

Attachments to Supporting Statement

- A. Email from OJJDP to OMB regarding decision to suspend collection and implement improvements
- B. Screen shots of CJP Online Registration and Submission Program
- C. OJP Confidentiality Legislation 42 U.S.C. 3789(g) and OJP Privacy Regulations (28 CFR Part 22)
- D. Advisors to OJJDP Data Collection Activities
- E. Compilation of Summary Data sent to CJPSO 2005 Respondents
- F. CJP Focus Group Report Prepared by GMU

A. Email from OJJDP to OMB regarding decision to suspend collection and implement improvements

Chiancone, Janet

From: Chiancone, Janet
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2008 6:24 PM
To: 'Achanta, Chandana L.'
Cc: Bryant, Lynn; Scarborough, Angela
Subject: Follow Up/Request to Withdraw the OMB PRA Package for Juvenile Probation Census Project
Importance: High

Dear Chandana,

Following our call with you last week, we had a series of discussions between OJJDP, George Mason Univ and Census Bureau. At this time, we have decided to withdraw the current OMB PRA package requesting renewal for the Juvenile Probation Census Project, and will cancel the CJP collection scheduled for this April.

We feel that we need time to do further investigation (and get some more answers) regarding the response rate to the CJP, and the questions we discussed on our call. We have mapped out a list of tasks/activities and timeline that is geared toward improving the collection and better understanding our experience to date. This process is designed to help us prepare a more complete and informative OMB PRA package when we are ready to apply again.

One thing that we have also realized is that it probably makes sense for us to separate the collections (CJPSO and CJP) into two different OMB PRA packages. So we will likely be submitting a package for the CJPSO (on its own) later this Spring, and a new package for the CJP later in the Summer.

In addition, this plan will give OJJDP some time to disseminate the findings of the two collections to a broader audience of researchers and practitioners, which you noted we had not done sufficiently.

I want to thank you again for your assistance and your thorough review and comments. It was extremely helpful to us in this process. Also, if it's okay, we'd like to take you up on your offer to provide us with guidance as we go through this process, and to periodically consult with you on issues about this collection, as we work to improve it.

Thanks again and please let me know if there are any questions. Angela, I am not sure if this email is sufficient to withdraw the package or if I need to submit something more formal? Please let me know.

Thanks,
Janet Chiancone, OJJDP
202-353-9258

2/27/2009

B. Screen shots of CJP Online Registration and Submission Program

Screen Captures:

CJP Survey Respondent Online Registration Process



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION

George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE



CJP INITIAL REGISTRATION ACCESS

Welcome to the Census of Juveniles on Probation Registration Page.

Thank you for participating in this landmark event -- the first full administration of the Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP). Data from this collection will allow for the first national description of the characteristics of young people on probation.

Most importantly, through new programming your participation in this effort will allow you to make comparisons of your young people and services to similar probation offices around the country.

The CJP will be collecting data for all young people on probation supervision in your office (and any office overseen by your office) on Wednesday, April 22, 2009. We are collecting this information on this reference day because research has shown that it is less likely to have unusual shifts in population size and content.

Unlike the sister collection of data on probation supervision offices (The Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices), we are expecting that respondents will require additional assistance in preparing for the collection. Thus, we are preregistering respondents so that we may:

1. introduce you to the questionnaire,
2. review the type of information that you will need to provide for each young person,
3. assess what type of assistance you would like from us,
4. alert you to events and training for this collection, and
5. assist you in developing a professional network of probation professionals.

Log In to Registration Process

Please begin the registration process by entering the User Name and Password you received by e-mail.

User Name

Password

preparing for the collection. Thus, we are preregistering respondents so that we may:

1. introduce you to the questionnaire,
2. review the type of information that you will need to provide for each young person,
3. assess what type of assistance you would like from us,
4. alert you to events and training for this collection, and
5. assist you in developing a professional network of probation professionals.

After entering the User Name and Password that you received by e-mail, you will begin a brief registration process that will allow you to access resources related to the collection, including results of a focus group of your colleagues about the importance of this collection. Registering does not obligate you to participate, and it may help you to determine who in your agency (if not you) is best positioned to provide the necessary information on young people on probation supervision.

Thanks very much for your time and energy,

The Census of Juveniles on Probation Team at OJJDP and GMU!

Other options

- View pilot CJP survey displaying data fields to be collected for each individual under your office's supervision on the census date.
- View Frequently Asked Questions page
- View Contacts for OJJDP and George Mason University.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

REGISTRATION FOR 2009 CJP SURVEY - PART I

Register for the CJP

About the CJP

FAQ

Contacts

Exit Survey

Register for the 2009 CJP

To take part in the survey and ensure the confidentiality of the process, you will need a User Name and Password. After you submit your registration, your User Name and Password will be entered into the study and will allow you to access the questionnaire to respond during the active period of the census. You will be able to modify your password and contact information until the actual recording of the census.

To learn more about the technical aspects of the survey and some of the substantive issues, click the tabs above.

Once you have registered for the survey, you can access your profile and more information about the study at <https://ojjdp.thelloydsociety.org/portal.php>.

If you encounter problems during registration, please e-mail the webmaster and include a brief description of your problem.

Contact Information

*First Name:	John
*Last Name:	Tester
*Organization:	Office of Probation Supervision
*Title:	Director

Contact Information

*First Name:	John
*Last Name:	Tester
*Organization:	Office of Probation Supervision
*Title:	Director
*Address:	1234 Main Street Suite 111
*City:	Test City
*State:	OHIO
*ZIP:	23232
*E-mail:	JTester@testtag0cy.com
*Phone:	(123) 5554455 Exl: 123

Your Security Settings

Please create a User Name and Password which you will use to access your respondent account.

User Name JTester999

Password

Re-type Password

Continue



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION

George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

REGISTRATION FOR 2009 CJP SURVEY - PART 2

- Registration Part 2
- About the CJP
- FAQ
- Contacts
- Exit Survey

Respondent: **John Tester**

1. Formal Supervision

Does this office provide OR oversee the provision of FORMAL court ordered juvenile probation supervision?

- YES (Please continue with registration.)
- NO (Please STOP and submit registration now.)

2. Participation in the 2007 Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO).

The CJPSO was administered in 2005 and 2007 by the U.S. Census Bureau for OJJDP. It collects information on processing and service options available through juvenile probation offices (see FAQ tab above for more information and results from these collections). This is a companion collection to the CJP. What best describes your experience with the CJPSO collection?

- I responded for my office
- Someone else responded for my office
- My office did not respond
- Don't know

Are you the appropriate person in your office to respond to this survey?

- YES
- NO. Please identify the appropriate person below.

3. Geographic Area Served By Your Office

Which best describes the geographic area served by this office and any offices that this office oversees?

Please select only one type and provide the name(s) of the area served, unless statewide.

NOTE: Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) treat a handful of cities as counties. These include Baltimore, MD; St. Louis, MO; Carson City, NV; and several cities in Virginia. For that reason, these cities can be considered "counties" for this survey and are included in county dropdown lists.

The entire state of OHIO

Most of the State of OHIO
(Please explain, e.g., "All of state except...")

Single County **Ashtabula**

Multiple Counties

All 15 counties
 14 counties
 13 counties
 12 counties
 11 counties
 10 counties
 9 counties
 8 counties
 7 counties
 6 counties
 5 counties
 4 counties
 3 counties
 2 counties
 1 county

Any additional counties served:

(Select up to 15; if your office covers more than 15 counties, please enter additional counties in text box provided. You may also enter an explanation such as "All counties in state except...")

If you cover most of a state, please select "Most of the State" above.

Municipality

Multiple municipalities (Explain)

Other type of area (Explain)

4. Survey Preferences

If you have a preference for method of taking the survey in April, please indicate:

- Online at CJP web site during 30-day window
- Excel spreadsheet provided by CJP for uploading to CJP web site
- Data file uploaded to CJP web site including field mapping
- Paper copy mailed to CJP
- No preference

Optional comments about survey method preference:

5. Assistance Options

Our goal is to make your participation in this survey as easy as possible. We are making a variety of help options available. Please indicate any you believe would be useful to you.

Note: Click here to view the data fields which will be collected for each individual under your office's supervision on the survey date.

- None
- Notification to your supervisor of the time required for participation
- Phone number for assistance in case of small difficulties
- In-state training presentation prior to collection
- Orientation for state and county responders at the February APPA Conference in Myrtle Beach
- Teleconference or web-based live training session

Comments or detail:

Comments or detail:

[Empty text box for comments or details]

6. Permission to Contact Offices for which Your Office will Provide Data

If you or your office is reporting data for other juvenile probation supervision offices, your participation qualifies probation professionals from those offices to access the products of this collection. With your permission, we'd like to contact and offer access to representatives from these offices. We will alert you to what contacts we've made. May we contact offices for which you will respond?

