

Attachment 5. IRB package


- 5A. Approval
- 5B. IRB materials

Appendix 5a. IRB Approval Letter



1650 Research Boulevard • Rockville, Maryland 20850-3195
tel. 301-251-1500 • fax 301-294-2040 • www.westat.com

TO: Tim Smith
Project Director
September 20, 2007

FROM: 
Kerry Levin
Acting Chair, Institutional Review Board

SUBJECT: IRB Review and Approval
National Survey of Youth In Custody
Contract No. 2005-RP-BX-K014
Project 8202
FWA 5551

On September 11, 2007, the Westat Institutional Review Board (IRB) conducted a review of the following: **National Survey of Youth in Custody**, Contract No. 2005-RP-BX-K014, Project 8202. Westat's IRB reviews studies involving research on human subjects before activities may begin under 45 CFR 46/28 CFR 46. This study is funded by Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), U.S. Department of Justice.

On September 4, 2003, the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA) was signed into law (Public Law 108-79). The Act requires BJS to "carry out, for each calendar year, a comprehensive statistical review and analysis of the incidence and effects of prison rape." Through the full-scale National Survey of Youth in Custody, this project will collect allegations of sexual assault self-reported by youth in juvenile facilities. The study will be conducted in numerous states, and therefore project staff will need to be concerned with state requirements in, for example, the areas of mandatory reporting and age of consent.

The data collection procedures and planned reports for the National Survey of Youth in Custody have been developed and refined over the course of the past 2 years. Throughout this period, the project has conducted cognitive testing of assent materials and survey questions. In the fall of 2006 and the spring of 2007, the project conducted field testing, resulting in about 750 interviews with youth. These efforts were carried out with IRB approval and presented to the IRB under Project 8095.

On August 16, 2006, the IRB approved the study's field test. The Board stated that the study should be re-assessed to ensure that it presents no more than minimal risk to participants, and requested that any negative incidents be reported immediately to the IRB. The final report on the field test indicated that the study, in fact, presented no more than minimal risk to participants. A formal debriefing was held with each facility, and no facility indicated any repercussions to participants resulting from taking part in the study, nor was there any evidence of concern about future repercussions to participants. At two

facilities, staff from that facility conducted the parental recruiting activities and no problems were reported.

The following conditions were specified in the August 16, 2006, IRB approval, and are addressed below in light of the national study:

- The field test approval allowed for a \$5 incentive. This was not used in the field test, and will not be used in the main study.
- A waiver of documentation of parental permission was granted for the field test, since the study presented no more than minimal risk and it may be difficult to obtain, particularly in situations where the facility is responsible for recruiting activities.
 - When Westat staff recruit parents, we will make all reasonable efforts to obtain written parental permission. If verbal consent is obtained, recruiters will audio-record the telephone conversation.
 - When facility staff recruit parents, we recommend that they make all reasonable efforts to obtain written parental permission. Furthermore, if verbal consent is obtained, we recommend that they make every effort to audio-record the telephone conversation. In situations where it is not possible or feasible to obtain written or audio-taped consent, we highly recommend that recruiters document that consent was received from the parent.
- Because the study can be considered minimal risk and permission from both parents would be logistically very problematic, a waiver of the requirement of permission from **both** parents was also granted. Since the field test showed that written parental permission was sometimes very difficult to obtain and no problems resulted from verbal consent from one parent, the waiver of documentation of parental permission and the need to obtain permission from both parents is also granted for the main study.
- For the main study, facility-level estimates will be published, and this will be included in the consent form.
- Feedback from state or other IRBs that review and approve the study will be sent to Westat's IRB.

The same parent permission/youth assent procedures will be used in the main study as were used in the field test. The same protocols, data collection instruments, and composite and training of staff also will be utilized. Any changes that are made must be re-submitted to the IRB for review and approval.

Westat's IRB unanimously approved this study. You are obligated to submit this study for an annual review on or before September 11, 2008. In the interim, you are responsible for notifying the Office of Research Administration as soon as possible if there are any injuries to the subjects, problems with the study, or changes to the study design that relate to human subjects.

