

1458

V E R A I N S T I T U T E O F J U S T I C E

MANHATTAN COURT EMPLOYMENT PROJECT

Progress Report

February 5, 1968 - September 30, 1968

Henry M. Aronson, Director
100 Centre Street - 1330
New York, New York 10013
212 732 0076

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>TOPIC</u>	Page No.
INTRODUCTION.....	1
THE PARTICIPANT.....	4
SCREENING.....	7
Criteria	8
Projected Intake	11
Screening Process	12
HUMAN SERVICES.....	22
Operations	23
Drug Involvement of Participants	28
The Representatives	33
CAREER DEVELOPMENT.....	54
Job Development	54
Counseling and Placement	59
Unemployed Participants	77
Servicing of Participants Friends and Relatives	79
The Role of the Career Developer	80
Career Development Records	81
LEGAL STATUS OF 300 PARTICIPANTS.....	86
Dismissal	86
Extensions	89
Terminations	92
Re-Arrests	95

Table of Contents (continued)

<u>TOPIC</u>	PAGE NO.
SOCIAL SERVICES.....	100
Cases Closed	106
MANHATTAN COURT EMPLOYMENT PROJECT COMMITTEE.....	111
PERFORMANCE TO DATE.....	114

INTRODUCTION

This report describes the operations of the Manhattan Court Employment Project for the period February 5, 1968 through September 30, 1968. The first participant was accepted into the project on February 5, 1968. 300 additional participants were accepted in the following eight months. The events described in the first report dated May 8, 1968, covering the period November 1, 1967 (the date the project was funded) through February 5, 1968 are not repeated here.

The project seeks to take persons from impoverished backgrounds who have been arrested, and assist them to develop a career and habits which will eliminate the probability of future adverse contacts with the criminal law. The project provides two essential services - Career Development and Counseling.

Career Development is aimed at identifying career and educational potential in the participant and developing openings in schools, training programs and industry. More often than not, the participant is unable to realize his potential without help because of severe obstacles confronting him:

ignorance of work habits or skills; a limited sense of responsibility; limited knowledge of his talents; debilitating fears; ignorance of resources within the community; destructive habits; lack of money. The objective of counseling is the elimination of these obstacles.

Resources existing within the community are relied on wherever possible. Some, such as Social Service benefits and drug addiction counseling, have been built into the project through out-stationing of staff from the appropriate agencies. The project does not directly provide job training, formal education, medical assistance, housing or stipends. Instead, the staff brings existing resources to the defendant and helps him in utilizing them.

We assumed that careful selection would eliminate narcotics addicts, a group which we knew would not be substantially aided by counseling and vocational assistance. We also assumed that the participants' interest in avoiding a record of criminal conviction (dismissal of charges having been assured successful participants by the District Attorney and the criminal court judges) would insure the cooperation of participants. Both assumptions proved incorrect. Careful screening has not eliminated the narcotics addict; and the prospective dismissal of charges

has not provided instant commitment of participants to the project and its staff. Approximately 23% of defendants without any indication of addiction on their records have turned out to be narcotics addicts.

Similarly, the assumption that the participant would provide project staff with an opportunity to assist him, from a desire for personal betterment or to avoid a criminal record, has not proven to be entirely correct. Most participants in the project have been arrested on misdemeanor charges and are aware that whether or not they participate successfully in the Manhattan Court Employment Project, they will not suffer severe personal deprivation. Jail is a remote possibility. In addition, most defendants know that if they fail to show in court on their adjourned hearing day, the chances of subsequent arrest on a bench warrant, or other official action, are slight.

This report describes the experiences of the major elements of the project - the participant, the screening process, Career Development, Human Services and Social Services.

The section entitled "Performance to Date" is a statistical analysis of the project for the period February 5, through September 30, 1968.

THE PARTICIPANT

The services described in the following sections - Human Services, Career Development and Social Services - exist for the single purpose of assisting the participant.

During the period covered by this report, 300 participants have been accepted into the project. A profile of these participants follows:

Age: 19.5 (the average age is increasing; the first 50 participants averaged 18 years; the last 50, 20.5 years)

Ethnicity (Percentage):

Black	52%
Puerto Rican	33%
White	9%
Other Spanish Speaking	4%
Other	2%

Education (average grade attained): 9.7 grades

Marital status: 89% are single

In the introduction, we noted that drug addiction was the largest single problem confronting the participant. Seventy (23%) of the first 300 participants are addicts.

They are included in the one hundred twenty-nine (43%) participants who admitted using narcotics. The degree of involvement is listed in the following table:

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Intake</u>
Addicted to heroin	60	20
Addicted to barbituates	10	3.3
"Involved" with heroin	13	4.3
"Involved" with barbituates	4	1.3
Constant use of marijuana	13	4.3
"Infrequent" use of marijuana	<u>29</u> 129	<u>9.7</u> 42.9%

These persons had no record of addiction or possession and did not reveal outward symptoms of addiction during a brief screening interview.

Assisting this predominantly non-white group of school drop-outs to develop a career and avoid further adverse contact with the criminal law is a difficult objective to attain.

Unlike the client of a state employment office, the participant does not seek us; rather we go to the participant. Unlike the parolee or probationer, the participant is not subject to rearrest if he fails to keep appointments or meet other obligations. This unique relationship requires

that we strike a responsive chord in the participant at the beginning of the relationship; he must recognize the desire and ability of the staff to assist him.

SCREENING

Every person arrested in the Borough of Manhattan is booked in the precinct station nearest the place of arrest and then arraigned in a criminal court which holds both day and evening sessions. At arraignment, the first judicial hearing after arrest, bail is set, charges are read, an attorney is appointed for indigent defendants, and a subsequent hearing is scheduled. All persons arraigned during the daytime are screened for participation in the Manhattan Court Employment Project. Additional defendants, arraigned at night or over weekends, are considered for participation when brought to the attention of project screeners by judges or attorneys.

A defendant must meet the following tests to be assigned to the project:

Information in his court papers
must meet stated criteria;

Satisfactory personal interview;

Approval by the District Attorney

Approval by the Court

CRITERIA

The criteria were designed to identify those defendants who would benefit from the project's services and to whom the judges and prosecutors would approve giving special treatment. They were meant to be as broad as possible and capable of being objectively applied by persons with clerical skills. Earlier criteria modified effective September 30, 1968, were not broad. Contrary to our expectations, they eliminated nearly everyone who was arrested.

As the project has gained the confidence of court personnel, the criteria have been gradually extended without resistance. The maximum age limit has gone from 25 to 40 to 45. Exclusions of all drug charges has been modified to permit participation by those accused of possession of small quantities of marijuana. Persons making no more than \$70 per week are now eligible; the previous requirement was complete unemployment. Initial resistance to acceptance of felons has decreased so that now one of every six participants has been arrested on a felony charge. The case of an otherwise eligible co-defendant will now be separated from those of his partners to permit participation.

Persons accused of violations - offenses punishable by a maximum of 15 days in jail - account for half of all arrests and are now considered for participation. We realized that the relative insignificance of the charge did not mean that the project should not respond to the accused defendants.

As of September 30, 1968, a defendant would be eligible for the Project if:

- 1) male
- 2) between 17 and 45 years of age
- 3) charged with a violation, misdemeanor, or a felony that the court agreed to reduce to a misdemeanor;
- 4) prior record does not include more than one year in jail (regardless of number of convictions, suspended sentences, etc.);
- 5) no record of drug addiction or possession (except small quantities of marijuana);
- 6) living in, and planning to remain accessible to Manhattan;
- 7) no prior charge pending;

- 8) not a full-time student;
- 9) not presently employed for more than \$70.00 per week (plus \$5.00 for each dependent);
- 10) not on probation at time of arrest; and,
- 11) not presently charged with sex offenses, homicide, robbery with a weapon, prostitution, public intoxication, public lewdness and offensive exhibition, gambling, traffic violations, loitering in connection with prostitution, gambling or drugs.

The criteria, with few exceptions, are not effective predictors of a defendant's potential for success in the project. The experience of our Human Services unit has demonstrated that the only useful exclusions relate to drug addiction, intention to stay in the New York area, and high income from illegal street activities. Except for these, successful and unsuccessful defendants are distributed at random among the other acceptable categories. It is conceivable that potentially successful defendants could be identified after lengthy contact with them - a kind of contact which could not be practically developed as a part of a screening process.

However, the criteria have not obstructed our work. The defendants we are accepting present the full range of problems the project was designed to confront. Furthermore, the criteria are effective in that those relating to prior record (criteria 4, 5, 7, 10) and present charge (criteria 3, 11) are satisfactory to the District Attorney and judges. In addition, they can be objectively applied: almost all the necessary information is present on the court papers.

In summary, we have discovered few criteria which identify responsive defendants with accuracy and ease in the context of the court. However, our criteria will continue to be broadened and there is no doubt that greater numbers of defendants could be available for participation if the project were to expand its staff.

PROJECTED INTAKE

We had originally planned to take 12 participants a week for 16 months. November 1st to February 5th, the first four months of operation, were spent hiring and training staff. During the 34 weeks of intake from February 5th "

to September 30th, 300 participants were taken in instead of the projected 408. We can anticipate a total of 500 participants by March 1, 1969. The lower number (800 participants had been projected for this period) results from the necessity to retain about one quarter of all our participants in the project for longer than the projected three month involvement in order to work with them further. This has represented a major shift from our original plan.

SCREENING PROCESS

Project screeners sit in the arraignment part and read the papers of all defendants arraigned during the day shift of court. In addition, they respond to requests from judges, District Attorneys and Legal Aid Society attorneys in other sections of the court who have identified previously arraigned defendants they believe eligible. Both in arraignment part and the adjourned parts, the project screener requests a delay in the calling of the case, reads the court papers, and checks the defendant's prior record by talking to the arresting officer, looking at the defendant's record of his prior arrests, and calling the Police Department's Bureau of

Criminal Identification. He will elicit missing information on employment and residence from the defendant either in the courtroom or in the detention cells. If the defendant passes this investigation, a project Representative (a counselor of the Human Services Unit) acquaints the defendant with the project, seeks his consent to participation, and secures additional information on drug involvement and residence.

As originally conceived, this interview was to be a confrontation in which a meaningful commitment from the defendant could be secured. In practice, the shortness of time and the lack of privacy in the detention cells has made the interview perfunctory. The Human Services Unit will continue to rely on the initial interview following acceptance into the project as the point at which the first significant contact with the defendant is made.

Either before or at the time that the case is heard by the court, the screener informs the Legal Aid attorney and the Assistant District Attorney of the defendant's

eligibility. A request is made by the defendant's attorney for a three month adjournment and release from custody on the defendant's recognizance. Both the District Attorney and the judge may balk at participation because of the defendant's present charge or prior record. When this occurs, the screener acts as the defendant's advocate. The following transcript illustrates this role in a case where there had been some difficulty in having the defendant admitted to the project at an earlier hearing. The defendant had begun working with a counselor in the hope that a longer adjournment and official assignment to the project could be obtained at the second hearing. The defendant had appeared late and the judge was not receptive, although the Assistant District Attorney was amenable to our request. The key moment was the summary by the screener of our experience with the defendant up to that time.