- Yes, you may contact offices
- No, please allow my office to contact these offices
- Not applicable

Comments:

[Empty text box for comments]

[Complete Registration](#)

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SUCCESSFUL REGISTRATION

Thank you, your registration for the CJP Census was successful.
To view or modify your profile, please [log in](#) using the User Name and Password you created during registration.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

REGISTRATION FOR 2009 CJP SURVEY - PART 2

Registration Part 2 | About the CJP | FAQ | Contacts | Exit Survey

About the 2009 CJP Survey

Thank you for participating in this landmark event – the first full administration of the Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP). Data from this collection will allow for the first national description of the characteristics of young people on probation.

Most importantly, your participation in this effort will allow you to make comparisons of your young people and services to similar probation offices around the country.

The CJP will be collecting data for all young people on probation supervision in your office (and any office overseen by your office) on **Wednesday, April 22, 2009**. We are collecting this information on this reference day because research has shown that it is less likely to have unusual shifts in population size and content.

Unlike the sister collection of data on probation supervision offices (The Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices), we are expecting that respondents will require additional assistance in preparing for the collection. Thus, we are preregistering respondents so that we may:

1. introduce you to the questionnaire,
 2. review the type of information that you will need to provide for each young person,
 3. assess what type of assistance you would like from us,
 4. alert you to events and training for this collection, and
 5. assist you in developing a professional network of probation professionals.
- **View the data fields on 2007 pilot census form. (PDF, Adobe Reader required to view)**

Registering for the 2009 CJP will allow you to access resources related to the collection, including results of a focus group of your colleagues about the importance of this collection. Registering does not obligate you to participate, and it may help you to determine who in your agency (if not you) is best positioned to provide the necessary information on young people on probation supervision.

Thanks very much for your time and energy.



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

REGISTRATION FOR 2009 CJP SURVEY - PART 2

Registration Part 2 | About the CJP | FAQ | Contacts | Exit Survey

Frequently Asked Questions

What data fields will be collected in the census?

The census will collect data for each individual under your office's supervision on the target census date, April 22, 2009. The fields are:

- An identification field, such as a number or a First Name/Last Initial combination that will allow YOU to reidentify each person 6 months from now, if a callback is needed.
- Individual's sex
- Individual's date of birth
- Individual's race
- Detail, if two or more races
- Individual's county and state or residence on April 22, 2009
- County and state where the individual committed the most serious offense for which he or she was adjudicated delinquent
- Most serious offense for which the individual was adjudicated delinquent
- The date on which the individual's current probation began
- Individual's probation status on April 22, 2009
- Explanation of probation status if needed
- View the data fields on 2007 pilot census form. (PDF, Adobe Reader required to view)

Will there be assistance available?

Yes. A variety of assistance options will be provided. During the registration process you will be asked to identify any that you think will be helpful to you. Currently these include:



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

REGISTRATION FOR 2009 CJP SURVEY - PART 2

- Registration Part 2
- About the CJP
- FAQ
- Contacts
- Exit Survey

Contacts

Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention

Janet Chiancone
Research Coordinator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Office of Policy Development
810 Seventh Street NW
Washington, DC 20531

Janet.Chiancone@usdoj.gov

(202) 353-9258

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/index.html

George Mason University

Catherine A. Gallagher, Ph.D.
Survey Design
cgallag4@gmu.edu

(703) 993-8460

Anne Douds, J.D.
Legal Issues and Definitions
adouds@gmu.edu

(703) 593-1115



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

REGISTRATION FOR 2009 CJP SURVEY - PART 2

- Registration Part 2
- About the CJP
- FAQ
- Contacts
- Exit Survey

Exit Survey

Do you wish to log out and exit the CJP survey?

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION

Screen Captures:

CJP Survey Respondent Online Portal



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LOGIN TO CJP SURVEY

Please enter the User Name and Password you created when you registered for the 2009 CJP Survey

User Name
Password

Log In

.if you have forgotten your password, click here.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

John Tester

You may update fields and save changes by clicking the "Update Record" button.

First Name:	John
Last Name:	Tester
Organization:	Office of Probation Supervision
Title:	Director
Address:	1234 Main Street Suite 111
City:	Test City
State:	OHIO
ZIP:	23232
eMail:	JTester@testagency.com
Phone:	(123) 5554455
Extension:	123
User Name:	JTester999
Current Password:	1234Asdf
New Password:	1234Asdf
Retype Password:	1234Asdf

Does this office provide OR oversee the provision of FORMAL court ordered juvenile probation supervision?

Municipality (please specify)

Multiple municipalities (please specify)

Other type of area (please explain)

Contact Permission:

- Yes, you may contact offices for which I am reporting
- No, please allow my office to contact these offices
- Not applicable

Comments

Survey Preferences:

- Online at CJP web site during 30-day window
- Data file uploaded to CJP web site including field mapping
- Excel spreadsheet provided by CJP for uploading to CJP web site
- Paper copy mailed to CJP
- No preference

Optional comments about survey method preferences

Assistance Options:

- None
- Notification to your supervisor of the time required for participation
- Phone number for assistance in case of difficulties
- In-state training presentation prior to collection
- Orientation for state and county responders at the February APPA Conference in Myrtle Beach
- Teleconference or web-based live training session

Comments or detail:

Does this office provide OR oversee the provision of FORMAL court ordered juvenile probation supervision?

- Yes
- No

Did you or your office respond to OJDIP's 2007 Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO)?

- I responded
- Someone else responded
- My office did not respond
- Don't know

Are you the appropriate person in your office to respond to the CJP survey?

- Yes
- No (If not, please identify the appropriate individual below.)

Geographic Area Served by Your Office:

- Entire state of OHIO
- Most of the state of OHIO (Please explain below)

- Single County (please specify)

Ashtabula

- Multiple Counties (please specify)

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

If more than 15 counties, please enter additional counties below:

Survey Preferences:

- Online at CJP web site during 30-day window
- Data file uploaded to CJP web site including field mapping
- Excel spreadsheet provided by CJP for uploading to CJP web site
- Paper copy mailed to CJP
- No preference

Optional comments about survey method preferences

Assistance Options:

- None
- Notification to your supervisor of the time required for participation
- Phone number for assistance in case of difficulties
- In-state training presentation prior to collection
- Orientation for state and county responders at the February APPA Conference in Myrtle Beach
- Teleconference or web-based live training session

Comments or detail:

Update record

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

The Survey module will not be activated until April 22, 2009.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

Offense codes tab will be activated with survey.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION

George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

Racial categories tab will be activated with survey.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster
OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

Frequently Asked Questions

What data fields will be collected in the census?

The census will collect data for each individual under your office's supervision on the target census date, April 22, 2009. The fields are:

- An identification field, such as a number or a First Name/Last Initial combination that will allow YOU to reidentify each person 6 months from now, if a callback is needed.
- Individual's sex
- Individual's date of birth
- Individual's race
- Detail, if two or more races
- Individual's county and state or residence on April 22, 2009
- County and state where the individual committed the most serious offense for which he or she was adjudicated delinquent
- Most serious offense for which the individual was adjudicated delinquent
- The date on which the individual's current probation began
- Individual's probation status on April 22, 2009
- Explanation of probation status if needed
- View the data fields on 2007 pilot census form. (PDF, Adobe Reader required to view)

Will there be assistance available?

Yes. A variety of assistance options will be provided. During the registration process you will be asked to identify any that you think will be helpful to you. Currently these include:



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

About the 2009 CJP Survey

Thank you for participating in this landmark event – the first full administration of the Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP). Data from this collection will allow for the first national description of the characteristics of young people on probation.

Most importantly, your participation in this effort will allow you to make comparisons of your young people and services to similar probation offices around the country.

The CJP will be collecting data for all young people on probation supervision in your office (and any office overseen by your office) on **Wednesday, April 22, 2009**. We are collecting this information on this reference day because research has shown that it is less likely to have unusual shifts in population size and content.

Unlike the sister collection of data on probation supervision offices (The Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices), we are expecting that respondents will require additional assistance in preparing for the collection. Thus, we are preregistering respondents so that we may:

1. introduce you to the questionnaire,
 2. review the type of information that you will need to provide for each young person,
 3. assess what type of assistance you would like from us,
 4. alert you to events and training for this collection, and
 5. assist you in developing a professional network of probation professionals.
- **View the data fields on 2007 pilot census form. (PDF, Adobe Reader required to view)**

Registering for the 2009 CJP will allow you to access resources related to the collection, including results of a focus group of your colleagues about the importance of this collection. Registering does not obligate you to participate, and it may help you to determine who in your agency (if not you) is best positioned to provide the necessary information on young people on probation supervision.

