addressed in the application such as vocational evaluation, career counseling, vocational training, job placement and emergency services. 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 and alleged offenders to the geographical area to be served and the specific nature and extent of supervisory constraints, if any, placed on the released offenders and alleged offenders.
3. An assessment of the ex-offender and alleged 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 assessment should identify sources of information, such as criminal justice agencies, and indicate the 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. Identification of the sources and extent of financial and non-financial assistance available to service agencies.

Designs for job placement and emergency service projects where applicable should include the following elements:

1. Job placement efforts should involve extensive travel by at least one staff member to employers in the area to secure commitments to hire ex-offenders and alleged offenders.
2. Staff involved in securing commitments by employers to hire ex-offenders and alleged offenders should have experience in job placement and experience in marketing a product or concept.
3. Frequent counseling contact should be maintained with employers and ex-offenders after job placement to insure successful adjustment.
4. Attempts to secure emergency services from existing community service agencies prior to utilizing project funds for purchasing emergency services. Project staff should maintain a log listing all clients receiving funds and reasons for the decision to provide funds.
5. An agreement whenever possible that the project will function as a liaison among the various service agencies and between these agencies and the criminal justice system.
6. Design for an ongoing evaluation device to improve project operations and assess identifiable client success factors.

Probation Caseload Management. The use of computerized probation caseload management and scheduling is proposed to improve efficiency and resource allocation of probation departments. The computerized management system will be designed for integration into the present computerized court management information system and will require

software and hardware upgrading. Applications for these projects must include endorsement from the Judicial Coordinating Committee.

Probation Contract Programming. Applications for contract probation projects must include the endorsement of the (Judicial Coordinating Committee). As the basic program design incorporates a shift of emphasis from a calendar oriented system to a behavior-change oriented system, the mechanisms to establish contract criteria and to monitor behavior change must be clearly described. Indications of cooperation from community resource agencies as well as the affected criminal justice department must be included in the applications. Under the contract probation approach, participants will be asked to sign a contract as a condition of probation. Continued probation will be contingent upon successful participation in and/or completion of a treatment, work, educational, training or other task as stipulated in the contract.

Funding for projects within this program area normally will be on a yearly basis for three years. Continuation fundings will be contingent upon an acceptable evaluation at the conclusion of each grant period and availability of funds.

Applicants are encouraged to request technical assistance from SLEPA staff in the development of project objectives, activities, methods, staffing and evaluation.

Subgrant Data:

Continuation funding will be provided for manpower projects in the following counties: Union, Gloucester, Cumberland, Passaic and Burlington. A total of \$340,000 is allocated for these grants.

A total of \$140,000 is provided to continue the Passaic Modification of Probation Principles Project (contract probation), the Camden County Probation Caseload Management Project, to develop one new contract probation project and one new probation caseload management project. Applications for probation programs are required to obtain prior Judicial Coordinating Committee endorsement.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$480,000

PROGRAM D-6: Alternatives to Adult Offender Incarceration

Objectives:

To provide graduated community re-entry to approximately 300 offenders released from State correctional institutions through continuation of two residential halfway facilities and the purchase of community bedspace projects.

To provide the courts with an additional alternative to incarceration by continuing a community-based residential center to serve at least 100 offenders who would otherwise have been sentenced to a correctional facility.

Subgrant Data:

The State Department of Corrections will be provided \$260,900 in continuation funding for the Newark Adult Residential Program, \$67,500; Women's Adult Residential Center, \$93,400; and the Coordination of Purchase of Bedspace, \$100,000.

Continuation funding will also be provided for the Mercer County Residential Facility \$113,300.

Budget:

	LEAA
Part D Block Support	\$374,200

PROGRAM D-7: Program Efforts to Provide for Separation of Adult and Juvenile Offenders and to Insure Deinstitutionalization of Status and Non-Offenders

Objectives:

To supervise the classification and placement of juveniles committed to the Youth Correctional Institution Complex to insure that no juveniles are placed in the Complex where they would have regular contact with adult offenders.

To continue the funding of projects under this program area which will encompass approximately 450 juveniles who would otherwise be in regular contact with adult offenders in State correctional institutions.

To provide for a system of monitoring which will survey, assess and insure compliance with the requirements to separate juveniles from adult offenders and to prohibit the placement of status and non-offenders in detention and correctional facilities.

Subgrant Data:

Monies will be available to the Department of

Corrections to continue funding for up to six projects which further the implementation of the requirement to separate juvenile from adult offenders.

Budget:

JJDP Act Funds	LEAA \$579,189
----------------	--------------------------

NEW JERSEY STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

JOHN J. MULLANEY
Executive Director

HAROLD F. DAMON
Deputy Director

ADMINISTRATION UNIT

RONALD D. SOST
Assistant Director

Auditing Section

Frederick P. Schrenk
Chief Fiscal Officer
Michael J. Boccanfuso
Assistant Fiscal Officer
Vincent M. Pennacchi
John J. Roman
Technical Specialist
Venita Broughton
Research Assistant

Robert J. Caccese
Supervisor
Kathleen Coury
Ann L. Osborn

Bookkeeping Section

David Hiestand
Accountant II
Beverly Speck
Head Clerk
Raymond E. Elmer
Ervin J. Kovacs
Gert Kowalski
Mary Lou Martinez
Joyce Brooks

Office of Administration & Supplies

Martin J. Wallace
Supervisor
Luke J. Horvath
Assistant

OPERATIONS UNIT

Gerald A. Griffin
Assistant Director

Adult Corrections & Rehabilitation

Charles Leone
Chief
Curtis A. Wood
Nancy Erdo French

Police

Karl Koehler
Chief
Edward Rowland
John Koren

Courts/ Ancillary Services

John H.C. West
Chief
Giles T. Dunn
William Bostic

Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention

Terry Edwards
Chief
Arnold Cohen
Dennis O'Hara
Phyllis Thomas

PLANNING UNIT

Donald J. Apai
Assistant Director

Planning Section

Martha A. Lackey
Supervising Planner
Planners:
Karen Walsh
Lorrie Wendruff

Wilma Solomon
Supervising Planner JJDP

Evaluation Team

Mark Geller
Supervising Planner
Lynn Ford
George Dannenberg

SECRETARIAL STAFF

Doreen Tancredi
Executive Secretary

Marilyn Abbott
Julie Anderson
Diane Cardaciotto
Terri Collura
Roseann DiGaetano
Elaine Fisher

JoAnn Haney
Sharon Senzick
Lorraine St. George
Virginia Voilas
Barbara Wood

