

**PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION  
SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

Agency: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)  
Title: Juvenile Probation Census Project  
Form: 1121-0291  
OMB No.: (current approval expires 12/31/2007)

**A. JUSTIFICATION**

1. Circumstances of the Collection

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) requests renewal of the National Juvenile Probation Census Project under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The project consists of 2 data collection forms:

- **Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO).** This form will identify individual juvenile probation offices and collect an aggregate count of the number of youth on both formal and informal probation. In addition, this form asks questions about the different juvenile probation processing options utilized by the respondents, as well as information about monitoring, sanction and treatment options. The form also includes questions about partnerships and contracts, prevention programming, representation of juveniles, and administrative issues.
- **Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP).** This form will be administered to a sample of the offices who received the CJPSO and ask more detailed questions about the types of juveniles on formal probation including age, race, sex, and offense. Included in this form will be roster pages in which the respondent will be asked to enter information about each juvenile probationer on their caseload. It is anticipated that most respondents will provide this information in an electronic format.

Juvenile probation has been termed the “workhorse of the juvenile justice system.” In 2004, formal probation was the most restrictive disposition ordered in 393,100 delinquency cases—63% of all adjudicated delinquency cases.<sup>1</sup> While it is fitting and important to understand the youth who consume the lion’s share of resources (i.e. those placed out of the home), juvenile justice policy must also address the issues of youth who receive probation, as it impacts the vast majority of juvenile offenders in this nation.

---

1 Internet citation: *OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book*. Online. Available: <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/court/qa06501.asp?qaDate=2004>. Released on March 19, 2007.

The first administration of the Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO) occurred in April, 2005. Nearly 88% of all pre-identified juvenile probation offices responded. Recognizing that about 12% of all pre-identified offices did not respond, the remaining 88.8% responding Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (JPSOs) reported serving 392,651 formal and 96,264 informal probationers across the United States on April 25, 2005. Some key findings of this first data collection included:

- California served the highest percentage of all reported formal and formal probationers, accounting for 17.3% of the total U.S. count of formal probationers, and 13.3% of all informal probationers in the United States. Florida accounted for the next highest proportion of all formal probationers (6.2%), with Ohio, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Texas close behind (5.6, 4.7, 4.6 and 4.6% respectively). Texas accounted for the second highest proportion of all informal probationers, serving 7,555 young people or 7.8% of the total informal probation count in the United States.
- Alaska, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming had the smallest formal population counts, with each state accounting for less than .5% of the total U.S. count. The average number of probationers reported per JPSO per state varied tremendously, ranging from a low of 15 young people in South Dakota to a high of 1,664 in Massachusetts. These averages should be interpreted cautiously, as the geographic and population sizes of the geographic areas served by the JPSOs across the United States vary considerably.
- Only four states served more informal than formal probationers (Montana, North Dakota, Iowa, and Missouri). Fifty percent of all states reporting using informal probation had a ratio of 3.5 or fewer formal probationers for each informal probationer. Nationally, the ratio of formal (392,651) to informal (96,264) is 4.1, however, the mean of all state ratios is higher at 12.83. The mean is drawn upwards by the five states with ratios higher than 20:1. Nebraska has the highest ratio (267.8:1).
- JPSOs have available a variety of processing options that appear to depend in part on the type of offense and the offense history of the young people involved. On the whole, it appears that JPSOs rely more heavily upon court-ordered options for auto-theft than they do for the offenses of school fighting and possession of marijuana. Juveniles who are on formal, court-ordered probation at the time of an offense uniformly have fewer non-court-processing options available, with the fewest seen for cases involving auto theft. The majority of JPSOs reporting that non-court processing options are available included diversion and informal probation in their portfolio of supervision services.

- Many JPSOs partner with schools and law enforcement agencies. For example, 39.1% of all responding offices noted that at least one probation officer served more than four hours per week within local schools. Fifteen percent of all offices reported that a probation officer rode along with the police on patrol at least once per week. Respondents at these offices indicated that the purpose of these ride alongs included: monitoring juveniles on probation supervision (10.4%), providing prevention programs (2.1), and finally, assisting police (4.4).
- No matter the type of probation supervision, the most frequent monitoring requirement for all probationers is in-office contacts. Home visits and in-school contacts are required for the bulk of young people on formal and intensive supervision probation. Community service, financial restitution and drug testing appear to be the mainstay of required sanctioning components for juveniles on formal and intensive supervision probation.