COURT OFFICER: Recalling calendar number 52, 53, 54, 55 and 56, Mr. R. B. Earlier this defendant failed to appear. Parole was revoked. Warrant ordered. The officer left a date of 7-19.

THE COURT: Why weren't you here?

THE DEFENDANT: My train got delayed, and I caught the wrong train.

THE COURT: What train?

THE DEFENDANT: Seventh Ave.

THE COURT: I don't hear you.

THE DEFENDANT: I caught the wrong train.

THE COURT: Well, you were supposed to be here 9:30. This is nearly one o'clock. I can't understand how you would delay yourself all that time?

THE DEFENDANT: (No response.)

THE COURT: This man has four traffic violations; two misdemeanor traffic violations, a third misdemeanor count, assault and leaving the scene of an accident. I'm going to fix bail here.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: Your Honor, could you just hold this one second because - - I know the defendant left a little late, but there is some more background in this case. The Vera Institute of Justice has gone into his case, and I think they have something about his background which may ultimately prove favorable. They are asking for a long adjournment here.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY: I have no objection, Judge.

THE COURT: No? Why weren't you here this morning at 9:30? That's what I want to know.

MCEP SCREENER: Your Honor, he caught the wrong train.

THE COURT: That's non-sense. Even if you took the wrong train, you are not delayed four hours -- three hours.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: Well --

THE COURT: He's not out in a prairie somewhere. This is New York City. The subways are still running.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: That's correct. If it's first time in court, perhaps we could excuse him only this one time, and I'm sure if he doesn't cooperate with Vera the case will go certainly much harder.

THE COURT: The officer requested July 19th. Let him come back July 19th here.

MCEP SCREENER: Your Honor, Mr. B has been working with the Vera Institute for approximately a month now. We placed him on a job. He's making two dollars an hour, and his place has nothing but good recommendations for him, and also the superintendent of this service, sir. We would request if you would consider a two-month adjournment on this case because of Mr. B. so we could put him into the program further.

DEFENSE COUNSEL: Unless your Honor perhaps, in view of his absence this morning, you might want to have an interim appearance by the defendant and a report from the Vera before the three months.

THE COURT: He certainly doesn't seem to have understood he owes an obligation to the Court here. All right. I'll give you the longer adjournment.

Approximately 16% of our participants are accepted at arraignment. The remainder are often identified at arraignment and followed to the adjourned part, because of insufficient time or information at the initial hearing. In every case, the defendant is accepted into the project prior to trial.

Project screeners have taken great care to inform court officers, defense attorneys, prosecutors and judges as to how the project operates and solicit their cooperation. Project administrators have met frequently with the District Attorney's staff.

Most significant has been the cooperation of Joseph Stone, Esq, Chief of the Criminal Court Bureau. He reviews our final recommendations and responds to day to day problems with knowledge and insight.

Judge Edward Dudley, Administrative Judge, and Judge Vincent Massi, Assistant Judge, of the New York Criminal Court have been of invaluable assistance. The memo by Judge Dudley following this page was sent to all criminal court judges advising them of the project.

Judge Massi and Judge Thomas J. Weaver of this court have come to our office to speak to the Representatives and gave suggestions on how we might improve our performances in court. People from Federal Probation and the New York County Supreme Court Probation Department have also addressed the staff. Screeners, working closely with Robert Morris, Chief Clerk of the Criminal Court, and his staff have made it possible for our cases to be called early in the day, thus saving time. Legal Aid attorneys, under the direction of Anthony Marra, Esq., have been a helpful source of referrals and advice.

CRIMINAL COURT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Office of the Administrative Judge
100 Centre Street
New York, New York 10013

April 5, 1968

BULLETIN: NO. 4

TO: The Judges of the Criminal Court

FROM: Edward R. Dudley
Administrative Judge

RE: Manhattan Court Employment Project
Vera Institute of Justice

The Manhattan Court Employment Project of the Vera Institute of Justice is an experimental program to combat recidivism by providing selected defendants with vocational training, job placement, counseling, and related services. Funded by the U. S. Department of Labor, the MCEP will screen, counsel and place approximately 2800 defendants from the Manhattan Criminal Courts over a three year period. I have worked closely with the director of the project, Mr. Henry M. Aronson, along with representatives of the Legal Aid Society, the Office of the District Attorney, the Department of Probation, the Human Resources Administration of the City of New York and the offices of Mayor Lindsay and Senator Robert F. Kennedy, all of whom were involved in designing and implementing the project.

On February 5, 1968, the MCEP began screening new arraignments in Part 3; on March 15, screening was transferred to Part 1A(1). All persons arraigned in Part 1A(1) are screened for participation, either because the seriousness of the charge would prevent their release or because they have special problems which would require treatment beyond the scope of the project. The excluded offenses included (1) 220.00 - 220.45 - all charges relating to sale and/or possession of dangerous drugs; (2) 130.25 - 130.65 - sex offenses except 130.20 (statutory rape); (3) 225.00 - 225.40 - all gambling offenses; (4) 230.00 - 230.40 - all prostitution offenses; (5) 125.00 - 125.60 - homicide, manslaughter and abortion; (6) 150.15 - robbery in the first degree and 120.10 - assault in the first degree; (7) 240.40 - public intoxication.

In addition, persons included in one or more of the following categories will be excluded: (8) Employed at the time of arraignment at more than \$65 per week; (9) Represented by privately retained counsel; (10) Drug addicts or alcoholics; (11) Persons who have served substantial jail sentences. Those who have received short jail sentences, suspended sentences or a discharge for prior charges will be accepted.

Eligible defendants are identified from the court papers by a Project screener stationed in the clerks' office adjacent to the courtroom. Both the District Attorney and the Legal Aid Society are notified that a defendant may be eligible to participate in the MCEP and, if they agree, a Project Representative will interview the defendant, explain the project and its obligations, and request his participation. Assuming the defendant agrees to participate for three months and keep his appointments with the Project, his attorney will ask the Court for a three month adjournment of the case and ask that the defendant be released on his own recognizance. At the end of the adjourned period, if the Project reports that the defendant had made progress in his vocational program and kept appointments made for him, the District Attorney's Office will support an application for dismissal of charges. In both cases - the request for adjournment and the request for a favorable disposition - the ultimate decision rests, of course, with the presiding judge.

To summarize, the Manhattan Court Employment Project is attempting to begin rehabilitation of selected offenders at an early point in the criminal process and provide them with the means to become productive, law-abiding employees. I am in close contact with the project staff and am closely monitoring its progress. I think the project merits our collective support. Do not hesitate to contact me regarding any questions you might have about this endeavor.

HUMAN SERVICES

Human Services is the counseling arm of the Manhattan Court Employment Project. Its staff presently consists of seven non-professional counselors (called Representatives), two professional supervisors and a unit director.

It is difficult to quantify the work of the unit. We know that the staff of non-professionals has been skillful in communicating with the participants, and useful relationships have been established in many cases. Problems have arisen which have resulted in numerous procedural and structural changes. We cannot yet give a final answer to the question of what the role should be of a counseling arm in a rehabilitation program.

Therefore, in this report, we are concentrating on a description of the unit's operations, and the problems encountered in the use of non-professionals. This is followed by three case studies which give an idea of the Representatives' involvement with the participant.

OPERATIONS

Prior to acceptance by the MCEP, a defendant is briefly interviewed by a Representative in the detention cells. Defendants who enter the project are brought from the courtroom offices immediately and interviewed at greater length by the Representative to whom each is assigned. The Representative attempts to assess both the participant's immediate needs and his long-range goals. He completes an Intake Questionnaire which becomes part of the participant's file (attached at the end of the section). The participant is asked to sign a statement acknowledging the project's commitment to him and his commitment to the project (attached at the end of the section).

An attempt is made during the intake interview to meet immediate needs including emergency grants to cover temporary housing, clothes and food; family and housing needs; psychological, medical and dental care; and related social services. Vocational counseling as well as benefits from the New York City Department of Social Services are available

within the project. In other cases, the Representative will attempt to make appropriate referrals and where necessary, accompany the participant to the referral agency.

Following the day of entry to the project, appointments are made with the participant. He is requested to return to our offices to confer with his Representative and to participate in evening group counseling sessions. These appointments continue regardless of whether the participant has been interviewed by a project Career Developer and has begun to work. More important, an attempt is made to make the participant feel that we exist to be of assistance to him.

On October 15th, we expect to complete furnishing a club facility at 44 Lispenard Street, approximately five blocks from the courthouse. Furnishings, donated by Playboy, Inc., the magazine publisher, will provide comfortable surroundings for tutoring, studying, counseling and relaxing.

Since many of the participants have never worked before or will have had such marginal jobs as to negate the experience, pre-vocational counseling has been essential.

Pre-vocational counseling has been conducted on an individual basis by Representatives at our 100 Centre Street (courthouse) office. A great deal of staff time has been devoted to this counseling - time which might be saved by conducting pre-vocational counseling in groups. This group would introduce the participant to the world of work (applications, social security, job expectations, etc.) and to what he can expect from the Human Services Unit and Career Development. It would also provide Career Development with a better knowledge of our participants.

Group counseling sessions have been held during the evening with moderate success. Group counseling of a heterogeneous population with little motivation has been difficult to sustain. Our groups have been

disjointed and diffuse with limited continuity. The population keeps changing and the holding power is minimal.

While most of the Representatives state that they feel comfortable running a group, we have had little more than moderate skill growth in this area. More formal training is scheduled for Representatives to acquire the tools of the group leader.

Under this training procedure, on any given evening (M-Th) there will be two groups being conducted between the hours of 6:30 - 8:00 P.M. An example of the mechanics of the group and the procedures for supervision with one unit of four Representatives is as follows:

Monday: Representatives 1 and 2 are each conducting a group. Counseling supervisor is co-leading with Rep. 1. Rep. 2 is recording his group session. Reps. 3 and 4 are making home visits.

Wednesday: Reverse procedure.

The counseling supervisor and the Representative will decide before group on the topic and the technique to be used for that evening's group. While they will be thought of as co-leaders, the supervisor, will, in fact, run a demonstration group with a specific topic and a specific technique to be used. The Representative will be expected to use the same topic and technique for his taping at the next group.

Every Friday from 2:30 to 5:00 P.M., both units will listen to segments of the two taped groups of the week.

Contact with Participants Following Dismissal of Charges

Once a successful participant's charges have been dismissed, he no longer has any formal obligations to the project. However, participants are told that they are welcome at the project at any time and that their Representative will be available to deal with problems that the participants may have.

Under this arrangement, half of the 52 participants whose charges have been dismissed have maintained some contact with their Representatives after their last court appearance. The Human Services unit is now considering an affirmative effort to keep contact with all participants beyond the time of their formal involvement in the project.