Cc: Institutional Review Board
David Cantor
Robert Hill

National Survey of
Youth in Custody
(National Study
Implementation)

Submission to Westat
Institutional Review Board

September 2007

Table of Contents

Section	Page
1 OBJECTIVES.....	1
2 STUDY POPULATION.....	3
3 DATA COLLECTION.....	6
3A DATA COLLECTIONS NOT INVOLVING RESEARCH ON HUMAN SUBJECTS.	6
3B YOUTH ROSTERS.....	7
3C IN LOCO PARENTIS AND PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT.....	8
3D YOUTH ASSENT.....	10
3E YOUTH SURVEYS.....	12
3F YOUTH DEBRIEFING QUESTIONS.....	14
3G ADMINISTRATIVE RECORDS FORM.....	15
4 MANDATORY REPORTING OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT.....	16
5 PROVISION OF COUNSELING SERVICES.....	17
6 PUBLICATION OF FACILITY-LEVEL SURVEY DATA.....	18

List of Appendixes

Appendix	Page
A Field test highlights.....	A-1
A1 Parent/Guardian consent rates.....	A-1
A2 Youth assent data (i.e., assent rates, comprehension, expectations, debriefing)	A-2
A3 Mandatory reports and counseling requests.....	A-3
B Youth roster.....	B-1

List of Appendixes (Cont.)

Appendix	Page
C Parent/Guardian consent materials.....	C-1
C1 Cover letter.....	C-1
C2 Consent form.....	C-2
C3 Telephone consent script.....	C-3
D Youth assent materials.....	D-1
D1 Assent form.....	D-1
D2 Assent script.....	D-2
E Questionnaires.....	E-1
E1 NSYC questionnaire.....	E-1
E2 NSYC-A questionnaire.....	E-66
E3 Sample 1 (Younger cohort, NSYC questionnaire).....	E-112
E4 Sample 2 (Older cohort, NSYC questionnaire with report of youth-staff contact).....	E-123
E5 Sample 3 (Older cohort, NSYC questionnaire with report of youth-youth contact).....	E-139
E6 Sample 4 (NSYC-A).....	E-155
F Administrative Records Form.....	F-1

List of Tables

Table	Page
1 Proposed sample frame.....	4
2 Whether or not estimate will be statistically different from 0, by size of estimate and sample size*.....	5
3 Sample frame and proposed sample sizes, by facility size.....	5

List of Exhibits

Exhibit		Page
1	Questionnaire Content by Treatment Group.....	12

NATIONAL SURVEY OF YOUTH IN CUSTODY

1. Objectives

On September 4, 2003, the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA or the Act) was signed into law (Public Law 108-79). The Act requires the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to “carry out, for each calendar year, a comprehensive statistical review and analysis of the incidence and effects of prison rape.” The Act further instructs BJS to collect survey data, “...the Bureau shall...use surveys and other statistical studies of current and former inmates...” The law was passed in part to overcome a shortage of available research on the incidence and prevalence of sexual violence within correctional facilities.

To implement the Act, BJS has developed the National Prison Rape Statistics Program (NPRS), which includes five separate data collection efforts: the Survey on Sexual Violence (SSV), the National Inmate Survey (NIS), the National Survey of Youth in Custody (NSYC), the Former Prisoner Survey (FPS), and a medical surveillance project to track medical and behavioral indicators of sexual violence. Due to the sensitive nature of violent victimization and potential reluctance to report sexual assault, BJS will collect multiple measures on the incidence and prevalence of sexual assault. Each of these collections is independent and, while not directly comparable, will provide various measures of the prevalence and characteristics of sexual assault in correctional facilities.

This submission is to seek clearance for NSYC. The data collection procedures and planned reports described in these materials have been developed and refined over the course of the past 2 years. Throughout this period, we have conducted several rounds of cognitive testing of the assent materials and survey questions. In the fall of 2006 (Phase 1) and spring of 2007 (Phase 2), we conducted field testing resulting in about 750 interviews with youth. Highlights from the field tests are provided in Appendix A.

Through the full-scale NSYC, we will collect allegations of sexual assault self-reported by youth in juvenile facilities, using a self-report survey administered to adjudicated youth held in juvenile correctional facilities. The data that are collected will be used to develop facility-level estimates of sexual assault. Data from these surveys will be included in a report from the Attorney General, which will be submitted to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The Act also establishes a

Review Panel on Prison Rape and a National Prison Rape Elimination Commission, which will use data collected in the these surveys.