OJJDP anticipates that the Juvenile Probation Census Project will become the backbone of the Office's information collection efforts with regard to juvenile probation. This data collection collects information related to the most important data elements concerning juvenile probation including number of juveniles on probation and the activities of juvenile probation offices around the country. This is the only collection that collects comprehensive, national-level information about this population. While we have a source of information on youth who receive probation as a court disposition (from the National Juvenile Court Data Archive), we have no way of telling how many youth are on probation at any one time.

Both of the instruments that are the focus of this collection have each been fielded twice over the past three years. Copies of the two data collection forms that are the focus of this collection--the Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO) and the Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP)--are included under item 5 of this package.

OJJDP is authorized to conduct this data collection under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 (the JJDP Act). For purposes of this PRA request, the relevant part of the JJDP language reads as follows:

*(b) Statistical Analyses.--The Administrator may--*

*(1) plan and identify the purposes and goals of all agreements carried out with funds provided under this subsection; and*

*(2) undertake statistical work in juvenile justice matters, for the purpose of providing for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of statistical data and information relating to juvenile delinquency and serious crimes committed by juveniles, to the juvenile justice system, to juvenile violence,*

*and to other purposes consistent with the purposes of this title and title I.*

--42 U.S.C. 5661

Copies of the relevant sections of the JJDP Act are included in this package.

## **2. Purpose and Use of the Information**

The data collected from the two surveys that are part of the National Juvenile Probation Census Project are key to understanding the population of juveniles on probation due to some contact with the justice system, and how juvenile probation supervision offices handle these cases. Specific information about what each census collects follows:

The CJPSO collects information about:

- the aggregate count of juveniles on both formal and informal probation;
- different juvenile probation processing options utilized by juvenile probation offices;
- information about monitoring, sanction and treatment options used by probation offices;
- information about the operation of juvenile probation offices (partnerships and contracts, prevention programming, representation of juveniles, and administrative issues).

The CJP collects information about:

- The offense characteristics of youth on probation,
- The racial breakdowns of these youth,
- The age and gender distribution of these youth, and
- The government level of the responding juvenile probation supervision office.

The specific content of these two forms was developed through a rigorous process in which OJJDP, the US Census Bureau, and George Mason University determined precisely what data are required to routinely monitor the population of youth on probation and in what format these data are needed. This process included discussions and consultations with many prominent researchers, policy analysts, and practitioners in the field of juvenile corrections. [See the section below on outside consultations. The list includes the many participants in these discussions.]

OJJDP utilizes the information from these data collections in the following ways:

- To learn more about how states and localities use juvenile probation as a sanction and monitoring tool;

- To identify differences and similarities in how states and localities utilize juvenile probation;
- To compare the number and characteristics of juveniles on probation with juveniles in court, and juveniles in residential placement;
- To compare the rates of probation among the States;
- To compare the types of offenses for which juveniles receive probation and the characteristics of these youth;
- To identify the unique issues of minorities and females in the juvenile justice system.

In addition, OJJDP expects to produce some publications that summarize the data findings (as either Fact Sheets or OJJDP Bulletins) for the juvenile justice field.

### **3. Use of Automated, Electronic, Mechanical or Other Technological Collection Techniques**

OJJDP considers automated data collection and submission an important, crucial element for any quality collection. OJJDP and the Census Bureau are committed to decreasing the burden of the data collection on respondents. The burden on respondents is likely to be greatest when submitting their responses to the CJP, because this form includes the Roster pages. For the CJP, the Census Bureau will take advantage of all available electronic means of data submission, as it did with the previous CJP data collection, and has done with another OJJDP roster data collection effort (the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement). These previous efforts have shown that electronic data submission reduces the burden and costs on both the respondent and the data collectors, the Census Bureau. Along with these savings, the data are cleaner and less prone to error when taken directly from the respondents' own systems.