DRUG INVOLVEMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Forty-three percent of the participants in the project have some present involvement with drugs and twenty-three percent are seriously addicted. This statistic is shocking since no defendant is accepted whose record contains any prior convictions or present charges for possession or sale of drugs, except for small quantities of marijuana. The implications for the general court population in Manhattan are obvious.

In planning our response to our participants' drug problems, compulsory commitment to treatment or disclosure to the District Attorney's office were not desirable or feasible policies. We were working

with participants whose drug involvement would not have been discovered absent participation in the project. Discovery of addiction came as a result of the intimate relationship we established with the participants, a relationship which disclosure or coercion would destroy. Furthermore, no competent defense attorney would consent to participation if his client ran the danger of additional criminal charges for drugs.

During the project's planning phase and the first months of intake, the Human Services staff visited every drug treatment program in the city. Channels for referral to treatment were opened. Nevertheless, our early experiences with addicted participants disclosed serious difficulties in counseling and maintaining contact with the addicts as well as negotiating referrals to treatment programs.

These difficulties were exacerbated by the character of our addict population. Addicts who enter most treatment programs do so as a result of self-selection coupled with intensive screening by the program

to identify the best motivated. The addicts in the MCEF constituted a random sample in regard to motivation for treatment. They are a cross-section and present a greater challenge.

In June, negotiations with the New York City Addiction Services Agency resulted in the outstationing to the project of Mrs. Rae Dibble, an addiction counselor formerly with Synanon. Mrs. Dibble was helpful in individual cases brought to her attention by the Representatives, and in conducting a census of addicts within the project.

However she found, as we had, that voluntary group counseling with randomly motivated addicts was not useful. She could offer no help with the problem of identifying and excluding addicts at the point of screening. We are now negotiating with the Addiction Services Agency for faster referrals into their treatment facilities but are relying on our own Representatives for counseling.

Our experience in working with addicts has not been totally negative. The following chart summarizes our efforts:

DRUG INVOLVEMENT OF MCEP PARTICIPANTS

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Intake</u>
addicted to heroin	60	20%
addicted to barbituates	10	3.3
"involved" with heroin	13	4.3
"involved" with barbi- turates	4	1.3
constant use of marijuana	13	4.3
infrequent use of marijuana	29	<u>9.7</u> 42.9%

MCEP RESPONSE TO ADDICTED PARTICIPANTS

Number of addicts	70
Number entering hospital treatment programs	15
Number entering other drug treatment programs	3
Number participating in group counseling	23

PRESENT STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS ADDICTED TO DRUGS

Number unfavorably terminated	29
Number currently active	35
Number favorably dismissed	4
Number discharged (death from overdose)	2

THE REPRESENTATIVES

Eight Representatives were initially hired and completed training. Two of the eight were terminated - one after seven weeks because of erratic attendance and, finally, disappearance, and the other after seven months because of personal problems which prevented his performing the assigned duties. Two additional Representatives were hired for a ninety day probation period. One failed to report regularly for work. After termination he was arrested on a drug charge. The second Representative has been with us for two months and is performing well.

The present staff of representatives consists of six Negroes and one Puerto Rican. All ten persons hired (including the three who have been terminated) were ex-offenders. We continue to look for persons who know the ghetto but, as in the past, will employ any qualified person whether or not he has been convicted

of a crime. We are now recruiting applicants for three unfilled positions and want at least one Spanish-speaking person and one caucasian.

In establishing a nonprofessional counseling program, the Human Services staff has performed well. Considerable difficulties were encountered - difficulties which we now believe to be inherent in a nonprofessional counseling program, and which were not fully understood or recognized when the project was designed.

We had initially thought that the training of non-professional counselors would be difficult and would consume all of the professional staff energy during the training period. It was also anticipated that after completion of training, full staff effort could be devoted to the participants. This has not been the case. The Representatives continued to consume considerable staff time after the completion of training. Inclusion of the nonprofessional comprises a project within a project.

The stress during the first months of operation was on the well-being and adjustment of the Representatives.

Too little emphasis was placed on their formal job requirements. Within the Human Services unit, division of responsibilities among supervisors and the Representatives was not clear. The initial common failure of Representatives to meet obligations such as reports and records and frequent requests that their supervisors enter in the Representative - participant relationship gave rise to supervisors performing counseling rather than supervisory functions. This development tended to inhibit the growth of the Representative and create dependence. After describing our project as free-wheeling, it was difficult to enforce paper work and bureaucracy.

A considerable amount of the Representatives work and leisure time was spent as a group during training; in the office, at parties and even as members of a project baseball team. We now believe that group activity should have been de-emphasized

and that a conscious effort should have been made to foster individualism and promote the feeling that these particular people had been selected because of the unique contributions each could make. By creating a tone of "oneness" the Representatives were able to avoid individual obligations, and rally together to thwart self-evaluation.

Gradually, we insisted that each Representative better account for his work. Supervisors began supervising. The Representatives responded favorably to the developing structure. We shifted from a program unconsciously oriented toward the needs of the Representatives to one consciously oriented toward the participants. The Representatives are aware, or are approaching awareness, of what their job entails and the kinds of modification in their personalities - often considerable - they will need to make. We believe the different stages we went through, or some variant, will inevitably occur in a program utilizing nonprofessionals.

That the Representatives are ex-offenders both adds to and detracts from their capabilities. The most

significant advantage is their sense of commitment and personal involvement. They are fiercely desirous of changing the system of criminal justice and of keeping other young men from going through what they themselves did.

The Representatives' ability to relate to participants owes much to their similarity of background. The client-counselor relationship is also built on differences. The client is an arrestee while his Representative is a white-collar worker with status, prestige, and know-how. The Representatives are increasingly adept at exploiting both sides of their position viz-a-viz their participants.

"I've been playing games all my life", said one Representative. "I know more games than I care to talk about. In the street, you could let a guy run a game on you, so what. Here, if a guy is running a game on you, you have to think of a way to get the guy to have more confidence in you so that he doesn't have to run any more games. You want to get him out of this bag".

Disadvantages of the ex-offender background include a tendency on the part of some Representatives to become over-involved with their participants. It has taken direction by the supervisors to convince the Representatives that although a close relationship with the participant may be a great support in the initiation to a job, a lack of detachment will bring about a dependency that can only inhibit self-fulfillment.

Some Representatives tend to be too stern and too directive with their participants. They have placed emphasis on symptoms and behavior rather than causative factors, and have assumed a "shape up or ship out" approach.

They relate their own backgrounds - the hurdles they faced and overcame - to those of the participants, and expect the same strength.

The job creates conflicts in the Representatives' personal lives. Being in a straight job, they lose many old friends, and contacts. It is not easy to

come to work in a building which houses all of the arms of the law. The Manhattan Criminal Court Building or one like it was the scene of a major crisis in their lives; now they work here. The confidence that the Representatives have developed in this milieu is no small accomplishment.

The involvement of three participants with the project is documented in the following three case studies - one describing a participant who responded well to the project, the second a participant whose addiction problem was too severe for us to reach, and the third a case of a participant who is still active in the project.

The first two reports were written by a supervisor of the Human Services unit. The third is taken from the narrative record kept by the project Representative assigned to the participant.

SUPERVISOR'S REPORT ON J.C., A PARTICIPANT WHOSE
CHARGES WERE FAVORABLY DISMISSED

J.C., a seventeen year old, has been involved with the law since age thirteen. He grew up in Brooklyn although both his parents are from Puerto Rico.

J.C. completed six years of school. He spent 8 months at Warwick in 1965 for auto theft. After his release he remained unemployed until arrested for Criminal Trespass and accepted by the MCEP.

Project Representative Tom Bowers visited J.C.'s home and discovered that J.C., his mother, three brothers and three sisters were living in a three room apartment with no refrigerator, pots, pans or front room furniture. Through their welfare case worker, who had never visited the home, Mr. Bowers arranged for full entitlements for furniture and kitchen supplies.

Tests revealed J.C. to be at fourth grade level in reading and math. He very much wanted a white collar job, although his only training was in auto repair. Career Developer Mike Carpenter felt that the only possibility was to try to upgrade him educationally while keeping him motivated in a job with the trappings of dignity.

Meanwhile, J.C. began attending group counseling regularly and a more complete picture began to emerge. He was ashamed of his limited literacy and wanted more education. We arranged for a private tutor for him and he kept every appointment.

Simultaneously, there was a series of unsuccessful job referrals. Mr. Bowers attempted to keep J.C. motivated in spite of these set-backs. Career Development finally reached a contact at a steamship company and J.C. was hired as a mail clerk. He worked hard and continued to come in for tutoring and group counseling twice a week. His manner of dress became neater and more conservative and he was invariably punctual. He began to talk about moving his family out of their neighborhood, getting an equivalency diploma and going to college.

At his court appearance, charges were dismissed on our recommendation. J.C. was pleased but apprehensive until he was assured that he could continue to participate in the project although no longer obligated to the court.

For several months after the dismissal of charges, J.C. has continued to come for tutoring. We are now trying to get him to enroll in night school.

SUPERVISOR'S REPORT ON WR, A PARTICIPANT WHO WAS UNFAVORABLY TERMINATED FROM THE MANHATTAN COURT EMPLOYMENT PROJECT.

WR, a 17 year old, is the oldest of six children. His father is not living in the home and the household is supported by his mother. He left High School in 1967 in order to work, held two jobs for a month each, was arrested three times for minor charges. He was assigned to the Manhattan Court Employment Project after the third arrest.

Project Representative Van Lierop, after several sessions, got WR to admit he was dabbling in heroin. WR claimed that his problem was "mostly psychological" and that he was not "strung out" physically.

With the help of Career Developer Mike Carpenter, WR was enrolled in the Police Auto Mechanics Course at Voorhees Institute. A close relationship was established with the coordinator, Lt. Perini. Van Lierop also arranged for WR to meet with Rae Dibble, a narcotics counselor outstationed to the Manhattan Court Employment Project.

WR was initially very pleased with the mechanics course and Lt. Perini was satisfied with his work. After one month, however, both Lt. Perini and Mrs. Dibble informed us that they suspected WR to be totally addicted.

WR withdrew from the training program and, with Van Lierop's help, was admitted to Morris Bernstein Clinic. Although he claimed he wanted treatment, WR signed himself out after a few days, saying that he was not like the others in the Clinic, i.e. not addicted.

He was readmitted to the training program and kept in touch with us but contracted hepatitis. He began treatment but then discontinued all contact with us, our only information coming from his mother.

After a month of unsuccessful attempts to locate him, we terminated WR from the project. He had been in the project for four months.

PROJECT REPRESENTATIVE'S RECORD ON C.L., A CURRENTLY
ACTIVE PARTICIPANT

ACTIVE

C. L., age 19, came into the program on 7/15. He was charged with resisting arrest.

Day 1 - Intake (5 P.M.) Because of late hour of intake, appointment was made for day 2 after 1st page of application was filled out.

Day 2: C. L. failed to appear.

Day 3: Office Interview: C. L. states that he lost his job at Blank Inc. as a result of arrest. He was employed there as a mail clerk. He apparently had been warned that if he ever was absent again, he'd be fired. He was.

