EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NEW JERSEY STATE PAROLE BOARD

Our audit found that the financial transactions included in our testing were related to the State Parole Board’s programs, were reasonable, and were properly recorded in the accounting systems. We did note certain internal control weaknesses and matters of compliance merit management’s attention. In addition, we noted that the State Parole Board is not monitoring offenders in compliance with established supervision standards.

AUDIT HIGHLIGHTS

- The State Parole Board (SPB) supervision requirements as stipulated in their standards, including face-to-face contacts, home visits, and drug or alcohol testing, are not being completed within established timeframes which could result in an increased risk to the public and a reduced likelihood that the offender will achieve long-term behavioral reform.

- Parole officers did not make required face-to-face contacts for 148 of 320 offenders in our sample within established timeframes. This included 32 of 60 sampled sex offenders and 48 of 100 sampled offenders on mandatory parole supervision (MSV) who have been convicted of violent crimes.

- Required face-to-face home visits were not made within established timeframes for 73 of the 320 offenders in our sample, including 24 of 100 sampled MSV offenders and 10 of 60 sampled sex offenders.

- Required home visits verifying with an independent source, such as a neighbor, that the offender is living at the approved residence had an exception rate of over 98 percent.

- Random drug or alcohol testing is to occur at least once every 30 days for phase I and phase II offenders. Parole officers did not perform the required testing on 143 of the 200 offenders in our sample. This included 33 of 40 sampled sex offenders and 45 of 60 sampled MSV offenders.

- Controls over the Community Resource Center (CRC) program are inadequate. The SPB has not established a comprehensive written policy regarding billable program participation and an effective process for the review of provider invoices. As a result, providers have been reimbursed for unsupported and questionable services, as well as duplicate billings. In addition, the SPB has not established a limit for the number of off-site days that can be billed during an offender’s referral period. One tested CRC was reimbursed $676,000 for off-site days, representing 49 percent of the total amount reimbursed.

AUDITEE RESPONSE

The Board generally concurs with our findings and recommendations except for the benefit improved compliance with supervision standards would provide.

For the complete audit report, click here.