For the CJP data collection, respondents will have several options available to submit their roster data electronically. With each mailout, OJJDP provides all respondents with an automated data submission guide which provides details regarding the data formats that will be accepted.

OJJDP and the Bureau of the Census have used a similar mechanism to collect roster data for the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement in since 1997. This method has lessened the response burden for many CJRP respondents, decreased the data entry burden for the Census Bureau, and minimized the likelihood of data entry errors. We expect similar advantages to using this method for the Census of Juveniles on Probation. An example of what the CJP automated submission guide looks like is at <http://harvester.census.gov/cjrp/> (or see Attachment A).

#### 4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

Data collections from OJJDP and other federal agencies have served to inform the office on juvenile probation. However, these efforts do not fully address the needs of OJJDP in developing a more comprehensive data collection on juvenile probation. Briefly, the sources of information include the following:

- (1) The **1991 Census of Probation and Parole Agencies** conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics covered juvenile probation. Unfortunately, this project suffered from numerous technical problems including difficulties with updating the mailing list and problems in receiving timely and complete responses. BJS intended this project as a one-time effort to collect information on all persons on probation. It was never certain that this effort would be reproduced. Given the past difficulties and expense of this first census, it seems unlikely that BJS will be able to provide OJJDP with necessary information on juveniles on probation.
- (2) The **National Juvenile Court Data Archive** annually collects information the disposition of delinquency cases in juvenile courts throughout the nation. From automated data and published reports submitted by court jurisdictions covering about 70% of the juvenile population, this project produces national annual estimates of court activity. These estimates include the number of youth who receive probation as their ultimate and most serious disposition. This project has produced these estimates for OJJDP since 1974 when the Office was created through the JJDP Act.

While this project can provide information on the juveniles entering probation, it cannot provide information on the numbers of juveniles on probation at any one time. Further, it cannot provide information on juvenile probation officers or their caseload, both important indicators of the functioning of juvenile probation. The NJCDA is an important project, but cannot replace the data collection activities in this request.

- (3) Through the **Juvenile Probation Officer Initiative** funded by OJJDP, the office had established a routine and continuous contact to juvenile probation administrators and officers. For many years, this project served as a mechanism for training probation officers, informing these professionals of changes in the field, and keeping the Office apprised of emerging issues. The JPOI project used to maintain a list of all probation officers in the country. Due to budget constraints this aspect of the project was discontinued in Fiscal Year 1996.

The Juvenile Probation Census Project was determined to be necessary after an exhaustive search and analysis of existing Federal and state data sources on juvenile probation. Such a search was conducted as part of OJJDP's Statistics and Systems Development Project (SSD) which aimed to improve the national and State level collection of information on juvenile justice. One task of this

project was to gather information on all national data systems that could serve to inform policy makers on juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice. No similar information exists, nor can any existing information be modified to serve the purposes described above.

In addition to the activities discussed above, OJJDP has continued to consult and network with juvenile justice researchers and individuals involved directly in juvenile probation matters around the country and has found no duplication of this data collection effort.

## **5. Impact on Small Businesses and Small Entities**

Small business are not involved in this data collection.

## **6. Consequences If Information Is Collected Less Frequently**

There are two data collection forms that are part of this OMB request: the Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO) and the Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP). The juvenile justice system is in a constant state of flux. An annual survey of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices which collects information on both the operation of those offices (the CJPSO) *and* the juveniles on their probation caseload (the CJP) would be ideal. However, it would not be practical to expect respondents to answer so many questions on an annual basis. OJJDP decided instead to split the data collection effort into two distinct parts, with each to be administered annually on a specific reference date in late April.

## **7. Special Circumstances**

Most of the special circumstances listed in the instructions for OMB Form 83-I (10/95) do not apply to this data collection for the following reasons:

- The data collections are not quarterly or more frequently;
- The respondents will have more than 30 days to respond;
- Only one copy of the document will be requested;
- The collections do not require respondents to maintain records beyond the data collection itself.
- The collections are designed to be a census of juveniles probation supervision offices and a census of juveniles on probation and as such will produce valid and reliable results;
- OJJDP will not require reporting of statistical data classifications that have not been approved by OMB.
- The pledge of confidentiality provided with the data collection derives directly from statute (see attached *42 U.S.C. 3789g*);

- The collection does not request proprietary information.