Users of these data include the following:

- U.S. Congress – Congress will receive a report on data collected under the Act. The report will include information about the prevalence of sexual assault at each facility in the sample.
- U.S. Department of Justice – The Review Panel on Prison Rape will solicit testimony from correctional administrators in facilities with the highest and lowest rates of sexual violence as identified in the study report.
- National Prison Rape Elimination Commission – “...shall carry out a comprehensive legal and factual study of the penalogical, physical, mental, social, and economic impacts of prison rape in the United States...” Duties to be performed by the Commission include: a review of the procedures for reporting incidents of prison rape, an assessment of correctional staff training, and an evaluation of the safety and security of correctional facilities.
- National Institute of Corrections (NIC) – is responsible for establishing a “national clearinghouse for the provision of information and assistance to Federal, State, and local authorities responsible for the prevention, investigation, and punishment of instances of prison rape.” NIC will also develop periodic training and educational programs for “...authorities responsible for the prevention, investigation, and punishment of instances of prison rape.”
- National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Assistance – are responsible for studying characteristics of victims and perpetrators and identifying trends in sexual violence within correctional settings. Findings from NSYC disclosed in the Congressional report may be used to inform research proposals for grant funding opportunities provided in the Act.
- Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice – may use data from the Congressional report to understand the magnitude and scope of sexual violence within correctional facilities as they relate to the violation of youths’ civil rights.
- Federal, State, and local corrections and juvenile officials and administrators – will use data from the Congressional report to assess and compare trends in youth-on-youth and staff-on-youth sexual violence.

2. Study population

The sample is designed to estimate rates of non-consensual sexual contact for juvenile correctional facilities that house adjudicated youth.

The sampling frame will be the 2005 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The sample is designed around five requirements.

- Include on the sample frame all those facilities that meet one of the following criteria:
 - state facilities (except for very small ones) with at least 25 percent adjudicated youth
 - large non-state facilities (e.g., county, municipal, and other) that house adjudicated youth with at least 25 percent adjudicated youth.
- Maximize the number of large facilities in the sample. This is to increase the number of facilities for which reliable and confidential estimates of nonconsensual sexual contact can be made. All state-operated facilities with 90 or more adjudicated youth will be sampled with certainty. This will ensure that the largest facilities will fall into the sample. A maximum of 240 youth will be selected within each facility (depending on size).
- Draw at least one facility from each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. This is mandated by PREA.
- Oversample females. Females are oversampled because they are only 10.4 percent of adjudicated youth in the sampling frame and there is a desire to obtain reliable national estimates for this group.
- Provide reliable national estimates.

Table 1 provides the distribution of the facilities on the sample frame by size and type of facility, according to the 2003 CJRP.

Table 1. Proposed sample frame

Facility Size	Facilities				Adjudicated Youth			
	State	County	Other	Total	State	County	Other	Total
Less than 20	111	-	-	111	1,626	-	-	1,626
21 - 50	183	-	-	183	5,671	-	-	5,671
51 - 89	69	-	-	69	4,773	-	-	4,773
90 - 120	29	-	-	29	2,943	-	-	2,943
121 - 150	15	10	8	33	1,987	1,349	1,103	4,439
151 - 250	35	10	11	56	6,869	1,823	2,157	10,849
251 - 350	27	2	1	30	8,083	644	263	8,990
More than 350	13	-	6	19	5,975	-	3,433	9,408
Total	482	22	26	530	37,927	3,816	6,956	48,699

Sampling of youth within facilities will be with equal probability, except that most, if not all, females will be included in sample. Only adjudicated youth will be included in the survey because of the requirement to gain parent/guardian consent. A lead time of approximately 8 weeks is required to get parent/guardian consent. Since non-adjudicated youth are typically in facilities for less than this amount of time, it would be impractical to attempt to get parent/guardian consent for non-adjudicated populations

The sample design specifies that all youth will be selected who are in facilities with populations under 240. In larger facilities, 240 youth will be randomly selected within each facility. Somewhat fewer than 240 youth may be sampled in facilities where consent is given in loco parentis, since much higher response rates should be possible. The number of youth sampled in each facility is designed to maximize the number of facilities for which estimates can be published. In deciding on the sampling rate, consideration was given to drawing large enough numbers of youth to obtain reasonably reliable estimates.

Table 2 illustrates one set of calculations used in this design decision. This table shows which combinations of sample size and rates of non-consensual sexual contact for which the confidence interval will not cover zero. These calculations assume a design effect of 1.5, a response rate of 60 percent, and 90 percent of the interviews will be used to generate estimates of nonconsensual contacts. Using these assumptions, a designated sample size of 111 will be adequately large if the estimated rate of nonconsensual sexual contact is at least 10 percent. For a designated sample size of 56, the rate must be 20 percent or greater. For designated sample size of 165, a rate of 7 percent or more will have a confidence interval that does not cover 0. For the largest designated sample size of 240, even a rate as low as 5 percent will have a confidence interval that does not cover 0.