Group: Participated quite a bit. Very articulate but highly superficial. Spent most of time focusing attention on other participants' hang-ups. When confronted about his own behavior, he insisted that he has himself under control.

Day 13: Field: Visited his hotel and Washington Square Park. Couldn't find him.

Day 15: Office: He forgot our previous appointments but received my calling card at his home. I explained that this was unacceptable and he'd better start keeping more appointments. I made an appointment with him to see Career Development.

Day 16: Office: C. L. was here on time and taken to Career Development. Asked him about his co-defendant, J. R. (also in the project) and how I could locate him. C. L. told me he'd help me find him.

Field: Went with C. L. to Greenwich Village in search of J. R. Spent considerable time hanging out in Washington Square, but no luck. C. L. promised to come in for group on Day 17 and try to bring J. R. with him.

Day 17: Telephone Contact: I called hotel to speak to C. L. about the appointment Career Development had arranged. Was not at home and I left note.

Day 18: Telephone Attempt: Again called to remind him of appointment with ABC-TV arrange by Career Development. Hotel states he checked out two days ago and left no forwarding address.

Office Interview: C.L. called office and was told to get right in. He showed up and was given letter of introduction for ABC. C. L. was not dressed properly and Career Development called ABC - T.V. to apologize. C.L. was told to call me right after interview.

Day 21: Telephone Call: C. L. called to tell me he was in trouble. He was beaten up by police after a demonstration in Washington Square Park and besides a real bad foot (horse stepped on), his wallet with hotel rent and food money was lost. He had asked me to come to the park to see him but I told him it was impossible and he should run the story down over the phone. After he related it to me I told him to come in as soon as possible.

Office Contact: By the time C. L. came in he had had his wallet returned from a friend but money was missing. I took him into Social Services but Jose stated that as an unmarried man he was not entitled to money. Jose did offer to get him into a shelter but C. L. stated that he preferred staying in a crash pad. Since he was hard pressed I invited him out to dinner with me before going over to group counseling session. At this time C. L. informed me that there would most likely be a riot in the Village this evening and I told him if he was arrested we would most likely bounce him out of the program.

Group: Although C. L. came to group he hardly participated at all and seemed pre-occupied about the Village situation.

Appointment for Day 22: Didn't show but called. He says he was instrumental in stopping the riot last night but was up 'til very late and wouldn't come in for his appointment. Living with girlfriend who needed medical help. C. L.'s foot still hurt and his girlfriend (16 years old and a run-away) was ill. Asked how we could get her medical attention. Told to come in. Didn't.

Telephone Day 23: Called to tell me he arranged for a rally in Washington Square Park with permission of Tactical Police Force. Invited me and Dan Rubenstein, Human Services Director, to join him. Explained that we couldn't and that I wanted him in group this evening. He pointed out that this was impossible.

Day 24: Office: Representative out in the field. C. L. seen by supervisor. Informed that C. L. was rearrested last night on Disorderly Conduct charge in Washington Square (Seems a harassment arrest). Asked to speak to Dan Rubenstein about his girlfriend, a run-away. Dan spent considerable time talking to both of them regarding individual and mutual problems. Suggested to C. L. that the only thing he could do at this point is get a legitimate job through Career Development and we might keep him if Representative goes along with it. Representative called in and found out circumstances.

Day 31: Office: In again with a different girl. Supposed to see Career Development but decided to wait until tomorrow. Again, wanted help for his girlfriends. Girl told him where he's at and told him he'd better concentrate on helping himself.

Day 46: Telephone: Called from Port Authority and asked me to come down and meet him and girlfriend's mother from Allentown, Pennsylvania. I told him I'd be there.

Meeting at Port Authority: Met with mother of sick girlfriend. Very nice and concerned about welfare of daughter and potential son-in-law. Gave C. L. money to live in hotel with daughter and medicine for her illness. Promised to keep in touch and C. L. agreed to contact her in two week's time.

Day 64: No contact since. I called Allentown and spoke with girl's mother who told me daughter had returned and was in the process of court hearings for probation violation. In response to my question of whether or not she had seen C. L. she said yes and that he had been there and had left to return to New York City and MCEP this very morning.

Day 66: Office: Representative out in field. C. L. came in and explained how he had been in Allentown and had a job offer. Wanted permission to return there if he would keep in constant touch with representative.

Day 67: Telephone: C. L. called from Allentown and told me that he had not landed a job yet but would keep me posted.

Day 68: Telephone: C. L. called to assure me that he wouldn't forget court hearing on day 72. Also that he got a job at Knitwork of Allentown and started at \$78.00. He gave name and address of employer. We verified employment by phone.

Day 71: Telephone: Called again to reassure me that he would be in for rearrest hearing.

Day 72: Office: Went with C. L. to court and asked for rearrest to be adjourned to same day as case he originally came to MCEP with. C. L. came back up to office and told me how great Allentown was... also that he had no money to return. Jose came up with one-way carfare and C. L. returned to Pennsylvania with the understanding that we'd go to bat for him if he keeps in constant touch up to 11/10.

Day 77: Telephone: Called from Allentown to say all is well and that he'd call every Monday. Also spoke to Dan. C. L.'s case is still open and his participation continues.

V E R A I N S T I T U T E O F J U S T I C E
MANHATTAN COURT EMPLOYMENT PROJECT
INTAKE QUESTIONNAIRE

Intake Date: _____ Counselor _____

 Group _____

 Job Developer _____

 Supervisor _____

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Name _____
 (last) (first) (M.I.) (alias, nickname)

Date of Birth _____ Age _____ Male _____ Female _____
 Mo. Day Year

Place of Birth _____ Marital Status _____
 City State

Name of Parents _____
 Father Mother

Birthplace of Parents _____
 Father Mother

Social Security Number _____ Ht. _____ Ft. _____ in. Weight _____

Telephone number _____ Contact _____
 (if other than home)

ADDRESSES: _____ Length of time in Residence _____

_____ Present Address _____

_____ Previous Address _____

Do you live alone? yes No With Spouse? Yes No

Do you live with:
 Other Relatives () _____ Name _____

Parents () _____ Name _____

Children () _____ Name _____

Non relatives () _____ Name _____

VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE
Manhattan Court Employment Project
Intake Questionnaire - Page 2

GENERAL INFORMATION: (Continued)

Relatives in New York City that you keep in close contact with:

Name	ADDRESS
How often seen? _____	Last seen _____
Do you belong to any groups or clubs _____	Yes _____ No _____
If so, name _____	
Are you a member of a church _____	Yes _____ No _____
If so, name _____	

CRIMINAL RECORD:

Present Charge _____

Date of Charge _____ Legal Aid Attorney _____

Prior Arrests and Convictions: _____ Date: _____

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

EDUCATION:

Indicate highest grade completed: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

Are you a high school graduate? _____ Yes _____ No _____
Date Graduated _____

_____ Name and Address of High School _____

Are you a drop-out? _____ Yes _____ No _____
Date dropped out _____

_____ Reason for dropping out _____

VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE
Manhattan Court Employment Project
Intake Questionnaire - Page 3

EDUCATION: (Continued)

Other Schools _____

Type of Training _____ Last Date Attended _____

Reason for leaving? _____

Reading Grade _____
Test _____ Date _____ Administrator _____

Math Grade _____
Test _____ Date _____ Administrator _____

FINANCIAL SITUATION:

Savings Account: ___ Yes ___ No Checking Account ___ Yes ___ No

Debts _____ Loans _____ Welfare _____

MEDICAL:

How would you describe your health? _____

Do you have any illness or physical defects? _____

Does this prevent you from doing certain types of work? If so, what? _____

Last Dentist visit? _____ Eyes checked? _____
Date _____ Last date _____

Are you now on any type of medication? _____

MILITARY:

Dates: From _____ To _____ Branch of Service _____

Draft Class _____ Type of Discharge _____

Other Information _____

VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE
Manhattan Court Employment Project
Intake Questionnaire - Page 4

EMPLOYMENT: Please begin with your present position and work back.

Dates: From _____ To _____

Place of Employment _____

Name

Address

Title of Job: _____

Duties: _____

Name of immediate Supervisor _____

Dates: From _____ To _____

Place of Employment _____

Name

Address

Title of Job: _____

Duties: _____

Name of immediate Supervisor _____

Reason for Leaving _____

Dates: From _____ To _____

Place of Employment _____

Name

Address

Title of Job: _____

Duties: _____

Name of immediate Supervisor _____

Reason for Leaving _____

VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE
Manhattan Court Employment Project
Intake Questionnaire - Page 5

EMPLOYMENT: (Continued)

Do you want a job? ___ Yes ___ No Training? ___ Yes ___ No

What type of job or training would you like to have? _____

What are the obstacles, if any? _____

What salary would you need to earn on a job to meet your re-
sponsibilities? _____

Do you wish to have your present job back? ___ Yes ___ No

Additional Information: _____

Number of Dependents other than self: _____

	Name	Relationship
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____

VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE
Manhattan Court Employment Project
100 Centre Street
New York, New York 10013
732-0076

Dear _____

What can you expect from the Manhattan Court Employment Project?

As we discussed, we will try to provide these things:

1. A three month adjournment of your trial and release without bail so you can take part in the project.
2. A job and/or training for a job that interests you. Our objective is to help you obtain the kind of job that will reward you and whatever other services you may need to get and keep that job.
3. Help for yourself and your family in obtaining whatever community services you are entitled to, such as public assistance, Veteran's benefits, Medicaid, further education or whatever opportunities that exist and that you may think you need.

What Do We Expect From You?

1. Many appointments will be involved. You will be expected to keep them.
2. At each step during our involvement together decisions affecting you must be made. We will not make decisions for you. We will help you make decisions. Your cooperation is both expected and necessary.
3. Your Representative will meet with you frequently and will make other appointments for job interviews, etc. Your Representative is _____ and you can reach him by calling _____
4. You must appear in court on _____ at _____ a.m./p.m. in Part _____. Your lawyer will ask the court to dismiss the charges against you if you have participated successfully in the project. If you have not, the case against you will be prosecuted.

We look forward to your joining the project; its success depends on you.

(Sign)

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

From the time a participant enters the project, a Human Services Representative takes responsibility for his over-all progress. However, the key service which the project makes available is provided by the Career Development unit: job counseling and placement. The relationship between the Representative and the Career Developer is complex, and crucial to the project's success. Much of the Representative's effort is directed towards guiding employable participants into a useful relationship with the Career Developer.

JOB DEVELOPMENT

The planning period was used by the Career Development staff to contact employers, acquaint them with the project and secure commitments for future jobs.

We were aware that small companies, which hire on need, would not be able to plan for a time when they might accept Manhattan Court Employment Project participants. In introducing the project to such companies,

we explained our interest in their business and tried to give them a feeling of being "chosen", in hopes that they might contact us in the future. Larger companies, on the other hand, more able to plan their employment needs, could establish "accounts" with us. The Career Development staff also contacted non-profit vocational placement agencies as well as acquiring the status of a Neighborhood Manpower Center within the city's Manpower and Career Development Agency. The latter arrangement gave us access to jobs developed by the Agency.