Thanks very much for your time and energy.



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION

George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE



CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

The Report Creation module is not currently activated. This feature will be available after the data collection for the 2009 CJP survey is complete.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION

George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CJP RESPONDENT PORTAL

- [View Profile](#)
- [Survey](#)
- [Offense Definitions](#)
- [Race Categories](#)
- [FAQ](#)
- [About the CJP](#)
- [Create Reports](#)
- [Exit CJP Site](#)

Exit Survey

Do you wish to log out and exit the CJP survey?

Yes, Log Me Out No, Return to Site

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION

George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LOG OUT

You have successfully logged out.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

**OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION**



OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



George Mason University
ACTING AS COLLECTING AGENT FOR
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Sorry, but you have attempted to access this page without authorization or the user name and password combination you entered is invalid.

If you feel you received this message in error, please try again.

Note that user name and password fields are case-sensitive and may contain only letters or numbers, no spaces or punctuation.

[Register for CJP Survey](#)

[Access Your CJP Survey](#)

If you have already registered for the 2009 CJP survey and have forgotten your password, click here.

If you continue to encounter problems, please contact the webmaster.

If you encounter technical problems with this survey, please contact the webmaster

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

CENSUS OF JUVENILES ON PROBATION



Forgot Password

Enter your email address and your password will be sent to you.

Email:



Update Successful

https://ojjdp.thelelloidsociety.org/emailpw_success.html



Your password has been emailed to you at the address you entered.

To log in to your account with the correct user/password combination, [click here](#).

Email Password Failed

https://ojdp.theloydsociety.org/emailpw_fail.php

Q Google



Forgot Password

Sorry, the email address you entered does not match any record. Please try again.

If you continue to have problems, please [contact the webmaster](#) for assistance.

Email:

Attachment C.

OJP Confidentiality Legislation 42 U.S.C. 3789(g) and

OJP Privacy Regulations (28 CFR Part 22)

**TITLE 42 - THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE
CHAPTER 46 - JUSTICE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT
SUBCHAPTER VIII - ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS**

42 U.S.C. 3789g **Confidentiality of information**

**(a) Research or statistical information; immunity from process;
prohibition against admission as evidence or use in any proceedings**

Except as provided by Federal law other than this chapter, no officer or employee of the Federal Government, and no recipient of assistance under the provisions of this chapter, shall use or reveal any research or statistical information furnished under this chapter by any person and identifiable to any specific private person for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was obtained in accordance with this chapter. Such information and copies thereof shall be immune from legal process, and shall not, without the consent of the person furnishing such information, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial, legislative, or administrative proceedings.

**(b) Criminal history information; disposition and arrest data;
procedures for collection, storage, dissemination, and current status; security
and privacy; availability for law enforcement, criminal justice, and other lawful
purposes; automated systems: review, challenge, and correction of information**

All criminal history information collected, stored, or disseminated through support under this chapter shall contain, to the maximum extent feasible, disposition as well as arrest data where arrest data is included therein. The collection, storage, and dissemination of such information shall take place under procedures reasonably designed to insure that all such information is kept current therein; the Office of Justice Programs shall assure that the security and privacy of all information is adequately provided for and that information shall only be used for law enforcement and criminal justice and other lawful purposes. In addition, an individual who believes that criminal history information concerning him contained in an automated system is inaccurate, incomplete, or maintained in violation of this chapter, shall, upon satisfactory verification of his identity, be entitled to review such information and to obtain a copy of it for the purpose of challenge or correction.

(c) Criminal intelligence systems and information; prohibition against violation of privacy and constitutional rights of individuals

All criminal intelligence systems operating through support under this chapter shall collect, maintain, and disseminate criminal intelligence information in conformance with policy standards which are prescribed by the Office of Justice Programs and which are written to assure that the funding and operation of these systems furthers the purpose of this chapter and to assure that such systems are not utilized in violation of the privacy and constitutional rights of individuals.

(d) Violations; fine as additional penalty

Any person violating the provisions of this section, or of any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, shall be fined not to exceed \$10,000, in addition to any other penalty imposed by law.

(Pub. L. 90-351, title I, Sec. 812, formerly Sec. 818, as added Pub. L. 96-157, Sec. 2, Dec. 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 1213; renumbered Sec. 812 and amended Pub. L. 98-473, title II, Sec. 609B(f), (k), Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 2093, 2096.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 812 of Pub. L. 90-351 was classified to section 3789a of this title prior to repeal by section 609B(e) of Pub. L. 98-473.

AMENDMENTS

1984 - Subsecs. (b), (c). Pub. L. 98-473, 609B(k), substituted "Office of Justice Programs" for "Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics".

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1984 AMENDMENT

Amendment by section 609B(k) of Pub. L. 98-473 effective Oct. 12, 1984, see section 609AA(a) of Pub. L. 98-473, set out as an Effective Date note under section 3711 of this title.

From: http://www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/waisidx_04/28cfr22_04.html

TITLE 28--JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION

CHAPTER I--DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PART 22_CONFIDENTIALITY OF IDENTIFIABLE RESEARCH AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION--Table of Contents

Sec.

22.1 Purpose.

22.2 Definitions.

22.20 Applicability.

22.21 Use of identifiable data.

22.22 Revelation of identifiable data.

22.23 Privacy certification.

22.24 Information transfer agreement.

22.25 Final disposition of identifiable materials.

22.26 Requests for transfer of information.

22.27 Notification.

22.28 Use of data identifiable to a private person for judicial, legislative or administrative purposes.

22.29 Sanctions.

Authority: Secs. 801(a), 812(a), Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3701, et seq., as amended (Pub. L. 90-351, as amended by Pub. L. 93-83, Pub. L. 93-415, Pub. L. 94-430, Pub. L. 94-503, Pub. L. 95-115, Pub. L. 96-157, and Pub. L. 98-473); secs. 262(b), 262(d), Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, 42 U.S.C. 5601, et seq., as amended (Pub. L. 93-415, as amended by Pub. L. 94-503, Pub. L. 95-115, Pub. L. 99-509, and Pub. L. 98-473); and secs. 1407(a) and 1407(d) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, 42 U.S.C. 10601, et seq., Pub. L. 98-473; Pub. L. 101-410, 104 Stat. 890, as amended by Pub. L. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321.

Source: 41 FR 54846, Dec. 15, 1976, unless otherwise noted.

22.1 Purpose

The purpose of these regulations is to:

(a) Protect privacy of individuals by requiring that information identifiable to a private person obtained in a research or statistical program may only be used and/or revealed for the purpose for which obtained;

(b) Insure that copies of such information shall not, without the consent of the person to whom the information pertains, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any judicial or administrative proceedings;

(c) Increase the credibility and reliability of federally-supported research and statistical findings by minimizing subject concern over subsequent uses of identifiable information;

(d) Provide needed guidance to persons engaged in research and statistical activities by clarifying the purposes for which identifiable information may be used or revealed; and

(e) Insure appropriate balance between individual privacy and essential needs of the research community for data to advance the state of knowledge in the area of criminal justice.

(f) Insure the confidentiality of information provided by crime

victims to crisis intervention counselors working for victim services programs receiving funds provided under the Crime Control Act, and Juvenile Justice Act, and the Victims of Crime Act.

[41 FR 54846, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 51 FR 6400, Feb. 24, 1986]

Sec. 22.2 Definitions.

(a) Person means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, public or private organization or governmental entity, or combination thereof.

(b) Private person means any person defined in Sec. 22.2(a) other than an agency, or department of Federal, State, or local government, or any component or combination thereof. Included as a private person is an individual acting in his or her official capacity.

(c) Research or statistical project means any program, project, or component thereof which is supported in whole or in part with funds appropriated under the Act and whose purpose is to develop, measure, evaluate, or otherwise advance the state of knowledge in a particular area. The term does not include "intelligence" or other information-gathering activities in which information pertaining to specific individuals is obtained for purposes directly related to enforcement of the criminal laws.

(d) Research or statistical information means any information which is collected during the conduct of a research or statistical project and which is intended to be utilized for research or statistical purposes. The term includes information which is collected directly from the individual or obtained from any agency or individual having possession, knowledge, or control thereof.