Table 2. Whether or not estimate will be statistically different from 0, by size of estimate and sample size*

Sample Size	Rate = 5%	Rate = 7%	Rate = 10%	Rate = 15%	Rate = 20%
56	No	No	No	No	Yes
111	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
165	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
240	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

* Assumes 1) 95% confidence interval, 2) design effect of 1.5, 3) 60% response rate, and 4) 90% of the interviews will ask about sexual activities.

Using the design described above, Table 3 provides estimates of designated sample sizes by facility size. (The additional sample of female youth, resulting from selecting all females, is not included in the table.)

Table 3. Sample frame and proposed sample sizes, by facility size

Facility Size	Sample Frame		Proposed Sample	
	Facilities	Youth	Facilities	Youth
10-20	111	1,626	13	190
21 - 50	183	5,671	41	1,326
51 - 89	69	4,773	35	2,546
90 - 120	29	2,943	29	2,943
121 - 150	33	4,439	33	4,439
151-164	11	1,712	11	1,712
165 - 250	45	9,137	45	9,133
251 - 350	30	8,990	30	7,200
350+	19	9,408	19	4,560
Total	530	48,699	256	34,049

The estimated sample size is 34,049 youth, including both adults and minors housed in the sampled facilities. Based on pilot test results, we make the following assumptions:

- About 16 percent of sampled youth (n=5,448) will be discharged prior to the data collection visit, thereby becoming ineligible.
- About 30 percent of the remaining sample will be adults or youth for whom the state provide consent *in loco parentis* (n=9,395).
- Parent/Guardian consent will be needed to contact the remaining eligible youth (n=19,206). Consent will be obtained from 45 percent of the parents/guardians (n=8,643).

Combining these groups, we anticipate contacting 18,038 youth to request an interview.

Again, based on field test results where 95 percent of contacted youth participated in the interview, we expect that 17,136 will take part in NSYC.

3. Data collection

Data collection efforts entail obtaining information from states, facilities, parents/guardians, and youth. Some of the data that we will collect is not related to human subjects (e.g., organizational structure of facilities); in Section 3a, we highlight the activities associated with these efforts to provide context for the broader data collection efforts. Other information that we will collect is highly sensitive and we have developed special safeguards to ensure that human subjects are protected.

3a. Data collections not involving research on human subjects

The first steps in our data collection process include contact with representatives from the state agency with jurisdiction over juvenile correctional facilities and with representatives from the sampled facilities. The goal of these initial contacts is to obtain support for and commitment to the study. During subsequent contacts, we will gather data needed to characterize the environments in which the youth reside and to plan the data collection visits to the facilities.

Westat project staff will contact the director of the state agency to identify a state staff person who will serve as a liaison to the study. This liaison will work with the residential juvenile facilities and Westat to prepare for and coordinate the survey team visit. In addition, the liaison will:

- Communicate requirements to obtain informed consent for minors. Either the state will provide consent *in loco parentis* or work with the facility and Westat to define the procedures for obtaining written or verbal consent from the minors' parents/guardians. (We elaborate on options for obtaining parent/guardian consent in Section 3c.)
- Confirm state procedures for mandatory reporting of abuse or neglect: The liaison will confirm how incidents should be reported to child welfare authorities if a youth informs the survey team of abuse or neglect.
- Identify external counseling resources: The liaison will confirm that both internal and external counseling will be available to youth who participate in the survey.
- Other information to be collected from the state liaison covers topics such as the number of facilities in the state and the number of adjudicated minors in state custody.

Information collected during initial contacts with the facility coordinator includes:

- Type of facility (e.g., state-owned);
- Number of non-adjudicated and number of adjudicated youth (by gender) living at the facility;
- Segregated and shared living/sleeping units (e.g., shared classrooms);
- Unit function (e.g., diagnostic center) and treatment services (e.g., substance abuse) provided; and
- Average age and length of stay for youth in unit.

None of these data pertain to individual youth; rather, they are summary data about the facilities and units. No identifying information about any youth will be provided as part of these data collection steps.

3b. Youth rosters

Westat will collect a roster of adjudicated youth living from each of the selected facilities (Appendix B). For each youth, the facility will provide:

- Youth identification number assigned by the facility;
- Date of birth;
- Gender; and
- Date of admission to the facility.