With the establishment of a "job bank", the first participants had job opportunities waiting for them upon their entry into the program in February. However, there was never the intention of relying exclusively on already-developed jobs for participants. In doing their counseling, the Career Developers begin with the participant's ambitions and abilities and then find the relevant job. If one is not available, the developer attempts to contact new companies to arrange an opening.

There has been extensive change in the manner of approaching employers and the choice of the employers we deal with. This change is a function of the growing trend in industry, over the past months, to take responsibility for hiring hard-core unemployed. The Career Development unit has exploited this trend by making the criminal process a sensible recruiting ground for employers wishing to hire the perennially unemployed.

We had placed greater emphasis initially on the small and medium size firm in the belief that these would give greater personal attention to participants. However, it became apparent that the larger firms offered substantial advantages in their ability to make commitments in advance of hiring dates, to offer a larger volume and variety of jobs, and to offer a chance for greater advancement within the company.

Among the larger firms it is now our policy to seek those that have entered into MA-3 contracts. With these, there is assurance that persons within

the company have committed their prestige to the policy of hiring, training and motivating the hard-core unemployed. This provides a greater likelihood of success for participants.

The concentration on MA-3 programs reflects our belief that the commitment by the hiring company, at the supervisory as well as the management level, is crucial. Virtually every employer approached so far has accepted at least the rhetoric of his company's obligation to the unemployed. However, the sensitivity to the problems and the flexibility in response has varied. As one of the Career Developers wrote in a moment of frustration:

"What firms seem to be looking for are: 1) Hard-core unemployed who behave like middle-class employed. or 2) hard-core unemployed who behave like middle-class employed after several Pat O'Brien lectures by a supervisor."

In speaking to employers, the Career Developer presents an accurate picture of our participant's capabilities and the problems he presents. He makes clear the scope of the response that is needed if the company wants successes in its hiring program. He stresses the social necessity of industry's commit-

ment. Whenever possible, the Career Developer makes a similar presentation to the future employee's immediate supervisor. He is the key figure.

The Manhattan Court Employment Project is presented to employers as an additional management capability which prepares the participant for his job, counsels him, and follows up on complaints from the company. One Career Developer becomes the continuing contact between the firm and the project.

By August 1, some 400 firms, unions and training programs had been contacted. 211 of these are now accounts which we rely upon. Of that 211, 62 are so-called "house accounts" with which the project does volume business. The remainder, called "tickler accounts" have sporadic needs for employees and are contacted by the staff when a special job is needed that can't be found in the house accounts. There are 150 more firms among the 400 who indicated some interest in the project.

The project has become increasingly selective in the firms it works with. Accounts are not opened with those which appear unresponsive to our participants, and we will discontinue our account with a firm in which a number of participants have not been able to adjust.

On the other hand, we are solicitous of the firms on which we rely. If a number of participants are referred who prove unreliable, we will hand-pick the next referrals. After a run of bad luck, we will let an account lie fallow until management is once again receptive. We continue to use the smaller firms particularly for participants whose attitude or inexperience indicate that they may not be successful on the first job. With the smaller firms, we do not jeopardize our volume accounts nor those with a potential for upgrading employees.

COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT

When the project began, we had a policy of gradually motivating a participant to accept employment through a series of counseling sessions with both the Representative and the Career Developer. We have abandoned

this policy. Our aim now is to have every employable participant referred to Career Development by the Representative on the first day in the project. The Career Developer's task is to refer the participant to a job or training program with equal speed, to demonstrate the project's ability to "deliver" for him. This seems imperative in a placement program which offers no stipend to its participants.

Ennis Olgiati, the Associate Director in charge of Career Development, recently wrote:

"There is a 'loss-of-participant' factor in a pre-vocational system which includes more than one interview. The loss is estimated by my staff at more than 33% if two counseling interviews take place without a job referral. Half of those lost can be retrieved with phone calls, letters and home visits, but the other half will refuse to believe that we can help them and will either drop from the program or flounder around attempting to locate their own jobs.

It has become obvious that our system must include quick referrals to Career Development, quick referrals to a job, and quick placement, unless people exposed to multiple pre-vocational sessions do so much better as to negate the incurred loss of participants that the system fosters.

We have no evidence that the underlined statement is true. We have reason to believe that we do as well with people whom we place after one session as with people whom we place after two or three."

This policy of rapid referral underlies the relationship between the Representative and the Career Developers, two of whom are assigned to each team of four Representatives. As soon as the Representative has cleared up the participant's immediate needs for housing, clothing and medical care, and determined that the participant is employable, he is referred to Career Development.

The following figures indicate the number of participants from each group of 50, who were referred to Career Development.

NOTE: Our participants come into the project at the rate of 9 per week. As each one completes anywhere from 3 to 6 months of participation, he is discharged from the project, either favorably or unfavorably. After 3 months of intake, we reached a point where new participants were coming in and a steady flow of old participants were being cycled out.

For purposes of measurement, we divide the total of 300 participants into groups of 50. The first men in the first group entered on February 5, 1967; the last in that group were accepted on March 18. Only two of that first group are still active.

In contrast, the last man in the last group of 50 did not enter the project until September 27. All 50 are active in the project, completing their

3 month assignment.

As a result, the figures for groups of 50 reflect the longer period of time we have had contact with the earlier groups.

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS:

NUMBER INTERVIEWED BY A PROJECT CAREER DEVELOPER

GROUPS	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Number of participants referred to Career Development	38	30	29	31	32	22	182

There has been increasing rapidity in the rate of referral from the Representative to a Career Developer, as the following figures indicate for each group of 50 participants:

AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS BETWEEN ENTRY TO PROJECT AND

INTERVIEW WITH A PROJECT CAREER DEVELOPER

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Average days between intake and first Career Development interview	14	18	16	13	7	3

Upon referral a copy of the intake sheet is left with the Career Developer and a new file is opened.

One hundred and eighteen participants have never been interviewed by a Career Developer. The following chart explains their status:

PARTICIPANTS NOT REFERRED TO CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Had own job or full-time student at entry to project	33
Terminated from project before referral	43
Discovered to be addict, alcoholic or ineligible for project before referral	22
Recently entered in project and not yet referred	<u>20</u>
TOTAL:	118

Before job referrals are made, the Career Developer talks with the participant to determine his vocational ability and interests. The participant is asked about former jobs, and what he like or disliked about them. He often will have had little or no work experience, and will instead be asked about his interests and ambitions. A variety of questions will be asked, all of which aim toward the question, "What kind of work would you like?"

The Career Developer then calls employers and contacts to try to arrange an interview for the participant. He draws on three resources: his access to house accounts, the tickler accounts and his expertise in developing new jobs.

If a possible job is located, the Career Developer discusses it with the participant and counsels him on how to appear for the interview. When it is necessary, the participant will be taken shopping for suitable clothes. Where testing is involved, he is shown copies of the tests and allowed to make a few dry runs so that the tests won't appear so fearsome. In some cases he is coached outright. The following figures show:

1. The number of participants referred to jobs.
2. The average number of days between their acceptance into the project and first referral.

NOTE: The dates during which each group entered the project are:

GROUP I	February 5 - March 18
GROUP II	March 19 - April 16
GROUP III	April 16 - May 24
GROUP IV	May 27 - July 9
GROUP V	July 9 - August 12
GROUP VI	August 12 - September 27

AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS BETWEEN ENTRY TO THE PROJECT
AND FIRST REFERRAL TO EMPLOYMENT

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Number of participants referred at least once	37	29	29	27	22	20	164
Average days between acceptance into MCEP and first referral to a job	18	24	24	19	9	5	

Again, there has been increasing smoothness and speed in the rate of referrals.

The rate of hirings of referred participants is high, as the following figures indicate.

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS PLACED AT LEAST ONCE

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Number of Participants referred at least once	37	29	29	27	22	20	164
Number of Participants placed at least once	31	23	22	16	15	14	121

The speed with which participants are hired has increased also:

AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS BETWEEN ACCEPTANCE INTO THE
PROJECT AND FIRST PLACEMENT

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Average days between intake and first placement	32	43	38	39	17	9

The percentage of placements per referral has increased:

PERCENTAGE OF PLACEMENTS PER REFERRAL FOR MCEP
PARTICIPANTS

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Percentage of placements per referral	45%	40%	54%	50%	50%	59%

We have established that if the participant fails to obtain the job to which he has been referred, he will, in a majority of cases, not return to the project without an affirmative effort to locate him and bring him in.

Specifically, we know that when a first referral results in a non-hiring through no fault of the participant (job was already filled, interviewer not present) he will never return to the project without prodding. When a first or subsequent referral results in a non-hiring with some participant culpability (tardiness for interview, improper dress) 50% will not return to the project without prodding.

To avoid losing contact after a referral, the participant is given a re-appointment with the Career Developer for the work day following his scheduled interview unless he has started work. Participants hired to begin subsequent to the first day after the job interview also are asked to keep the re-appointment.

Where a participant is not hired and fails to

keep the appointment with the Career Developer, a letter is sent by the Career Developer inviting him in, and the participant's Representative is notified to encourage the participant to come to our offices.

If this fails, and the participant is receiving money from the Department of Social Services, a letter is sent out on Department stationery, advising the participant to come in for an interview.

If there is still no contact, the Representative, rather than the Career Developer, will visit the participant's neighborhood and attempt to locate him.

Once a participant is hired, Career Development keeps track of his progress in the following way: The Career Developer responsible for a given "account" with an employer calls him every two weeks to check on the progress of all participants hired by that firm. Information on specific participants will be passed to the Career Developer who placed the participant through carbon copies of the Career

Development records.

In the same way, information relevant to employment which is learned by the Human Services unit at its counseling sessions will be sent to the pertinent Career Developer. These record exchanges grew out of the informal conversations and occasional joint meetings which were relied on at the beginning of the project and were found inadequate.

We have found that many participants with little work experience will lose or resign from their first two or three jobs. This may be due to fear, lateness, poor attendance, incompetence, or dislike of the position. Few participants have been interested in training programs or willing to stay with them once enrolled. The pay-off is too indefinite, the stipends too low, and the immediate need for salary too great.

The Career Developers are prepared to refer and place participants as many times as necessary, and assume a non-punitive position towards the participant in regard to his losing his job. They try to help him learn from the experiences he has had.

Participants placed more than once tend to remain longer on subsequent jobs. 31% of participants who are employed are placed by their Career Developer two or more times.

Statistics for the total number of placements, broken down by jobs per participant, follow:

NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS PER PARTICIPANT
BROKEN DOWN BY GROUPS OF 50

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS
Participants placed once	18	14	14	13	17	12	88
Participants placed twice	8	5	4	3	0	0	20
Participants placed three times	4	4	3	1	1	2	15
Participants placed four times	2	0	1	0	1	0	4
Participants placed five times	1	0	0	0	0	0	<u>1</u>

128

There are 2.1 referrals for every placement.
 The following figures show the total number
 of referrals and placements by groups of 50:

NOTE: The total placements differ slightly
 from the totals in the chart above. This
 chart was calculated a few days after the
 one on the previous page, and the totals had
 changed.