(e) Information identifiable to a private person means information which either--

(1) Is labelled by name or other personal identifiers, or

(2) Can, by virtue of sample size or other factors, be reasonably interpreted as referring to a particular private person.

(f) Recipient of assistance means any recipient of a grant, contract, interagency agreement, subgrant, or subcontract under the Act and any person, including subcontractors, employed by such recipient in connection with performances of the grant, contract, or interagency agreement.

(g) Officer or employee of the Federal Government means any person employed as a regular or special employee of the U.S. (including experts, consultants, and advisory board members) as of July 1, 1973, or at any time thereafter.

(h) The act means the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

(i) Applicant means any person who applies for a grant, contract, or subgrant to be funded pursuant to the Act.

(j) The Juvenile Justice Act means the "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended."

(k) The Victims of Crime Act means the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.

[41 FR 54846, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 43 FR 16974, Apr. 21, 1978; 51 FR 6400, Feb. 24, 1986]

Sec. 22.20 Applicability.

(a) These regulations govern use and revelation of research and statistical information obtained, collected, or produced either directly by BJA, OJJDP, BJS, NIJ, or OJP or under any interagency agreement, grant, contract, or subgrant awarded under the Crime Control Act, the Juvenile Justice Act, and the Victims of Crime Act.

(b) The regulations do not apply to any records from which identifiable research or statistical information was originally obtained; or to any records which are designated under existing statutes as public; or to any information extracted from any records designated as public.

(c) The regulations do not apply to information gained regarding future criminal conduct.

[41 FR 54846, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 43 FR 16974, Apr. 21, 1978; 51 FR 6400, 6401, Feb. 24, 1986]

Sec. 22.21 Use of identifiable data.

Research or statistical information identifiable to a private person may be used only for research or statistical purposes.

Sec. 22.22 Revelation of identifiable data.

(a) Except as noted in paragraph (b) of this section, research and statistical information relating to a private person may be revealed in identifiable form on a need-to-know basis only to--

(1) Officers, employees, and subcontractors of the recipient of assistance;

(2) Such individuals as needed to implement sections 202(c)(3), 801, and 811(b) of the Act; and sections 223(a)(12)(A), 223(a)(13), 223(a)(14), and 243 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

(3) Persons or organizations for research or statistical purposes. Information may only be transferred for such purposes upon a clear demonstration that the standards of Sec. 22.26 have been met and that, except where information is transferred under paragraphs (a) (1) and (2) of this section, such transfers shall be conditioned on compliance with a Sec. 22.24 agreement.

(b) Information may be revealed in identifiable form where prior consent is obtained from an individual or where the individual has agreed to participate in a project with knowledge that the findings cannot, by virtue of sample size, or uniqueness of subject, be expected to totally conceal subject identity.

[41 FR 54846, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 51 FR 6400, Feb. 24, 1986]

Sec. 22.23 Privacy certification.

(a) Each applicant for BJA, OJJDP, BJS, NIJ, or OJP support either directly or under a State plan shall submit a Privacy Certificate as a condition of approval of a grant application or contract proposal which has a research or statistical project component under which information identifiable to a private person will be collected.

(b) The Privacy Certificate shall briefly describe the project and shall contain assurance by the applicant that:

(1) Data identifiable to a private person will not be used or revealed, except as authorized under Sec. Sec. 22.21, 22.22.

(2) Access to data will be limited to those employees having a need therefore and that such persons shall be advised of and agree in writing to comply with these regulations.

(3) All subcontracts which require access to identifiable data will

contain conditions meeting the requirements of Sec. 22.24.

(4) To the extent required by Sec. 22.27 any private persons from whom identifiable data are collected or obtained, either orally or by means of written questionnaire, shall be advised that the data will only be used or revealed for research or statistical purposes and that compliance with requests for information is not mandatory. Where the notification requirement is to be waived, pursuant to Sec. 22.27(c), a justification must be included in the Privacy Certificate.

(5) Adequate precautions will be taken to insure administrative and physical security of identifiable data.

(6) A log will be maintained indicating that identifiable data have been transmitted to persons other than BJA, OJJDP, BJS, NIJ, or OJP or grantee/contractor staff or subcontractors, that such data have been returned, or that alternative arrangements have been agreed upon for future maintenance of such data.

(7) Project plans will be designed to preserve anonymity of private persons to whom information relates, including, where appropriate, name-stripping, coding of data, or other similar procedures.

(8) Project findings and reports prepared for dissemination will not contain information which can reasonably be expected to be identifiable to a private person except as authorized under Sec. 22.22.

(c) The applicant shall attach to the Privacy Certification a description of physical and/or administrative procedures to be followed to insure the security of the data to meet the requirements of Sec. 22.25.

[41 FR 5486, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 51 FR 6401, Feb. 24, 1986]

Sec. 22.24 Information transfer agreement.

Prior to the transfer of any identifiable information to persons other than BJA, OJJDP, BJS, NIJ, or OJP or project staff, an agreement shall be entered into which shall provide, as a minimum, that the recipient of data agrees that:

(a) Information identifiable to a private person will be used only for research and statistical purposes.

(b) Information identifiable to a private person will not be revealed to any person for any purpose except where the information has already been included in research findings (and/or data bases) and is revealed on a need-to-know basis for research or statistical purposes, provided that such transfer is approved by the person providing information under the agreement, or authorized under Sec. 22.24(e).

(c) Knowingly and willfully using or disseminating information contrary to the provisions of the agreement shall constitute a violation of these regulations, punishable in accordance with the Act.

(d) Adequate administrative and physical precautions will be taken to assure security of information obtained for such purpose.

(e) Access to information will be limited to those employees or subcontractors having a need therefore in connection with performance of the activity for which obtained, and that such persons shall be advised of, and agree to comply with, these regulations.

(f) Project plans will be designed to preserve anonymity of private persons to whom information relates, including, where appropriate, required name-stripping and/or coding of data or other similar procedures.

(g) Project findings and reports prepared for dissemination will not contain information which can reasonably be expected to be identifiable to a private person.

(h) Information identifiable to a private person (obtained in accordance with this agreement) will, unless otherwise agreed upon, be returned upon completion of the project for which obtained and no copies of that information retained.

[41 FR 5486, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 51 FR 6401, Feb. 24, 1986]

Sec. 22.25 Final disposition of identifiable materials.

Upon completion of a research or statistical project the security of identifiable research or statistical information shall be protected by:

(a) Complete physical destruction of all copies of the materials or the identifiable portion of such materials after a three-year required recipient retention period or as soon as authorized by law, or

(b) Removal of identifiers from data and separate maintenance of a name-code index in a secure location.

The Privacy Certificate shall indicate the procedures to be followed and shall, in the case of paragraph (b) of this section, describe procedures to secure the name index.

Sec. 22.26 Requests for transfer of information.

(a) Requests for transfer of information identifiable to an individual shall be submitted to the person submitting the Privacy Certificate pursuant to Sec. 22.23.

(b) Except where information is requested by BJA, OJJDP, BJS, NIJ, or OJP, the request shall describe the general objectives of the project for which information is requested, and specifically justify the need for such information in identifiable form. The request shall also indicate, and provide justification for the conclusion that conduct of the project will not, either directly or indirectly, cause legal, economic, physical, or social harm to individuals whose identification is revealed in the transfer of information.

(c) Data may not be transferred pursuant to this section where a clear showing of the criteria set forth above is not made by the person requesting the data.

[41 FR 5486, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 51 FR 6401, Feb. 24, 1986]

Sec. 22.27 Notification.

(a) Any person from whom information identifiable to a private person is to be obtained directly, either orally, by questionnaire, or other written documents, shall be advised:

(1) That the information will only be used or revealed for research or statistical purposes; and

(2) That compliance with the request for information is entirely voluntary and may be terminated at any time.

(b) Except as noted in paragraph (c) of this section, where information is to be obtained through observation of individual activity or performance, such individuals shall be advised:

(1) Of the particular types of information to be collected;

(2) That the data will only be utilized or revealed for research or

statistical purposes; and

(3) That participation in the project in question is voluntary and may be terminated at any time.

(c) Notification, as described in paragraph (b) of this section, may be eliminated where information is obtained through field observation of individual activity or performance and in the judgment of the researcher such notification is impractical or may seriously impede the progress of the research.

(d) Where findings in a project cannot, by virtue of sample size, or uniqueness of subject, be expected to totally conceal subject identity, an individual shall be so advised.

Sec. 22.28 Use of data identifiable to a private person for judicial, legislative or administrative purposes.

(a) Research or statistical information identifiable to a private person shall be immune from legal process and shall only be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial, legislative or administrative proceeding with the written consent of the individual to whom the data pertains.