The identification number will be different from any used by the facility for other purposes. Facilities will create these numbers and maintain a crosswalk linking them to the youth listed on the roster. This will allow Westat and facility staff to discuss the status of individual cases without our knowing the name or other number commonly used to identify the youth.

The roster will be provided through a secure means that the facility is willing and able to use. Options will include faxing it to a dedicated machine that stores the files until a password is entered, emailing it to the Westat recruiter as an encrypted password-protected file, or using a file transfer protocol (FTP) to post it to a secure server at Westat.

Westat will select a random sample of youth from the roster to be included in NSYC. The Westat recruiter will notify the facility liaison which youth are selected. Prior to the field visit, the recruiter will periodically collect updated roster information, including similar data on any new arrivals at the facility and the release of any selected youth from the facility.

3c. ***In loco parentis* and parent/guardian consent**

The NSYC sample will include both adults and minors held in custody by the state. Given these conditions, we plan to contact youth only when one of the following criteria is true:

- The state or facility consents *in loco parentis*;
- A parent or guardian consents in writing or verbally (if recorded); or
- A youth is considered an adult by the state for purposes of this type of research.

Westat will discuss with each state and/or facility the conditions under which consent can be granted *in loco parentis*. We had experience with this method in one state during the field test and it proved to be very successful: no parents/guardians questioned the decision to permit contact with their children and nearly all sampled youth chose to participate.

When the local authorities require parent/guardian consent, Westat will discuss methods that might be used and negotiate the responsibilities that we and the facility will have. Several configurations of responsibilities were used successfully during the field test and we plan to follow similar procedures for the national study.

- **Facility is responsible for all activities.** Some facilities will choose to conduct all activities related to contacting parents/guardians and documenting consent. Typically, these activities will include sending a cover letter, consent form, and return envelope to the parent/guardian and receiving completed forms by mail. Often, the facility will follow up with nonrespondents by mail or in person. For example, during the field test, some facilities sent counselors to the home and some met with parents/guardians on visitation days.

Under these conditions, we will also discuss with the facility liaison the safeguards necessary when contacting parents/guardians to help ensure that there is no coercion. Westat will provide the facility with a sample consent form and discuss any modifications they might wish to implement. Before agreeing to any modification, the project staff will consult with the IRB chair about the appropriateness of the change. A copy of the standard cover letter and consent form are shown in Appendix C.

The facility will receive completed forms from parents/guardians (by mail, in-person, or as a result of telephone calls) documenting their decisions. The liaisons will update Westat on the status of consent efforts during periodic telephone calls with the facility recruiter. This information will be logged into the survey management system and used to govern which youth become eligible to contact at the facility. The field team supervisors will confirm consent information with the liaisons during their first day at the facilities.

- **Westat is responsible for all activities.** Some facilities will ask Westat to conduct all activities to contact and obtain consent. Again, these activities will typically include sending a cover letter and consent form and receiving completed forms by mail. Followup activities will vary, depending on the procedures approved by the state.

In order for Westat to contact parents/guardians, the facility must provide us with confidential and sensitive information. This information includes the name of parent/guardian name, the name of the youth, and parent/guardian address. If Westat is to conduct telephone followup, we must also be provided with the telephone number for the parent/guardian.¹ We will use one of the three secure methods of file transmission to receive the data. All paper records will be locked during the course of consent acquisition and destroyed once the field visit to the facility is completed.

Additional safeguards that we will use to ensure the confidentiality of the contact information include the following.

- Westat staff assigned to work with the contact information will not have access to any survey data collected from or about the youth.
- The electronic files will not be stored on the same server as other study information.
- The electronic files will not be subject to routine Westat systems backup (to prevent duplicate files).

Using the contact information provided by facilities, we will assemble and mail materials to the parents/guardians. These materials will include a similar cover letter, consent form, and return envelope used by the facilities and shown in Appendix C. In this scenario, completed form will be returned to Westat. The outcomes will be logged into the survey management system and used to govern which youth are eligible for field contact.

If no response is received by mail, Westat may attempt contact by telephone. This activity will be done by interviewers in Westat's Telephone Research Center. When interviewers contact parents/guardians, they will read a scripted version of the consent form designed for telephone delivery (Appendix C). As soon as the interviewer determines that the parent/guardian is on the telephone, he/she will ask to record the conversation. Depending on the procedures approved by the state, the interviewer

¹ Westat will not conduct tracing in order to identify alternative telephone numbers.

will then either attempt to obtain consent by telephone or prompt the parent/guardian to return the completed form to Westat. All recordings will be reviewed to confirm that proper procedures were implemented and that the outcome of the call was properly coded. No refusal conversion efforts (i.e., call backs those who refuse consent) will be attempted.