The number of referrals is smaller for each
 succeeding group reflecting the shorter time
 those participants have been in the project.

The dates during which each group entered
 the project are:

GROUP I	February 5 - March 18
GROUP II	March 19 - April 16
GROUP III	April 16 - May 24
GROUP IV	May 27 - July 9
GROUP V	July 9 - August 12
GROUP VI	August 12 - September 27

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS: TOTAL REFERRALS AND
 PLACEMENTS, BROKEN-DOWN BY GROUPS OF 50 PARTICIPANTS

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Total number of referrals	132	94	67	52	44	32	421
Total number of placements	60	38	36	26	22	19	201

Forty-four percent of the placements are in low-level
 service jobs, factory jobs and training programs. The
 types of employment are summarized in the following
 table:

NOTE: Information is available on the type of job
 the participants were hired to do in 173 of the 201

placements. In cases where placement is through a union or manpower agency, this information is not always available.

TYPES OF JOBS FOR WHICH MCEP PARTICIPANTS ARE HIRED

	<u>Number of Placements</u>
Low level service (clerks, helpers, porters, messengers, packers, office boys)	88
Industrial (primarily employed by manufac- turing interests; factory jobs)	16
Training Programs (On-the-job training, schooling with a stipend. Good preparation for skill and high pay)	20
High level service (Drivers, salesmen, waiters, telephone solicitors, civil service people, community project workers)	27
Skills (Mechanics, electricians, machine operators)	19
Commercial (Management, real estate, banking, supervisors. Also extremely high paying jobs that would fall into another category)	3

Most placements are done by the Career Developer. A small number is done through the New York State Employment Service and the New York City Manpower and Career Development Agency because they have jurisdiction over certain training programs and jobs which our participants need. However, the rate of placements is lower for the small number of participants referred to these agencies. This is largely due to the participant's need to keep two appointments instead of one when he is referred through another agency. A comparison of total referrals and placements made through the other two agencies and through the Manhattan Court Employment Project follows:

TOTAL REFERRALS AND PLACEMENTS THROUGH THE MCDA,
THE NYSES AND THE MCEP OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE
MANHATTAN COURT EMPLOYMENT PROJECT

	Manpower and Career Develop- ment Agency	NY State Employ- ment	Man. Court Employment Project
Total referrals	31	44	346
Total placements	12	15	176
Percentage of placements per referral	39%	34%	50%

The employment situation of our participants fluctuates from day to day as jobs are gained and lost and participants enter and leave the project. The following table depicts the employment picture of 300 participants, broken-down by groups of 50, as it was on September 27, 1968.

All information on the employment status of our participants has been directly verified with the employer as well as the participant. No assumptions have been made that lack of contact with a participant means he is satisfactorily employed, nor that favorable dismissal from the project signifies continued employment. In every case where doubt existed, we have assumed a participant to be unemployed. It can be assumed that among the participants we list as unemployed are a number who have changed jobs following dismissal or termination.

NOTE: The dates during which each group entered the project are:

GROUP I February 5 - March 18
 GROUP II March 19 - April 16
 GROUP III April 16 - May 24
 GROUP IV May 27 - July 9
 GROUP V July 9 - August 12
 GROUP VI August 12 - September 27

TOTAL MCEP PARTICIPANTS EMPLOYED, IN TRAINING,
 OR IN SCHOOL ON SEPTEMBER 27, 1968, BROKEN
 BY GROUPS OF 50:

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Total presently employed	12	16	8	13	17	18	84
Presently students	4	1	3	2	5	1	16
Presently in training	5	2	2	1	3	3	16

The same employment picture is reflected in the following table now broken down by the groups of participants whose charges were dismissed, who were terminated unfavorably from the project, and who are currently active in the project. The category of dismissed participants include some who left the project as early as May 6, 1968.

PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF 300 NCEP PARTICIPANTS
BROKEN-DOWN INTO CATEGORIES OF CHARGES DISMISSED,
UNFAVORABLY TERMINATED AND CURRENTLY ACTIVE.

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
<u>Dismissed</u>							
Employed	11	12	5	3	0	0	31
In training	3	0	1	1	1	0	6
In school	2	0	2	1	0	0	5
Not placed	5	2	2	1	0	0	10
TOTAL	<u>21</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>52</u>
<u>Terminated</u>							
Employed	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
In training	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
In school	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Not placed	<u>23</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>92</u>
TOTAL	<u>27</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>Active</u>							
Employed	1	3	2	10	17	18	51
In training	0	0	1	0	2	3	6
In school	0	1	1	1	5	1	9
Not placed	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>82</u>
TOTAL	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>148</u>

6 students, 4 active and 2 dismissed, are also currently working part time.

UNEMPLOYED PARTICIPANTS

About 39% of our participants are employed, in training or in school. Of the remainder, some are probably permanently unemployable because of mental or physical illness. Some are between jobs and will probably be placed again. Others have recently entered the project and have not yet been placed. Others have been uncooperative, have disappeared, or have been rearrested. Others are addicts or alcoholics.

The percentage break-down of these categories follows:

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS: PERCENTAGE EMPLOYED AT PRESENT AND THE PRINCIPLE REASONS WHY THE REMAINDER ARE UNEMPLOYED.

employed	39%		
Unemployed	61%	addicts or alcoholics	21%
		mentally or physically ill	4%
		recent cases or between jobs	15%
		rearrested, uncooperative	<u>21%</u>
			61%

The same information is presented in the following table, broken-down by presently unemployed participants whose charges were dismissed, who were unfavorably terminated, or who are currently active in the project:

PRINCIPLE REASONS WHY PRESENTLY UNEMPLOYED PARTICIPANTS DO NOT HAVE JOBS - BROKEN INTO CATEGORIES OF (1) UNFAVORABLY TERMINATED (2) CURRENTLY ACTIVE AND (3) CHARGES FAVORABLY DISMISSED.

UNEMPLOYED, UNFAVORABLY TERMINATED PARTICIPANTS

<u>Number of Participants</u>	<u>Reason for Unemployment</u>
31	Narcotics users or alcoholics
8	Ineligible, died, retarded, or hospitalized
34	Absconded and can't be found
<u>19</u>	Were uncooperative and got into further trouble with the law
92	

UNEMPLOYED, CURRENTLY ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS

<u>Number of Participants</u>	<u>Reason for Unemployment</u>
29	Narcotics users or alcoholics
2	Hospitalized or retarded
1	Absconded
10	Uncooperative or got into further trouble with the law
11	Recently lost job or placement
<u>29</u>	Recent intakes, recent open referrals, or no information available.
82	

UNEMPLOYED PARTICIPANTS WHOSE CHARGES WERE FAVORABLY

DISMISSED

<u>Number of</u> <u>Participants</u>	<u>Reason for Unemployment</u>
3	Narcotics users or alcoholics
2	Hospitalized or retarded
2	Recently lost job or placement
<u>3</u>	Open referral or generally
10	cooperative but temporarily unemployed

SERVICING OF PARTICIPANT'S FRIENDS AND RELATIVES

An estimated 100 friends and relatives of participants have been serviced by the Career Development Unit. This has been done in cases where it has helped in establishing a better relationship with the participant himself. These placements are not included in any of the preceding statistics.

THE ROLE OF THE CAREER DEVELOPER

In the early months of the project, there was excessive delay in referral of participants to Career Development. The Representatives were attempting to do much of the vocational planning that could have better been done by the Career Developer. Often they brought the participant to the Developer with a demand for a specific job. As the Representatives gained increased confidence both in themselves and in the Career Developers, the speed and rate of referral increased, helped by pressure from the project administration.

Similarly, there was information acquired by each unit that was not reaching the other. Reliance on occasional conversation, gave way to planned meetings, and finally to an exchange of records.

Our initial decision to have the job developing function and the vocational counseling function be combined in one person -- the Career Developer -- has made sense. The Career Developers have little trouble communicating with employers, participants

and Representatives. There is a tension between the Developers and the Representatives growing out of their mutual desire to benefit the participants, which tends to keep each Unit efficient.

It should be noted that an additional Career Developer was taken on during this period following the sudden death of one of the staff. She relied on the manual of Career Development techniques developed during the training period, as well as the notebooks of job bulletins and was performing at full capacity within two weeks.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT RECORDS

The system of record-keeping in Career Development includes:

1. Vocational folders
2. Caseload Surveys
3. Face Sheets
4. Master Cards
5. Status Chart
6. Non-Participant Activity Chart

- 1) A vocational folder is kept by the involved Career Developer on each participant. It begins with a copy of the participant-application form. All contacts with Career Development, with employers, with training programs, and all contacts vocationally pertinent (e.g., an appointment with Social Services for a "work clothes grant"; an appointment for a medical employability check) are kept, in narrative style, in the folder.

Copies of transcribed contacts made by the Human Services Unit, which are vocationally pertinent, are placed in the folder.

- 2) Each Career Developer maintains a caseload survey form.

Each participant the Career Developer is working with, or has worked with, is listed on the form. The current place of employment or training is recorded on the form as are follow-up checks on progress after placement.

The form was initially designed as a reminder for "follow-up" with employers and training program directors.

In early September a decision was made for Career Development to become more involved with participants who were unplaced and had decreased their Career Development involvement, by contacting them with offers of help. The survey form identifies participants in this category.

- 3) A "face sheet" is maintained, by the unit secretary, on each participant giving name, number, Human Services Representative, intake date, Career Development Initial Interview, each referral, hiring, and work or program termination.
- 4) Master Cards are kept on each employer, union, and training program to which referrals have been made.

Dates of referral, participant referred, disposition of referrals, commencement dates of working or training, and termination of work and training are posted.

Reasons are posted for unsuccessful referrals and for work terminations.

Job titles and salaries are posted, when possible, on all referrals, and, always, on all successful referrals.

- 5) A Status Chart is kept by Career Development giving the following characteristics on each participant:
- a) whether or not he has been serviced by Career Development
 - b) whether or not he has been terminated from MCEP
 - c) whether or not he has been favorably dismissed from MCEP
 - d) whether or not he has been employed
 - e) whether or not he is in training
 - f) whether or not he is a student
 - g) whether or not he has been unsuccessful on at least one job
 - h) whether or not he has been unsuccessful in at least one training program

and, by absence of the above designations:

- i) whether or not he is unemployed, not in training or school
- j) whether or not he has not been serviced by Career Development

- 6) The unit secretary maintains a chart detailing the names of non-participants who have been serviced, the date of the service, the referral source (which may be another agency who has requested our assistance when the client is totally without ties to us or may simply be the relationship of the non-participant client to a participant when he is friend or relative to one of our people), the involved Career Developer and the action taken.

LEGAL STATUS OF 300 PARTICIPANTS

At the time a participant is assigned to the Manhattan Court Employment Project, his case is adjourned for 90 days. At the completion of 90 days, one of three actions will be taken by the court. If the participant has been successful, his charges are dismissed. Participants who are making progress but with whom the project wishes more time to work will receive an extended adjournment. At the end of the extension, a recommendation will be made for dismissal of charges or termination from the project. A few persons assigned to the Manhattan Court Employment Project have been discharged when found to be ineligible for participation due to outstanding pending charges or because of their youth. Participants who have not cooperated are terminated and returned to normal court processes.