(b) Where consent is obtained, such consent shall:

(1) Be obtained at the time that information is sought for use in judicial, legislative or administrative proceedings;

(2) Set out specific purposes in connection with which information will be used;

(3) Limit, where appropriate, the scope of the information subject to such consent.

[41 FR 54846, Dec. 15, 1976, as amended at 45 FR 62038, Sept. 18, 1980]

Sec. 22.29 Sanctions.

Where BJA, OJJDP, BJS, NIJ, or OJP believes that a violation of section 812(a) of the Act or section 1407(d) of the Victims of Crime Act, these regulations, or any grant or contract conditions entered into thereunder has occurred, it may initiate administrative actions leading to termination of a grant or contract, commence appropriate personnel and/or other procedures in cases involving Federal employees, and/or initiate appropriate legal actions leading to imposition of a civil penalty not to exceed \$10,000 for a violation occurring before September 29, 1999, and not to exceed \$11,000 for a violation occurring on or after September 29, 1999 against any person responsible for such violations.

[Order No. 2249-99, 64 FR 47102, Aug. 30, 1999]

Attachment D.
Advisors to OJJDP Corrections and Probation Data Collections

Attachment D: Advisors to the Collections

Kim Godfrey
Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators

Paige Harrison
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Ramona Rantala
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Catherine A. Gallagher
Justice, Law and Crime Policy Program
George Mason University

Christopher Maxwell
Director
National Archive of Criminal Justice Data
University of Michigan

Kaye Marz
Project Leader
National Archive of Criminal Justice Data
Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research

Chaz Puzzanchera
Senior Research Associate
National Center for Juvenile Justice

Melissa Sickmund
Chief of Systems Research
National Center for Juvenile Justice

Ron Wilson
Manager
National Institute of Justice's Mapping and
Analysis for Public Safety Program and Data Resources

Brad Snyder
President
New Amsterdam Consulting

Peter M. Brien
Attorney Advisor
Office of the General Counsel
Office of Justice Programs

Elissa Rumsey
Compliance Monitoring Coordinator
OJJDP

Janet Chiancone
Research Coordinator
OJJDP

JoAnne McFarland O'Rourke
Director
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive

Adrienne Oneto
Assistant Division Chief for Special Statistics
U.S. Census Bureau

Charlene M. Sebold, Chief
Criminal Justice Statistics Branch
U.S. Census Bureau

Steve Simoncini
Supervisory Survey Statistician
U.S. Census Bureau

Andrea Sedlak
Westat

John Foster- Bey
Director of the Policy & Program Evaluation Research Division
CSR, Incorporated

Monica Robbers
Senior Research Associate
CSR, Incorporated

Barbara Allen-Hagen
Research Consultant
CSR, Incorporated

Jacintha Henry
Research Assistant
CSR, Incorporated

Mary Beth Leonard
Research Assistant
CSR, Incorporated

Ashley Hayward
Research Assistant
CSR, Incorporated

E. Compilation of Summary Data sent to CJPSO 2005 Respondents

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 22, 2006

From: Catherine A Gallagher, PhD
Justice, Law and Crime Policy Program
George Mason University
cgallag4@gmu.edu

To: Juvenile Probation Directors, Administrators, and Officers

Via: U.S. Bureau of the Census and the Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

Subject: PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM THE CENSUS OF JUVENILE
PROBATION SUPERVISION OFFICES, 2005

As you prepare to respond to this year's census, we thought it timely to provide you with examples of the importance your participation has on describing the work done by juvenile probation offices across the country. The first administration of the Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO) occurred in April, 2005. Eighty-eight percent of all pre-identified juvenile probation supervision offices (JPSOs) provided responses to the census. Thank you to all respondents for your hard work. In addition to the brief preliminary description of juvenile probation supervision offices included in this memo, we are preparing in-depth analyses of the CJPSO results and will alert you as they are disseminated.

As seen in Table 1, on the April 20, 2005 reference day, there were 392,651 young people on formal, court-ordered juvenile probation in responding offices. An additional 96,264 young people were supervised separately on informal, non-court-ordered probation. In all, JPSOs served nearly a half-million young people on the reference day. This is about five times the number of young people served daily in the juvenile justice residential facility system. Most JPSOs serve single counties (72.1%), though there are many other types of geographic areas served.

Table 1. Respondent status, caseload counts and type of area served

Respondent completion status	Non-respondent	187 (11.6)
	Critical item respondent (provided limited data)	270 (16.8)
	Full respondent	1,149 (71.5)
	Total	1,606 (100.0)
Caseload counts	Formal probation (1408 offices provided caseload count)	Minimum 1 Maximum 20,026 Mean 279
		Total 392,651
	Informal probation (1127 offices reported using informal probation, 1082 offices provided caseload count)	Minimum 1 Maximum 3,000 Mean 89
		Total 96,264
Type of area served by juvenile probation supervision office	Single municipality	18 (1.3)
	Single county	1,021(72.1)
	Multiple county	337 (23.8)
	Other type of area Multiple municipalities/towns	31 (2.2) 9 (.6)

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 (see Table 2). 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.

Table 3 provides an overview of the types of monitoring, sanctioning and treatment options offered by JPSOs by the type of probation supervision service. 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. A large proportion of all JPSOs have most of the treatment options listed in the questionnaire available, very few of them report that these options are required for their probations. This in all likelihood reflects the practice of tailoring probation plans to the individual young person's needs.

Table 2. Processing options available to juvenile probation supervision offices by type of offense and prior history (n=1151)

Processing options	Offense		Possession of recreational marijuana		Auto theft	
	No offense history	On formal probation	No offense history	On formal probation	No offense history	On formal probation
Out-of-home detention	44.1	76.5	47.3	73.4	74.1	87.0
Non-court options	92.2 (n=1060)	58.5 (n=673)	85.9 (n=987)	48.4 (n=556)	70.3 (n=808)	32.9 (n=378)
<i>Diversion</i>	89.0	67.8	88.6	70.9	82.8	72.2
<i>Informal probation</i>	74.8	35.8	77.2	38.5	75.9	43.7
Court-ordered options	83.1 (n=956)	99.0 (n=1138)	91.5 (n=1051)	98.8 (n=1135)	98.2 (n=1128)	99.7 (n=1145)
<i>Formal probation</i>	95.5	-	96.0	--	99.0	--
<i>ISP</i>	21.9	49.9	23.0	52.1	32.3	57.5
<i>Transfer to adult</i>	9.6	9.8	6.3	8.6	11.0	17.1
<i>Seek new charges</i>	-	93.1	-	96.4	--	98.7

Table 3. Monitoring, sanctioning and treatment options provided by juvenile probation supervision offices by type of supervision

Type of probation supervision	Formal Probation (n=1149)		Informal Probation (n=892)		Intensive Supervision Probation (n=720)	
	Percent available but NOT required	Percent REQUIRED for all juveniles	Percent available but NOT required	Percent REQUIRED for all juveniles	Percent available but NOT required	Percent REQUIRED for all juveniles
Monitoring options						
Phone contacts	52.5	46.9	64.2	32.1	26.5	72.8
Home visits	37.1	61.7	63.7	28.3	11.8	87.8
In-office contacts	24.8	75.2	37.4	60.2	19.2	80.6
In-school contacts	45.1	54.4	64.2	31.8	24.7	74.9
Sanctioning options						
Community service	74.2	23.8	74.2	20.7	62.6	36.0
Financial restitution	76.6	22.8	74.9	19.4	72.1	26.9
Out-of-home placement	90.9	3.1	28.4	0.4	86.9	4.6
Scared straight	30.6	1.0	28.9	0.8	35.3	1.9
Restorative justice	51.9	14.3	48.1	12.6	50.6	17.4
Home confinement	88.2	3.0	60.9	1.1	84.2	8.9
Electronic Monitoring	79.4	2.1	36.9	0.8	71.5	10.8
Drug testing	67.7	32.1	74.1	18.0	54.2	45.4
Treatment options						
Anger management	91.7	2.0	89.1	2.2	91.3	3.6
Group substance abuse	94.6	1.4	92.0	2.0	93.6	2.9
Individual substance abuse	97.1	1.7	94.8	1.2	95.6	3.1
Out-patient group mental health	88.9	1.7	85.2	1.1	88.3	3.6
Out-patient individual therapy	97.0	1.8	94.2	1.2	94.6	4.0
Out-patient family therapy	96.4	1.7	93.4	0.8	93.6	3.3
Tutoring	78.9	1.3	75.0	0.9	81.4	2.1
Alternative education	86.9	2.7	79.7	1.9	83.9	3.8
In-patient treatment	91.4	1.3	48.1	0.6	90.0	0.8
Financial assistance	48.7	0.8	40.5	1.1	51.7	1.3
Parenting programs	81.9	3.9	78.0	1.8	82.4	5.7

Many JPSOs partner with schools and law enforcement agencies (see Table 4). 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).