- **Facility and Westat share responsibility.** Westat will negotiate with all states and facilities the parameters and responsibilities for each of the activities described above. For example, some facilities may ask that Westat mail the consent packets, but that parents/guardians receive instructions to return completed forms directly to the facility. Likewise, Westat might be responsible for mailing and receiving the materials, but the facility would take the lead in conducting all telephone contacts. Only the activities that are described herein will be conducted without prior approval of the Westat IRB chair.

3d. Youth assent

All youth for whom parent/guardian consent is obtained and those residing in facilities that provide *in loco parentis* consent will be invited to participate in the interview. Before an interviewer begins the assent process, he/she must first verify that the youth has been sampled and has the necessary consent. Field staff will use survey cards and rosters to achieve this goal.

The field supervisor will provide the liaison with a survey card for each youth. The card will include the youth's gender, identification number, and survey password. These cards will be given to facility staff assigned to escort youth to the interview rooms. Once they arrive at the room, the escort will give the card to the youth, who in turn, will give it to the interviewer.

The interviewer will match the identification number on the card with the number that appears on a printed roster. This roster includes both the identification number and the birth date of each sampled youth. Once the interviewer finds the identification number and birth date on the list, he/she will ask the youth for his/her date of birth. If the birth date reported by the youth does not match the birth date printed on the roster, the interviewer will notify the field supervisor or the facility liaison to reconcile the difference. This process will ensure that only those youth who are sampled and have consent are asked to participate in the study.

The standard youth assent form is provided in Appendix D; key elements include:

- Name of the project sponsor and project goals;

- Voluntary nature of participation, and the options to skip any questions or stop the interview at any time without repercussions;
- Random assignment to one of two survey instruments (see Section 3e);
- Explanation of the survey administration methodology (i.e., audio computer-assisted self-interview);
- Confidentiality of survey responses and mandatory reporting of any verbal indications of abuse/neglect; and
- Availability of counseling services.

The field interviewer will give a copy of the assent form to the youth once he/she comes to the interview room. Then the interviewer will use a scripted version of the assent form to review the information with the youth (Appendix D). The scripted text and the assent form text are the same. However, we have added several questions to the script that the interviewer will use to assess the youth's comprehension of the information. If a youth answers any of these questions incorrectly, the interviewer will read the relevant text again and try to paraphrase the information to help the youth understand.

If the youth fails to understand a question the second time, the interviewer will finish the assent process with the youth. However, the interviewers will not ask the youth to complete the interview. The script includes text that the interviewer will read to inform the youth that the computer has indicated that he/she has already answered all the questions that are needed. This approach will minimize the risk that a youth will question why he/she is not being asked to participate further.

We used this approach in the field test; only one youth out of over 600 failed to comprehend the assent information.

3e. Youth surveys

Youth participating in NSYC will be randomly assigned to one of two questionnaire treatment groups: NSYC or NSYC-A. The random assignment to questionnaire treatment group serves to "mask" which questions an individual might have been asked, thereby helping to protect the respondent. Exhibit 1 shows the questionnaire content to which the two groups will be exposed. All youth will be asked questions on their background and perceptions of life in the facility. Youth assigned to the NSYC questionnaire group will then be asked questions on sexual activity within the facility. Those assigned to the NSYC-A questionnaire group will not be asked about sexual activity; they will be presented questions

on drug and alcohol use prior to admission, treatment received before and since admission, and family and peer background.

Exhibit 1. Questionnaire Content by Treatment Group

Survey content	NSYC	NSYC-A
Background (e.g., reason for admission, education, race/ethnicity, orientation)	YES	YES
Facility perceptions (e.g., perceptions of staff, environment safety)	YES	YES
Sexual activity within facility (e.g., with other youth, with staff, coercion)	YES	NO
Detail on sexual assault by other youth (e.g., type of coercion, location and time of assault, reports of incidents)	YES	NO
Detail on sexual assault by staff (e.g., type of coercion, location and time of assault, reports of incidents)	YES	NO
Drug use prior to admission (e.g., lifetime and 30 day use by type of drug, abuse, dependency)	If needed	YES
Alcohol use prior to admission (e.g., lifetime and 30 day use, abuse, dependency)	If needed	YES
Treatment (e.g., before and during admission)	If needed	YES
Family and peer background (e.g., household composition, familial drug/alcohol abuse)	If needed	YES

Since youth assigned to the NSYC group could potentially complete the interview very quickly (by responding “No” to all of the sexual activity screener questions), we have incorporated a feature into the audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI) survey program to standardize the time each respondent spends answering questions. No matter how a youth assigned to the NSYC group answers the screening questions, the computer application will continue to present questions until a 30-minute threshold is reached. This is achieved by “shifting” from the NSYC questionnaire to portions of the NSYC-A questionnaire. Therefore, the scope of the questions posed to youth assigned to the NSYC group is time-dependant and unknown to anyone but the respondents.