DISMISSAL

Our recommendation that a participant's charges be dismissed is based on a number of factors: willingness of the participant to confront his problems and

to cope with them; the relation established with the counselor; participation in group counseling sessions; employment attempts and success. We are more concerned with the quality of a participant's relationship with staff and his insights about himself, than the quantity of appointments he keeps. A participant's charges are dismissed when we and he are reasonably sure that positive results have taken place.

As of September 30, 1968, 52 of the 152 participants no longer active in the Project had had their charges dismissed on our recommendation. The following letter was written to the District Attorney and the Legal Aid Society for one participant who had his charges dismissed:

TO: Joseph Stone, Esq.
Anthony Marra, Esq.

DATE: June 3, 1968

SUBJECT: KG - Docket # 4567

K.G., age 20, was accepted into the Manhattan Court Employment Project on February 29, 1968. He is charged with 140.10, 155.25, and 165.40 (trespass, petit larceny, possession of stolen property). His case was adjourned until June 6, 1968 in Part IIA.

Mr. G. who is married and has a daughter, was referred to the Computer Programing Institute and began training in "console operations" on March 18, 1968. He has also enrolled in a neighborhood high school equivalency course and is doing well. He has been generally cooperative and has demonstrated a high degree of motivation toward self-improvement. His attendance at counseling sessions has been regular, and a marked improvement in attitude has been evident.

We recommend dismissal of charges in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HMA/sr

HENRY M. ARONSON

EXTENSIONS

In cases where a participant's response to the program has been marginal or when he presents a special problem (mental retardation, drug addiction), we ask for a continued adjournment of his case and an extension of his time in the project. A one month extension is requested for participants for whom there is little hope of success but with whom we are still in contact. If there is no change during the one month extension, the case will be terminated and referred back to court. An additional month is also requested for participants who are doing well but may have just lost their job, or run into a new problem which we might help resolve in a short period of time. A two month extension is requested when it is clear that much more time with the participant will be necessary to elicit a good response.

An addict, after his first three months with the project, will be extended for up to two more months if there is the feeling that progress is being made towards acceptance of treatment. If he enters a drug addiction program, either residential or out-

patient, during the first three months or second two months, an additional three months adjournment will be requested at his next scheduled court appearance. If his stay in a drug program goes well for the three months, we would recommend that his charges be dismissed.

A total of 69 participants had their cases adjourned for an additional period of one to seven months following the original adjournment for participation in the project. Of that number, 33 have completed the additional adjournment period. Eleven of these have had their charges favorably dismissed. Twenty-two have been unfavorably terminated. Thirty-six are still active and are numbered among the 148 participants currently in the project.

The following letter was sent to the District Attorney and the Legal Aid Society in support of a request for an additional adjournment:

TO: Joseph Stone, Esq.
Anthony Marra, Esq.

DATE: May 3, 1968

SUBJECT: BR - Docket #1234

BR, age 18, was accepted into the Manhattan Court Employment Project on February 5, 1968 following his arraignment in part III. His case was adjourned until May 6, 1968 in part III. He was charged with Loitering and Petit Larceny.

Through efforts of the project, Mr. B was accepted into a key punch operator training program at the Brooklyn Adult Training Center. He did poorly, in part, because he was weakened by a urinary infection and left the program for good cause on April 1. On April 17, he secured employment as an office clerk at the New York Infirmary, 321 East 15 Street, New York City.

He was rearrested on a charge of burglary on April 5, and was paroled on April 13. The Supreme Court clerk's office informs us that the case is still pending before the grand jury.

Mr. R. has not yet responded well to the project but we would like to work with him further, pending the disposition of the second charge against him. We request that his case be adjourned for an additional two months.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY M. ARONSON

TERMINATIONS

A participant may be terminated from the project at any time. At the next scheduled hearing, the participant's case will proceed as if he had never been in the project. The District Attorney has agreed that termination from the project will not be used to the defendant's detriment in further court proceedings.

In most instances, a termination follows a loss of contact with a participant. After a week has gone by and the participant has made no contact for counseling, social service help or job referral, the Representative will make phone calls, send letters and "hang out" in the participant's neighborhood in the hope of spotting him.

In a few cases, the unsatisfactory participant does maintain contact with the project but manifests no interest in confronting his problems, or participating in counseling, or setting employment goals. A report terminating him will be submitted on the hearing date.

The following is a sample termination report,
copies of which are sent to the District Attorney
and to the Legal Aid Society:

TO: Joseph Stone, Esq.
Anthony Marra, Esq.

DATE: June 24, 1968

SUBJECT: D.B. - Docket #901

D. B., age 18, was accepted into the Manhattan Court Employment Project on 3/19/68. He is charged with 155.25 (petit larceny), 165.40 (possession of stolen property) and 240.35 (loitering). His case was adjourned to June 26, 1968 in Part III.

At the time of his acceptance into the Project, Mr. B. was suffering financial difficulties and severe personal problems. He was not initially prepared for employment. Although he was moderately responsive to counseling for a brief period, his participation has been minimal. He has not been in touch with the Project since 5/20/68 and has moved from his residence at the Keystone Hotel, 161 West 36th Street. Efforts by the Manhattan Court Employment Project to locate him have proved fruitless.

Because we have been unable to find Mr. B., we must request that he be terminated from the program, and remanded to normal court processes. It is our understanding that the fact of disassociation from the Project will not be to his detriment in further proceedings before the court.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY M. ARONSON

HMA/sr

There were 92 terminations as of September 30th. A breakdown of the 92 terminations, and the principle reasons for them, are illustrated in the following table:

GROUP:	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
<u>Number of terminated participants</u>	24	27	22	15	4	0	92
<u>REASONS:</u>							
Disappeared	6	13	17	12	3	0	51
Re-arrested	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Drugs	6	4	3	0	0	0	13
Not interested	11	9	1	3	1	0	25

REARRESTS

Rearrests present a sensitive issue. If the participant had committed the new offense, it is an indication that we have not yet been effective in encouraging changes in his attitudes and behavior. However, the participant may have established a close relationship with his Representative and there may be other positive signs. From a counseling point of view, an arrest is serious and disturbing but reflects only one aspect of behavior, among many, that is self-destructive and must be confronted. The Participant may still benefit from our help.

However, we recognize that we owe an obligation to the court and to the District Attorney to exercise extreme

care in assessing our ability to deal further with a rearrested participant. Even more than with other cases, we must be able to point to clear indications of potential if we are to ask for further opportunity to work with such a case.

Of the first 300 participants, 36 were re-arrested during their three months in the project. In each case, we approached the Representative and his supervisor to ascertain the participant's progress and prospects prior to his arrest. Sometimes, the Representative interviewed the participant in jail to learn the details of the arrest and the participant's reaction to it.

In cases of rearrest for disorderly conduct or loitering, there has been no problem in securing a second adjournment for continued participation if we thought it would be beneficial. In more serious cases, we have sometimes appeared on the defendant's behalf, either in court or informally in conversation with prosecutor and defense lawyer. In some cases where the defendant had not been responsive to the project and termination was likely, we

have refrained from intervention.

When we continue to work with a rearrested participant, we attempt to have the new case adjourned to approximately the same date as the case that initially brought him into the project. If we are satisfied with subsequent progress, we would recommend that charges be dismissed in both cases.

Where this is not possible, we continue to work with the participant even though he will be proceeding through the normal court processes on the second charge. Only three participants have been terminated from the project entirely because of the fact of rearrest. In most cases, the rearrested participants whom we terminate have failed to cooperate in other ways and the rearrest represents only one further negative incident.

The following table illustrates the status of the 36 participants who were rearrested:

CURRENT STATUS OF REARRESTED PARTICIPANTS

Currently active:	16
Unfavorably terminated:	19
Charges dismissed:	1

The following chart traces the court disposition, based on Manhattan Court Employment Project recommendations, of the first 300 participants by groups of 50. The "current" column reflects the number of active participants as of September 30, 1968 who have yet to complete the indicated period.

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS: CURRENT STATUS
WITH THE PROJECT

PARTICIPANT	PERIOD	DIS- CHARGED	UNFAVOR- ABLY TERMI- NATED	FAVORABLY DISMISSED	CURRENTLY ACTIVE
1 - 50	1st 90 days	3	12	14	0
	After 1st extension		10	6	1
	After 2nd extension		2	1	1
51 - 100	1st 90 days	1	19	11	0
	After 1st extension		7	3	4
	After 2nd extension		1	0	3
	After 3rd extension			0	1
101 - 150	1st 90 days	2	21	11	1
	After 1st extension		0	0	11
	After 2nd extension		1	0	3
151 - 200	1st 90 days	1	14	4	17
	After 1st extension		1	1	10
	After 2nd extension		0	0	2
201 - 250	1st 90 days	1	4	1	44
251 - 300	1st 90 days	0	0	0	50
TOTAL:		8	92	52	148

SOCIAL SERVICES

A Department of Social Services intake unit consisting of one Supervisor and two case aides has been out-stationed to the MCEP. Its purpose is to expedite welfare monies and services to project participants in order that they may be prepared to seek employment as soon as possible. 37% of the first 300 participants received Social Services aid. This figure illustrates a phenomenon of immediate needs which a job cannot satisfy. In fact, we have found that food money, a place to live, medical treatment or clothes for a job interview are practical and psychological needs which must be met before a participant can be effectively serviced by the Career Development Unit.

In addition, many participants have serious, long-term employment handicaps (addiction, mental disabilities, poor health) but cannot rely on their families for support. The Social Services unit is committed to seeing that these persons also receive prompt and efficient service while every effort is made by the other project units to help them overcome their problems.

The outstationed Social Services unit is a significant development in that it is the first involvement of the Department in the court structure. It provides immediate one-stop service to eligible recipients and provides maximum entitlements.

Most important, the unit can give close attention to its clients' progress with the help of the other units in the project. Following employment, the supervisor can sensitively re-budget the case or, as has happened in 22% of all cases opened, close the case immediately.

All participants who are in need of public assistance are referred by their Representative to Mr. Jose Hernandez, the project's Social Services Supervisor. Mr. Hernandez can make an immediate emergency grant for food and rent and determine if there is need for a continued, semi-monthly allotment. If the participant has previously been a public assistance recipient his case will be administered by his neighborhood center; new cases are handled by a unit of the Special Services Center of the Department. Even on old cases, Mr. Hernandez makes recommendations to the local center which are invariably followed.

In addition to making emergency grants and budgeting cases, Mr. Hernandez has shown great ingenuity in helping participants secure housing and medical assistance.

The two case aides, Mrs. Melissa Robinson and Mr. Charles Wallace, formerly trainees under the Public Service Careers Training Program, work under Mr. Hernandez' supervision, keeping records, taking participants to neighborhood centers and making occasional home visits. Mr. Hernandez and the case aides are considered a part of our staff although they are also responsible to the Department.