8. Outside consultation

A 60 day and 30 day notice has been posted in the Federal Register and no comments have been received.

9. Consultations outside the Office

During the development phases of this project, OJJDP consulted extensively with several experts in the field. These consultants provided expert advice on the operations and population of the specific facilities. Since this time, additional area experts have been consulted as necessary. The Juvenile Justice Center of the American Bar Association, Parole and Probation leaders, and staff of the Bureau of Justice Statistics have provided guidance on their areas of expertise. The entire development phase of this survey stressed input from respondents. The first phase of the development included interviews with personnel from juvenile probation field offices, gathering substantive comments on the structure of the survey and how OJJDP might best structure the data collection to impose the least burden possible.

Additionally, OJJDP revisits the form after each collection to determine the value of the information being collected, the phrasing and content of questions, and the form structure. OJJDP also relies on experts in the field of juvenile probation to advise the agency regarding needed changes, deletions or additions to the form. This information is gathered through periodic phone calls of the "OJJDP Data Collections Working Group," as well as through conferences, regional meetings with State Juvenile Justice Specialists, and internal agency meetings. A list of the many individuals involved in advising OJJDP regarding the CJPSO, CJP and other data collection activities is included in Attachment B.

OJJDP is currently in the process of initiating a Juvenile Corrections and Probation Data Collection Advisory Board to inform the agency's various data collection efforts, including the CJPSO and CJP. It is expected that the membership of this Board will be multidisciplinary and will include experts from the fields of juvenile facility operations, corrections administration, research and data collection, as well as juvenile service needs (mental health, physical health, education, etc.). The Advisory Board will also include at least one Federal member.

OJJDP has also entered into an agreement with George Mason University for periodic review and testing of CJPSO and CJP questions, including developing proposed improvements to questions and survey structure. Through this process, the names of individuals who participate in pilot testing of questions or survey protocols are guaranteed confidentiality, so they are not included here. The individual who oversees the pilot testing process (through an OJJDP



interagency agreement) is:

Catherine Gallagher  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Public and International Affairs  
George Mason University  
Fairfax, VA  
(703) 993-8480  
[Cgallag4@gmu.edu](mailto:Cgallag4@gmu.edu)

### **Justification of Compensation**

OJJDP will not provide compensation to respondents who participate in this data collection. Participation will be purely voluntary.

10. Assurance of confidentiality

All information tending to identify individuals (including entities legally considered individuals) will be held strictly confidential according to Title 42, United States Code Section 3789(g). A copy of this section is included with this submission as Attachment A. Regulations implementing this legislation require that OJJDP staff and contractors maintain the confidentiality of the information and specifies necessary procedures for guarding this confidentiality. These regulations (28 CFR Part 22) is included at Attachment B. A letter from OJJDP will notify persons responsible for providing these data, that their response is voluntary and the data will be held confidential. A copy of this letter along with the necessary notification is included in Section 4 of this package.

11. Justification for sensitive questions.

Neither the CJPSO nor the CJP data collection contain sensitive questions.

12. Estimates of hour burden

Based on the original national field test, more recent field testing and the subsequent administrations of the two collections, OJJDP estimates the average time to complete the CJPSO form to be two hours, and the CJP to be either seven (for manual reporters) or five (for electronic reporters) hours. Since these collections are administered in alternating years, the burden on an annual basis will not be greater than the collection with the larger annual burden. The following table provides an overview of the estimate of the burden, for each collection:

	No. of Respondents	Avg. Burden	Burden per collection	Maximum Annual Burden
CJPSO	1,606	2 hours	3,212	3,212
CJP	375 (manual) 125 (electronic)	7 hours 5 hours	2,625 625	<b>3,250</b>

Note that since these collections are conducted on alternating years, the annual response burden will never be higher than **3,250** hours.