The ACASI survey program also presents somewhat different versions of the NSYC questionnaire depending on the age of the respondent. The differences are in the questions and wording of questions used to screen youth who have experienced sexual activity while at the facility. Youth aged 14 or younger are presented screener questions that use less explicit terminology to ask about sexual contact (e.g., "...rubbed your private parts") than the questions presented to older respondents. If one of these youth respond affirmatively to one of the screener questions, then questions using more explicit terminology are used (e.g., "...rubbed your penis"). All NSYC respondents aged 16 or older are presented only those questions using the more explicit terminology. We used this approach during the field test and did not detect any problems with the terminology presented to each age group.

We have attached both the full questionnaires (with programming specifications). In addition, we have included a set of four sample questionnaires to facilitate review (Appendix E). Each sample shows the set of questions that would be presented to a youth based on randomized assignment to the questionnaire, the youth's age, and responses to specific questions.

- Sample 1 shows questions from the "younger youth" version of the standard NSYC questionnaire (i.e., that containing questions on sexual experiences). The questions shown in this version are based on responses indicating no sexual activity while at the facility.
- Sample 2 shows questions from the "older youth" version of the questionnaire. The questions shown in this version are based on responses indicating sexual experiences between the respondent and a staff member at the facility.
- Sample 3 shows questions from the "older youth" version. The questions are based on responses indicating sexual experiences between the respondent and another youth at the facility.
- Sample 4 shows the NSYC-A, with questions from the alcohol and drug use instrument.

Regardless of questionnaire group assignment, the questionnaire will be administered to all respondents using the ACASI technology. Respondents wear headsets to listen to questions as they appear on the laptop screen and enter their answers using a touch-screen. This technology:

- Provides a special level of privacy for the respondent. The interviewer will not know which questions are asked or how respondents answer the questions.

- Accommodates respondents with limited literacy skills. Respondents both see the questions and answers displayed on the screen and hear them through their headsets. The voice from the computer guides them through the answer categories.
- Permits the use of complex branching and skip patterns that are programmed directly into the instrument. This allows us to tailor the question flow based on respondent age and answers to particular questions, thereby helping to eliminate exposure to language that is not age-appropriate.

A field interviewer will stay in the room while the youth completes the interview. The interviewer will be able to help the youth overcome any problems with the laptop or headset, instruct the respondent if he/she is unsure how to choose an answer, and monitor the youth’s demeanor. However, the interviewer will stay out of line-of-sight from the laptop screen to the extent possible so as to avoid seeing the survey questions or answers.

3f. Youth debriefing questions

All respondents will be asked to describe their experiences and reactions to the survey by answering a series of questions on the laptop; these questions will appear after they complete the last of the survey questions. The questions address the following topics:

- **Emotional upset as a result of participation;**
- **Willingness to participate, having completed the experience;**
- **Perceived importance of asking youth about life in the facility, and experience with sexual activities, drug use, and alcohol use; and**
- **Perceived comprehension of the survey questions.**

Similar questions were asked during Phase 2 of the field test. Key findings include the following.

- Most respondents thought that the survey was important. Responding to the questions, “It is important to ask young people about...”
 - the way things are in places like this” – 96 percent agreed
 - their sexual experiences...” – 80 percent agreed
 - their experiences with drugs...” – 82 percent agreed

- Nearly 9 out of 10 respondents (87%) would agree to participate in the survey again knowing “what is on the survey.”
- Three-quarters (75%) of respondents disagreed with the statement “Some of the questions made me upset.”
- Of the 25 percent who agreed who agreed with the statement “Some of the questions made me upset”, 80 percent said they would do the survey again. Therefore, there was strong support for doing the survey even among this particular group. Their support for the survey was not significantly different from the 75 percent who disagreed with this statement.
- A minority of respondents reported that some of the questions were difficult to understand (24%) or that the survey was too long (21%).
- Respondents tended to have confidence in the confidentiality of the data.
 - “No one here at this place will ever know my answers...” – 90 percent agreed
 - “No one outside of this place will ever know my answers...” – 79 percent agreed

Throughout the course of the national study data collection effort, we will examine the responses to these questions periodically to assess the effects that survey participation is having on respondents.