Table 4. Partnerships with other governmental agencies

Does this probation office have at least one juvenile probation officer who...		
...provides services to juveniles within a school for four hours or more per week?	Yes	39.1%
	No	60.9
...provides services to juveniles within a law enforcement office?	Yes	11.7
	No	88.3
...rides along with police on patrol at least once a week?	Yes	15.1
	No	84.9

As noted above, we will be preparing additional descriptive reports and more in-depth analyses of the data you provided in last year's CJPSO. Your responses to these questionnaires are vital to efforts to describe the work of JPSOs across the country, and will provide the foundation for discussing JPSO policy and practice. Thank you for your hard work and participation.

F. CJP Focus Group Report Prepared by GMU

Report: CJP Focus Group August 2-3, 2008

Prepared by George Mason University

In 2005, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) officially launched an ambitious data collection on the largest segment of the juvenile justice population: children on probation supervision. This effort consists of two censuses that are expected to be distributed in alternating years: the Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP), which was piloted in 2006 and is scheduled for full universe distribution in April 2009, and the Census of Juvenile Probation Services Offices (CJPSO), which premiered in 2005. The CJP seeks to collect individual-level data on all young people on probation supervision, and the CJPSO is an office-level collection that gathers information on disposition options and sanctioning, treatment, and supervision services. All efforts referenced in this report are covered by and consistent with the Institutional Review Board (IRB) standards for the protection of human subjects in research endeavors.

The first-ever test run of the CJP in 2006, which was administered to a nationally representative statistical sample of about 180 offices, resulted in a disappointing response rate of 62%. This is in stark contrast to the 92% response rate for the CJPSO. These initial response data became available in late 2007, at which point OJJDP began investigating causes to explain the differences between the response rates.. After determining that there were no problems inherent in the form or the substance of the questions being asked in the CJP, OJJDP convened a CJP Workgroup, consisting of representatives from OJJDP, the United States Census Bureau, CSR, Inc., and a team of researchers from George Mason University (GMU). The Workgroup realized that there were problems in the manner in which respondents perceive the CJP, but the nature and tenor of those perceptions was not known. Therefore, in mid-March 2008, OJJDP withdrew the CJP package from the Office of Management and Budget and undertook to remedy these perception problems.

The Workgroup convened focus groups: meetings of CJP respondents randomly selected from a sample sorted for office size and for respondent type (CJP responder, CJP non-responder, and respondents not selected into the CJP sample) in order to ensure respondent diversity. In an attempt to maximize respondent participation, these focus groups were held August 2-3, 2008, immediately prior to the American Parole and Probation Association's (APPA) Annual Training Institute in Las Vegas.

Despite of the short time between determining that more information was required, with the assistance of probation officials, and the date of the APPA conference participants were quickly recruited. Researchers used phone calls and emails to recruit focus group participants. Initially, participants were identified through participation in previous censuses (CJP and CJPSO). The groups were divided into CJP responders, CJP nonresponders, and the remaining universe of CJPSO respondents who were not drawn into the initial sample. Recruitment was time-consuming primarily because much of the contact information on file was dated and inaccurate especially for the non-responder information. However, once the recruiters were able to make contact with the responders, most were very receptive to participation or other forms of assistance with the CJP project. The recruitment process identified the need to confirm that the current contact file is as up-to-date as possible.

It is fair to characterize the overall reception to the phone recruitment process as positive. The respondents in the phone call efforts (at least those with whom contact was made) were eager to provide constructive feedback and assistance. A number of those who were contacted were unable to participate because they needed more notice in order to arrange leave and obtain funding for travel. Universally, all were interested in some other outlet to provide guidance and to get more information. Those who could not attend asked whether another meeting could be held during the next APPA meeting and whether web-based meetings might be scheduled.

The focus groups were held on Saturday and Sunday in the hotel that was hosting the APPA conference. The participants appreciated this scheduling effort to accommodate their schedules. Each session began with a brief introduction and was conducted using a protocol based on themes identified by the CJP Workgroup. The final focus group protocol consisted of 24 slides containing “think aloud” questions (see Appendix A). As is evident from the slides, the major themes explored included: Perceptions of the need for the individual-level data collection and the utility of the data for respondents; technical issues with storing and reporting the data; organizational issues such as workload for data reporters; and experiences with other data requests from external sources. A facilitator, who sat at the front of the room, led each meeting, and researchers sat with respondents encouraging elaboration. All participants were advised of the purpose of the focus groups. All participants confirmed that they were voluntarily participating in the focus groups and signed consent forms indicating that they were willing to be audio and videotaped. Each session lasted about two hours. The following summary of the sessions is grouped by subject consistent with the protocol.

Description of Participants

The focus groups consisted of fifteen participants from twelve states representing between one-tenth and one-fifth of all juvenile probation records in the country. One group of three and one group of four met on Saturday, August 2nd, and two groups of four met on Sunday, August 3rd. Participants represented a wide range of probation offices: counties or states with a wide range of communities; entirely urban counties; entirely rural counties; dairy farms surrounding a large city; socioeconomically and racially diverse populations; and homogenous populations. Some jurisdictions that were represented held records for an entire, large state while others spoke for a sparsely

populated county. The participants' years of professional experience ranged from a few years to over 20, representing nearly 200 years of collective professional experience

Focus Group Participant Population Counts and Responder Status

Location Represented	Count Self Estimated	Respondent Status			State Pop Count CJPSO*		Records held at State, Local, Mixed Level
		2005	2006	2007	Formal	Informal	
Anderson, TX	100	R	S, PR	R	17879	7,555	Local
Austin, MN	200	R		NR	13493	1,355	Mixed (86 out of 87 counties state level)
Austin, TX	800	NR	S, NR	NR	17879	7,555	Local
Cincinnati, OH	800	R		R	22,023	2,313	Local
Decatur, GA	7,000	R	S, NR	R	9,468	2,555	Mixed (84% at state level)
Denver, CO	8,500	NR	S, PR	R	6,050	160	State
Los Angeles, CA	22,000	NR	NR	NR	68,028	12,786	Local
Oklahoma	7,000	R		PR	2,562	821	State
North Carolina	7,200	R	S, R	R	7,298	1,540	State
Utah	2,700	R		PR	1,862	71	State
St. Anthony, ID	90	NR	S, R	R	12,521	6,511	Mixed
St. Cloud, MN	350	R		R	13,493	1,355	Mixed (86 out of 87 counties state level)
St. Paul, MN	1,400	R	S, R	NR	13,493	13,55	Mixed (86 out of 87 counties state level)
TOTAL COUNT	58,140				206049	45932	

Note:

NR – non-respondent

PR – Partial respondent

R – Respondent

S – Selected

Focus Group Introductions

The focus group was convened with a very brief introduction on the purpose of the meeting (to solicit respondent feedback on how to make the CJP a success), and an introduction of the research participants.

Respondents' Professional Attitudes

To get a sense of the respondents' general attitudes, the facilitator began each session by asking participants to describe their greatest professional challenges and successes. Record sharing and inter-office collaboration were frequently mentioned as one of the greatest professional challenges. Specifically, participants expressed institutional based confusion and concern about when to share data, with whom, and under what conditions. For example, problems arose when another county agency would not share reports on a juvenile under the probation office's care. Participants cited mental health services agencies as a type of agency that was resistant to record sharing, even if the probation office was the agency requesting services for the juvenile. Agencies that objected to sharing records often referenced HIPAA, regardless of its applicability. In other cases, a large geographical area, combined with the low number of probation officers, presented transportation problems.

One of the groups, consisting primarily of state-level officials, noted frustration with the lack of national leadership in setting probation guidelines, and more specifically, some very basic measures of quality and performance. It was noted that given the variation across probation jurisdictions, indicators were difficult to establish, however, these respondents were keen to see some development occur in this area and identified OJJDP as a potential leader (more discussion on this topic follows below). Creating coherent and systematic programming was difficult for several offices. A few respondents noted that irrational politics frequently intruded on their ability to offer services systematically. For example, one very large county agency represented in these meetings noted that a council would dictate service provision based on newsworthy events, thus taking resources away from data-driven need areas and emphasizing responses to rare events that were not necessarily real problems. Also noted was some difficulty in getting evidence-based programs and validated risk/need tools fully operational in the current organizational structure. Finally, four offices noted

challenges with serving growing immigrant populations, not just in language and in culture but on the types of services required. The largest office represented was extremely concerned with federal oversight on issues surrounding disproportionate minority contact (DMC).