13. Estimates of cost burden

The forms were designed so as not to require any new systems or efforts on the part of respondents. Rather, respondents provide information that all need for their own operational functions. As such, this data collection requires no start-up costs or maintenance costs from respondents.

14. Estimate of annualized cost to the Federal Government

Based on our experience in implementing the two collections, the following table provides an overview of the costs of implementing the Juvenile Probation Census Project.

On average, the annual cost of the collections to the Federal government is \$345,000. Below are the budgets for 2005 and 2006, by category, for the project:

<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Personnel	232,200	414,500
Travel	1,500	1,500
Procurement	0	0
Postage	3,500	4,500
Forms Design	2,000	4,800
Publications	500	700
Printing	3,500	5,500
Training	1,600	2,000
IT Flat Rate	4,000	5,000
Other	1,200	1,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>440,000</b>

15. Reasons for program changes

The change in burden hours reflected in the 83-I form (item 13.f.2) is the result of two factors. The first factor is a change in plans for administering this collection so that we will only be conducting one of these collections each year. In other words, the CJPSO and the CJP will be conducted in alternating years, which lessens the burden on respondents. The second factor is an update on the size of the respondent universe. The original PRA request indicated a respondent universe of 1,715; based on our experience in administering this collection and updating our lists, the actual respondent universe size is about 1,606.

OJJDP also requests a revision to Form CJ-17L (Census of Juveniles on Probation), p. 4, Q. 4. Race, to reflect the same language that is being used by the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) OMB #1121-0218. The race question language in the CJRP was changed in 2006 as a result of the OMB PRA review of the CJRP in 2006. The new language reads as follows:

[See p. 4, Question 4. of the attached CJP form.]

4. What is this person's race?  
Enter the code on the line
  1. White, not of Hispanic origin.
  2. Black or African American, not of Hispanic origin.
  3. Hispanic or Latino (i.e., Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin), regardless of race.
  4. American Indian or Alaska Native, not of Hispanic origin.
  5. Asian, not of Hispanic origin.
  6. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, not of Hispanic origin.
  7. Two or More Races, not of Hispanic origin – *Specify*

For definitions of these categories, please refer to page 16.

*Page 16 of the CJP form includes the following information:*

The Federal Government uses the following definitions for the various racial categories.

White – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

Black or African American – A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

Hispanic or Latino – A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

American Indian or Alaska Native – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and South America (including Central America) and who maintains tribal affiliations or community attachment.

Asian – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa or other Pacific Islands.

Two or More Races, not of Hispanic origin – Refers to combinations of two or more of the following race categories: White, Black or African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. In cases of Hispanic origin, regardless of race(s), mark "Hispanic or Latino".

16. Plans for tabulation and publication

OJJDP considers publication of the Juvenile Probation Census Project information important not only for Federal agencies, but also for enhancing the work of the probation offices themselves. OJJDP has developed a comprehensive system for analysis and distribution of the information collected. Under this plan, OJJDP funds an Interagency Agreement with George Mason University and a cooperative agreement to the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) for the analysis and dissemination of statistical data relevant to the juvenile justice field.

Presentations on the preliminary findings (which are summarized in section 1) have been conducted at the Annual Meetings of the following organizations:

- American Correctional Association
- American Parole and Probation Association
- Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences
- American Society of Criminology

A "Review of Findings" has been submitted to the American Parole and Probation Association's Journal, "Perspectives," for publication in the Spring of 2008. In addition, OJJDP shared a Research Brief with the universe of respondents in Spring of 2007.

In addition, OJJDP has entered into an Interagency Agreement with the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD), part of the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan, to eventually make the CJP and CJPSO data files available as restricted files to researchers. This effort would also promote the publication of research findings from the two collections.

In addition to these activities, OJJDP will continue to use the data as necessary to support programming and budgeting.

17. Request for approval to not display OMB approval expiration date.

The present request does not request such approval. The expiration date will be displayed along with the OMB approval number.

18. Exceptions to the certification statement in Item 19 of OMB Form 83-I

No exceptions to the certification statement are requested or required.