3g. Administrative records form

In order to determine if there is any bias introduced from nonrespondents, facilities will be asked to provide administrative record data for all sampled youth (Appendix F). This will allow researchers to compare characteristics (e.g., demographics, committing offense) of youth who participate and youth who do not participate. The form asks for the following information for each sampled youth:

- Date of birth, gender, and race/ethnicity;
- Authority responsible for placement (e.g., court, social services, school) and level of authority (e.g., federal, state, county);
- Most serious offense resulting in placement;
- State in which offense was committed;
- Adjudication status; and
- Date of admission.

4. Mandatory reporting of abuse or neglect

Our study protocol defines all project staff as mandatory reporters of actual or alleged child abuse and neglect. Under this definition, NSYC will abide by all state and local regulations pertaining to mandatory reporting. During the assent process, youth will learn that verbal statements alleging abuse or neglect must be reported to the authorities (whereas, responses entered into the laptop will remain anonymous). Following these procedures during Phase 2 of field test, 25 of about 650 youth made statements that triggered a report.

Although we do not anticipate a large number of mandatory reports, we will take several steps to ensure that we have a correct understanding of the pertinent regulations and fulfill our obligations to the youth.

- A senior project staff member will review state documents on reporting requirements. This review will include information on the definition of abuse and neglect, information that should be included in reports, and procedures for submitting the reports.
- Westat staff will review with the liaison from each state the information that we have assembled to confirm that it is accurate and complete.
- Westat staff will review with the coordinator at each facility this same information to ensure that everyone has the same understanding of the regulations and procedures.
- Field staff will receive instructions at training on how to respond to youth who make statements related to abuse or neglect. They will also practice implementing these instructions during training exercises.
- Field staff will receive written instructions for each facility that they visit. These directions will describe the definitions, necessary information, and procedures that are in force at the facility.

Field staff and Westat field managers will maintain a log of reports that are submitted during the course of data collection. Project management will keep informed of the number of reports by facility and by interviewer in order to identify possible inconsistencies in the approach individual interviewers take when conducting these procedures.

5. Provision of counseling services

Project staff will take special measures to ensure that youth receive counseling services if participation in the study causes emotional upset or raises issues that should be addressed by a professional. These measures include negotiating with state and facility staff to make available staff counselors during and after our visit, to make available counselors from outside the facility, and providing the youth with a telephone number to ChildHelp (www.childhelp.org), a national hotline that provides callers with information on local support resources.

Specific measures that we will take include the following.

- During the recruitment process, Westat recruiters will discuss the need for facility and external counselors to be available during and after the site visit. Availability of these resources will be a requirement for participation in the study.
- Both the parent/guardian consent and youth assent forms mention that these resources are available. Depending on whether the state and facility permit youth access to a telephone, the forms will include the telephone number for ChildHelp.
- Interviewers will receive training to identify signs of emotional upset. They will be instructed that they should not attempt to provide any services themselves; rather, they should encourage youth to request the services.
- At the conclusion of the ACASI interview, screens and audio are presented that encourage youth to request the services if anything in the interview has raised thoughts or concerns that should be addressed by a professional.

These procedures mirror those used successfully during the field test. At the nine facilities visited during Phase 2 of the field test, 22 youth (out of about 650) requested counseling services; 17 of these youth requested to talk with an external counselor. In debriefing calls with facility staff after our visits, we learned that all of the youth who requested services met with a counselor. The staff also indicated that there were no adverse events (e.g., youth becoming upset, increase in youth misbehavior, changes in requests for counseling) as a result of our visit. ChildHelp was not aware of any calls received by field test participants.

6. Publication of facility-level survey data

NSYC will make public estimates for individual facilities, except where confidentiality may be breached. Although it will be impossible to determine individual survey responses, publication of rates based on a small number of reports of nonconsensual sexual contact could significantly increase the risk of identifying a respondent. For this reason, the sample is designed to be able to obtain estimates for larger facilities, where there will be more youth interviewed and a greater chance of meeting the criteria for publishing a facility-level estimate. For planning purposes, we have used a rule that there has to be at least 3 respondents that report nonconsensual contact for an estimate to be eligible to be published. A rule on the absolute minimum number of interviews required to publish an estimate will be developed at a later time.