Participants' self-reported successes mostly related to improved services for the juveniles. Participants were pleased to have risk assessment methods linking the needs of the individuals to available services. Others were very pleased with recent technological developments in their jurisdictions that allow them to maintain records in a useful, assessable manner. Some of the participants who worked at the state level reported that their collaborations with state universities and other researchers had been rewarding. On a more basic level, some participants said that their greatest success was simply completing all of the paperwork in their in boxes.

Role of OJJDP - Data Collections and More

In order to consider the possibility that the initially low response rate for the 2006 trial run of the CJP was due to an unfavorable impression of OJJDP, participants were asked about their impression of OJJDP. Generally OJJDP was recognized as a source of funding and resources with a positive influence on their day-to-day activities. Resources, training, grants, technology, and consultants were associated with OJJDP. In addition, as a federal agency OJJDP was valued for its leadership in identifying "blue print" programs, such as gender specific programs, providing comparison data, offering publications, and identifying best practices. By providing federal level standards while actively seeking out useful programs rather than funding pet projects, OJJDP was regarded as a valuable resource for state and county agencies across the United States. Participants reported using and valuing OJJDP's online resources.

As mentioned earlier, it was suggested that OJJDP could take a much needed leadership role in the standardization of various aspects of juvenile probation and the

standardization of professional terminology. For instance, in some states “completion” might be defined as aging out of the system, while other states would consider “completion” the end of a program. Or “intake” might mean anything from the first face-to-face meeting with police officers to the first official court ruling. Several participants thought local agencies would be able to benefit by having a national standard for probation caseload. Given that some juveniles require more personal interaction than others, which cannot necessarily be anticipated based on the underlying offense; risk assessment would be a cornerstone to this caseload standard. Some focus group members suggested linking these standards to reporting and compliance requirements. To that end, they suggest that OJJDP work with other national institutions such as APPA and NCJFCJ in order to develop and implement such standardization.

Other Data Requests

Participants expressed frustration with the number of data collection requests received from various people and groups such as reporters, legislators, educational institutions, and OJJDP. Frequently participants were asked to complete short online attitudinal surveys often administered through ‘survey monkey’ by local or state researchers, vendors, or students completing thesis or dissertation research. At other times participants were asked for much more detail, particularly when the requests were made by legislators.

It is telling that the phrase “feeding the black hole” was used in three of the four focus groups to describe the providing of data in one direction with no useful information or report in return. This naturally contributed to a sense of dissatisfaction with data demands. Assuming that the CJP is not another example of “feeding the black hole,” participants agreed that the inconveniences associated with responding to the CJP were acceptable given that expected benefits were laid out clearly in the

request. Participants were particularly interested in electronic data resources. **This, in a nut shell, is the single most important change that must be made for the next round of the CJP: It must be clear to respondents that they will get to use these data to answer questions that are important to them.** This is discussed in some detail in the recommendations section.

Data and Record Keeping

The participants reported that their jurisdictions maintain juvenile probation records in a variety of methods falling into three general categories: (1) state-level maintenance; (2) mixed-level maintenance; and (3) local-level maintenance. In approximately one-third of the represented jurisdictions all of the juvenile probation records were maintained at the state level by a centralized office and data manager. Several participants reported that most of the probation records are held at the state-level, but acknowledge that some local-level offices do not participate in the state-level file maintenance program. Therefore, these states should be characterized as “mixed;” having both state and local level files. Finally, records in some states were entirely kept in local offices. All jurisdictions reported that they use both electronic and paper means to produce and maintain their juvenile probation files.

Participants reported using electronic file management systems that were primarily developed at the state level. Participants explained that representatives of various state and local agencies developed the required data fields for these programs through consensus. For example, judicial, law enforcement, technical, human services and medical representatives might collectively decide which fields needed to be included in the data system. A psychiatrist might persuade the panel that head injuries, past and present, should be recorded. If the panel agreed a “head injuries” field would be added to the database. Respondents in jurisdictions with panels reviewing the data

fields were very satisfied with the system, noting that it was rational and kicked out fields that simply were never used.

Database sorting varied widely, with some states permitting tracking through a(n) individual youth, staff member, offense, or family. All respondents had some sort of 'chrono' file on each kid – that is, a chronological electronic file that records every contact and, hopefully, the quality and outcome of the contact.

For obvious reasons, data on juveniles is first recorded at the local-level, at the point of contact with the juvenile. It is at this point that respondents uniformly noted the importance of (for lack of a better term) a positive "data culture." In other words, both local- and state-level respondents were quick to note that data quality is directly linked to how important the effort is viewed by the individual entering it. Most respondents indicated that this is a challenge that has implications for the quality of their data.

Records containing basic case information and chrono files are then maintained in a computer database. Access to view and change the records was variable across the represented jurisdictions. For some states, all people with a documented interest in a juvenile could access and enter data in the files; "up-to-date" could easily mean within the last few minutes. In contrast, some jurisdictions experience great difficulty accessing any data from any other government entity. Participants reported that changes to the records were general electronically limited. In other words, once data had been entered into a field it could not be edited.

Issues Surrounding Specific Data Points

The CJP asks respondents to report each young person's most serious offense resulting in his or her placement on probation. As with the CJRP (Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement), respondents are given an "Offense Code Card" – essentially a look up table with definitions so that the vast assortment of criminal codes across the

country may be standardized into a single system. This is perhaps the most arduous aspect of the CJP data collection. For savvy state-level respondents, this is less of a problem; they are able to write a short program that recodes the offenses and can continue to use that program if the offense code card structure remains. Other state-level respondents noted that this could be done by a programmer, but indicated that they would be deeply grateful if “you guys could just do it – and send it back.” Local-level respondents faced with line-by-line entering of data were extremely eager to have assistance. All focus groups were offered the following scenario: “If we were able to either allow you to (a) enter the data using your state’s criminal code with a drop-down menu in which you would see your offenses or (b) submit the data on offenses using your own criminal code (along with a cross-walk), would that increase the likelihood of your participation.” This was a resounding “yes.” Hence the recommendation that the data collection back-fills the automated reporting system with the criminal code for that state, at least for those that are targeted as being critical in the next round. This will be labor intensive on the receiving end, but it will allow researchers to at least capture the data.

Relatedly, the focus groups suggested that the CJP incorporate state-specific drop down menu of offense choices. One participant offered to share his state’s system for providing offense menu choices, and he offered to train his peers on how to develop such menus. In fact, many of the participants expressed the desire to become “ambassadors” for the CJP: spokespeople who can explain the importance of this data collection effort to their peers throughout their states.

The race code structure was recognized by the bulk of respondents, and did not pose a disproportionate level of difficulty. Several participants reported that the “county of residence” variable might pose a problem for their state. Cities and states might not maintain an express “county” field, but the identity of the field could be obtained by linking the city of residence to a county within the state. While this task

may seem simple, it does mean that the responders are asked to take extra steps to complete the CJP. Any details of probation not required at the state- or county-level, or which are deemed too sensitive, are routinely maintained in paper files. Along the lines of tying each state's criminal code to an automated form, respondents were equally as enthusiastic at the prospect of having a drop-down menu containing all of the possible geographic areas in both this question and the geographic areas served question in the first section of the form. We make both of these recommendations for the next CJP.

Issues Surrounding the Reference Day and Data Submission Options

Respondents were a bit puzzled by the reference day, asking questions to clarify whether they actually had to perform the data extract on that day, or whether it could be done a day or so after but using the reference day. They were also puzzled on how the particular reference day was selected. It was explained to them it was that the data be captured for that day that was important, and that the reference day was selected through pretesting (along with its fourth Wednesday in October counterpart in the facility censuses) to be a representative day in terms of case load and operations. This they could understand, and appreciated the information, saying "...then why not just tell us that?" Indeed, so is our recommendation to include an introductory statement establishing the importance of the reference date in communications to field offices from OJJDP.

Uniformly, respondents want an automated system (but they'd also appreciate a paper copy mailed). Large offices without the criminal code issues (having already addressed them), on the whole, would complete a fillable version of Section I and then upload a file. These offices would appreciate some formatted download files. Other large offices unable to see past the offense code noted clearly that it would be easier to provide data for the CJP if they could send all of their raw data files to the researchers rather than sort their files for variables such as probation status and the reference date. Smaller offices seemed more likely to fill out the form entirely on-line, thus entering

each young person line-by-line. One such office, with a case-load count of 800, would be considerably more likely to get this task done if the drop-down menus allowed them to see the geographic areas offense codes for that state and office. Even though participants were able to identify some specific difficulties with the census there were no objections to any of the data elements. Participants found the current data elements to be basic and critical to understanding of the population in question. Problems centered on: definitions and technological abilities. There is no expectation that a change in the data elements should be considered.