The following table illustrates the total number of participants who received Social Services benefits, broken down by groups of 50.

NUMBERS OF MCEP PARTICIPANTS SERVICED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES --

TYPES OF CASES -- KINDS OF ASSISTANCE RECEIVED

Participants	Number Referred to Social Services	Social Services Cases-new	Old cases			Family	Head of Family	Individual	Emergency or Special Grant Only	Medical Only	Semi-monthly Grant
			already Receiving Benefits	Family	Head of Family						
- 50	32	23	9	7	2	23	4	3	25		
1 - 100	26	21	5	2	1	23			26		
01 - 150	20	17	3	7		13	1		19		
51 - 200	20	13	7	5		15			20		
01 - 250	10	6	4	2		8			10		
51 - 300	5	3		1		2			3		

TOTAL	111	83	28	24	3	84	5	3	103
-------	-----	----	----	----	---	----	---	---	-----

There is a drop in the percentage of persons referred to Social Services out of the last 100 participants. This reflects two factors; more rapid referral to Career Development and faster placement on jobs, and a conscious effort by the Human Services unit to take fewer participants who are transients without any contacts in the city and consequently in need of housing.

It is significant that 75% of all the Social Service cases were new cases. These persons would not have been aware of their eligibility for public assistance had they not been accepted in the project.

Out of 111 recipients, 103 received a semi-monthly grant as well as emergency assistance. This belies the idea that a single massive infusion of money is sufficient to prepare a person for continued employment, and this has been our experience.

The following table shows the length of time between the date of entry to the project and the point of referral to Social Services: We see that 30.6% of the participants are referred to social services within one day, 52.2% within one week and 83.7% within three weeks.

Time lapse between acceptance into the project and
referral to Department of Social Service

Same day	34 participants
Less than one week	35 participants
Between 1-2 weeks	11 participants
Between 2-3 weeks	14 participants
Longer	17 participants

CASES CLOSED:

When a public assistance client is placed in a job or training program, his case is automatically rebudgeted with adjustment made for the salary or stipend he is receiving in his new position. If his salary is enough to cover his needs, his case is closed immediately.

The effectiveness of the Social Services unit can be measured by the number of cases closed because the participant was placed in a job or training, and the length of time these persons had to receive public assistance.

CASES CLOSED FOR REASON OF PLACEMENT IN EMPLOYMENT OR TRAINING WHILE PARTICIPANTS ARE ACTIVE IN MCEP.

Participants	Number serviced by Social Services	Cases Closed	
		Placed in job	Placed in Training
1 - 50	32	12	1
51 - 100	26	1	2
101 - 150	20	5	1
151 - 200	20	1	
201 - 250	10	1	
251 - 300	3	0	0
TOTAL	111	20	4

Department of Social Services statistics show that out of all the city's public assistance cases active in NYC only 16 2/3% were closed during the year 1967 for any reason (including all cases closed because of non-cooperation, change of residence to another city, deaths, etc.). Our percentage of cases closed for reasons of employment or training (24 out of 111 or 22%) betters the Department's yearly percentage of cases closed for any reason by more than 5%.

The length of time this group of 24 participants received public assistance is as follows:

Less than one week	7
One week to one month	8
One to two months	6
Two to three months	3

Out of the 24 cases which closed for reasons of placement in employment or training, 29% closed within a week and 71% closed within a month.

We can conclude that participants whose cases can be closed when they are placed in jobs or training generally require public assistance for only a brief period.

The following table shows the status of all MCEP public assistance cases serviced to date. It includes those cases which were closed for reasons other than placement in employment or training.

Closed because placed in employment or training	24
Closed because client disappeared (did not pick up his check for two pay periods in succession)	15
Closed because transferred to a local center (after serviced for 3 months at Special Services - 3 still active at local center and 1 closed)	4
Closed because client placed in hospital	1
Closed because client moved away from city	1
Closed after participant had been unfavorably dismissed from the MCEP	22
Still active at Special Services Center	22
Still active at local centers (not counting 3 transfers that are still active cases)	<u>22</u>
TOTAL: (15 of these are no longer active in MCEP)	<u>111</u>

Out of 111 public assistance cases in the project 82, or 74%, were referred to Career Development at least once. This proves that a majority of the project's social services clients are employable. Thirty-four of these, 41% (31% of all of those serviced) are currently in jobs or training. (Many of these were placed in jobs which did not provide enough income to support them right away; often their cases were rebudgeted rather than closed). When comparing the percentage of MCEP public assistance cases currently employed to the percentage of all MCEP participants currently employed, we realize that the public assistance recipients are not by and large less qualified or less motivated to seek and obtain employment than are other MCEP participants.

Overall Project Participation of MCEP Public

Assistance Cases

69 participants who received public assistance are no longer active in the project. The following table shows how many cases were terminated or how many dismissed in each group of 50:

	<u>Terminations</u>	<u>Favorably Dismissed</u>
1 - 50	17	13
51 - 100	15	7
101 - 150	8	3
151 - 200	5	1
201 - 250	0	0
251 - 300	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL:	45	24

This is not appreciably different from the rate for the total MCEP population.

MANHATTAN COURT EMPLOYMENT PROJECT COMMITTEE

In March 1967, in an effort to improve and coordinate crime prevention efforts in New York City, Mayor Lindsay established the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. The Council is composed of 60 high-level representatives of city agencies, the courts, and the business and academic communities with the Vera Institute of Justice as consultant. The Council is divided into several committees concentrating on different aspects of the criminal process. One of these is the Manhattan Court Employment Project Committee.

Under the direction of Mr. James M. Oates, Jr., Chairman of the Board of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of America, the MCEP Committee is charged with developing strategies for bringing the ex-offender into the competitive labor market. It serves two important functions in the educational efforts of the project; (1) Its members use their influence to persuade employers and the public that persons with criminal records can become a valuable manpower resource and that provision of employment may reduce crime; (2) drawing upon the members' collective expertise, the committee advises the MCEP staff in the area of career development.

The committee members include representatives of the Court, the Legal Aid Society and the District Attorney's Office; the City's Human Resources Administration, Bureau of the Budget, the City Council, and several corporations whose national headquarters are in New York.

In addition to their efforts to secure favorable publicity for the project, the Committee has proved helpful in solving some nagging problems. Mr. Donald Cohn, a partner in the law firm of Webster, Sheffield, Fleischman, Hitchcock & Chrystie, and vice-chairman of the committee, volunteered his efforts in negotiating the lease of commercial space for a clubhouse and evening counseling site. Mr. Kenneth Brendstrup, Vice President for Urban Affairs of the New York Telephone Company, was able to secure telephone service for several Project Representatives who needed home telephones to maintain contact with their clients and were unable to immediately pay the required deposit. He was also instrumental in cutting the waiting time required for a switchboard to be delivered to project offices. Mr. Oates and Miss Beatrice Shainswit of the New York City Council have both provided leads to employment opportunities which have led to placement of project participants.

Through the help of Mr. Oates and Mr. James Loverude, a Vice President of the Chase Manhattan Bank who is also on the MCEP Committee, the Career Development unit made a presentation before all branch managers and vice-presidents of Chase Manhattan in the New York area. A memo letter went out from Mr. Loverude to all who attended that meeting, advising them to refer bank clients seeking to recruit hard-core unemployed to the project's Career Development staff. There have been a number of responses.

PERFORMANCE TO DATE

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS: NUMBER INTERVIEWED BY A
PROJECT CAREER DEVELOPER; NUMBER REFERRED TO EMPLOY-
MENT; NUMBER PLACED; TIME INVOLVED IN EACH OPERATION.

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Number of participants who had contact with a Career Developer	38	38	29	31	32	22	182
Average days between intake and first Career Development Interview	14	18	16	13	7	3	
Number of participants who were referred at least once	37	29	29	27	22	20	164
Average days between intake and first referral	18	24	24	19	9	5	
Number of participants who were placed at least once	31	23	22	16	15	14	121
Average days between intake and first placement	32	43	38	29	17	9	

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS: TOTAL REFERRALS AND PLACEMENTS

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Total referrals	132	94	67	52	44	32	421
Total placements	60	38	36	26	22	19	201

NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS PER PARTICIPANT

BROKEN DOWN BY GROUPS OF 50

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS
Participants placed once	18	14	14	13	17	12	88
Participants placed twice	8	5	4	3	0	0	20
Participants placed three times	4	4	3	1	1	2	15
Participants placed four times	2	0	1	0	1	0	4
Participants placed five times	1	0	0	0	0	0	<u>1</u>
							128

NOTE: The dates during which each group entered the project are:

GROUP I February 5 - March 18
GROUP II March 19 - April 16
GROUP III April 16 - May 24
GROUP IV May 27 - July 9
GROUP V July 9 - August 12
GROUP VI August 12 - September 27

TOTAL MCEP PARTICIPANTS EMPLOYED, IN TRAINING,
OR IN SCHOOL ON SEPTEMBER 27, 1968, BROKEN
BY GROUPS OF 50:

GROUP	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	TOTAL
Total presently employed	12	16	8	13	17	18	84
Presently students	4	1	3	2	5	1	16
Presently in training	5	2	2	1	3	3	16

TYPES OF JOBS FOR WHICH MCEP PARTICIPANTS ARE HIRED

	<u>Number of Placements</u>
Low level service (clerks, helpers, porters, messengers, packers, office boys)	88
Industrial (primarily employed by manufac- turing interests; factory jobs)	16
Training Programs (On-the-job training, schooling with a stipend. Good preparation for skill and high pay)	20
High level service (Drivers, salesmen, waiters, telephone solicitors, civil service people, community project workers)	27
Skills (Mechanics, electricians, machine operators)	19
Commercial (Management, real estate, banking, supervisors. Also extremely high paying jobs that would fall into another category)	3

PARTICIPANTS NOT REFERRED TO CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Had own job or full-time student at entry to project	33
Terminated from project before referral	43
Discovered to be addict, alcoholic or ineligible for project before referral	22
Recently entered in project and not yet referred	20
TOTAL:	118

FOR 300 MCEP PARTICIPANTS: CURRENT STATUS
WITH THE PROJECT

PARTICIPANT	PERIOD	DIS- CHARGED	UNFAVOR- ABLY TERMI- NATED	FAVORABLY DISMISSED	CURRENTLY ACTIVE
1 - 50	1st 90 days	3	12	14	0
	After 1st extension		10	6	1
	After 2nd extension		2	1	1
51 - 100	1st 90 days	1	19	11	0
	After 1st extension		7	3	4
	After 2nd extension		1	0	3
	After 3rd extension			0	1
101 - 150	1st 90 days	2	21	11	1
	After 1st extension		0	0	11
	After 2nd extension		1	0	3
151 - 200	1st 90 days	1	14	4	17
	After 1st extension		1	1	10
	After 2nd extension		0	0	2
201 - 250	1st 90 days	1	4	1	44
251 - 300	1st 90 days	0	0	0	50
TOTAL:		8	92	52	148