Focus Group Recommendations for Increasing Response Rates in 2009

In addition to addressing the above themes, the following measures were received or offered as potential means for increasing response rates in the CJP:

1. Timing: The request for data permitting only a short turn-around time was likely to reduce response rates considerably. Ensuring ample time between first notification and final submission would facilitate planning and therefore result in increased response rates. Ideally first contact would be welcome 90 days prior to the collection date. Participants would like a hard copy sometime between 90 and 30 days prior to the collection date. While a paper copy of the survey was requested electronic submission was widely desired by participants.

2. Automation. Electronic completion could permit clarification for terms that posed problems to responders. Responders for the initial 2006 collection identified offense code as an obstacle to survey completion. An online application to automatically display a selection menu tied to a table of offenses coded to match the respondent's state would be very helpful to CJP responders. Other potentially problematic areas could be similarly cleared up through the implementation of contextual "pop-up" or "alert" messages in the online survey to conveniently present clear definitions of such potentially confusing terms such as "informal" probation.

Attention getting login codes such as “Superman” or “Hip Hop Bob” were proposed as a means to focus attention on the upcoming census task.

3. Continued access to automated form. Given that the CJP was unlikely to be completed in one sitting an online system permitting return visits over several weeks while saving the previous work would be very welcome. Participants recognized that paper and electronic reminders at reasonable intervals would be useful and welcome.

4. Increasing visibility of the CJP within the office and to supervisors.

Focus group members thought it would be helpful to include their supervisors in some of the correspondence. Allowing others in the office to understand how valuable their contribution to the CJP is on a national level will lay the ground work for concentrated effort on this census. Responders must prioritize the data requests they receive, and participants uniformly agreed that the priority placed on a request relates largely to how that data request is perceived by their supervisors. If the only person in the juvenile probation office who is aware of the CJP is the responder, the responder could easily rank the CJP as less of a demand than requests passing through the hands of others in the same office.

In addition to letting supervisors know of the CJP, a general publicity campaign might be helpful to OJJDP. Participants proposed raising the CJP’s profile with various state officials through: mass mailings advising the offices that the census was on its way; thank you letters to responders, letters to commissioners, state legislators, and other external supervising entities, and e-mail updates to all probation professionals containing snippets of information gleaned from CJP analysis.

5. Technical assistance...or just the name of someone to call. Some participants representing state-level or large metropolitan area data were enthusiastic about the idea of an onsite visit from CJP team members with the goal of collaborating on a methodology for extracting survey data from raw data files. At least one respondent had devised a method for data extraction on own for the initial survey but felt that the

task could be much more efficiently accomplished with direct cooperation. Most noted that having a personal contact would go a long way to increasing response rates, perhaps through low pressure calls or infrequent e-mails.

6. Use the focus group participants to recruit peers. As one respondent put it, he was much more likely to fill out a form if his friend and peer in the neighboring state told him he should. Thus, the participants were willing to assist OJJDP through the recruiting and training of peers in responding to the CJP (with the requisite prior consent from all parties involved). On a humorous note, many requested certificates of authority, sashes, tiaras, and other indicia of their status of "CJP Ambassadors." There was an overwhelming willingness to update peers at monthly/quarterly meetings with materials from the CJP Workgroup guiding them on what to cover at each contact.

7. HIGHLIGHT THE UTILITY OF THE DATA. The focus group respondents perceived some benefit to collecting the CJP data, but the benefit was not necessarily obvious and striking.

a. Allow comparisons with like groups. These respondents felt there was a need to describe the national trends surrounding juvenile probation, however, the most immediate and grabbing utility for them was getting like comparisons for their own office. As many pointed out, it is one thing to note a trend in a single jurisdiction, but to tie that to a similar jurisdiction and to be able to make a contact with that jurisdiction would be invaluable. Thus, the single most important thing that the CJP can do to increase response rates will be to tie the data to a program that matches similar jurisdictions. This could be done through selecting jurisdictions on other data points (density, juvenile population, UCR rate of juvenile crime, poverty, etc) and could mask the identity of the comparison areas.

b. Create a professional network for responding offices. The same model presented above could be replicated but allow location identities to be voluntarily disclosed between consenting areas, thus linking like jurisdictions for personal contact.

Several participants envisioned such a “peer pal program” as a critical leap in the sharing of data and best practices through an interstate targeted network across the country. Since the data is to be collected as a census appropriate, voluntary consent could reasonably result in a cross country linkage in such a “peer pal program”. An incentive for completion such as early access to data would be welcome.

Most respondents were very open to a list serve that allowed respondents to reach out to other professionals in general, but to discuss problems with the data process more specifically.

c. Use the CJP to test national definitions and standards. The desire for national leadership is clear, and these respondents saw the CJP as a convenient tool to being such a discussion, to test new measures, and to explore outcomes.

Action Items for the CJP 2009

- Submit and process data online or electronically
- Leave online access open for multiday interaction with online forms
- Create online forms that permit interactive clarification of problematic terms
- Send certificates of participation to responders
- Notify responders with ample advance notice – 90 days
- Provide the rationale for the reference day
- Devise silly security identifiers to be used for preregistration for online submission
- Tie criminal codes and state geographic areas to the automated forms
- Note that the race field might not reflect the juvenile’s self-identification
- Include focus group members in the training and recruiting of peers
- Consider offering a listserv for responders enabling consultation with one another during the CJP collection process

- Send CJP representatives to areas with especially large numbers of juveniles on probation that are in need of assistance with the coordination of record retrieval
- Advise supervisors of the participation value in responding to the CJP request

Action Items for OJJDP

- Link sites across the country using useful similarities; offender composition, population size, type of community creating a Peer Pal Program
- Establish national definitions for a handful of parole/justice system terms
- Consider linking preferential funding to census/data compliance

Focus Group Participants

Vincent J. Iaria
9150 East Imperial Hwy
Downey, Ca 90242
Phone: 562 708 6797
Email
vince.iaria@probation.lacounty.gov

Suite 400
Oklahoma City, OK 73126
Phone: 405-530-2859
Fax: 405-530-2892
kim.sardis@oja.ok.gov

Jennifer Donnell
Director
Program Evaluation Office
11701 Alameda Street 2nd floor
Room 3228
Lynwood, Ca 90262
Phone: 323 371 5115
Email: jennifer.donnell@laprob.org

Joshua Cargile
Lead Analyst
Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice
3408 Covington Highway
Decatur, GA 30032
Phone: (404) 508-7225
Fax: (404) 478-9485
JoshuaCargile@djj.state.ga.us

Sherrie L Barratt
Director
Grimes County Juvenile Services
P O Box 624
Anderson, TX 77830
Phone: (936) 825-1665
Fax: (936) 825-1669
integrityfirst2002@yahoo.com

Carol A Geraghty
Supervisor
Ramsey County Community
Corrections
Juvenile Probation
25 West 7th Street
E153
St. Paul, MN 55102
Phone: 651-266-5309
Fax: 651-266-5320
Carol.Geraghty@co.Ramsey.Mn.Us

Lisa Eichelberger
Business Analyst
Travis County Juvenile Probation
Department
2515 South Congress Ave.
Austin, TX 78704
Phone: (512) 854-7054
lisa.eichelberger@co.travis.tx.us

Gregory S Boelter
Supervisor
Stearns County Community Corrections
705 Courthouse Square
Rm 445
St Cloud, MN 56303
Phone: 320-656-6430
Fax: 320-656-6600
greg.boelter@co.stearns.mn.us

Kim D Sardis
Division Director
Office of Juvenile Affairs
3812 N. Santa Fe

Ray Wahl
UT Juvenile Court Administrator
UT Administrative Office of Courts
Salt Lake City
Phone:801-578-3800
rayw@email.utcourts.gov

Stephen M King
Director
Mower County Corrections
201 First Street NE
Austin, MN 55912
Phone: 507-437-9453
Fax: 507-433-6031
stevek@co.mower.mn.us

Darin Burrell
Chief Juvenile Probation Officer
Fremont County Juvenile Probation
P.O. Box 55
423 N. 2300 E.
St. Anthony, ID 83445
Phone: 208 624-1345 Ext. 106
Fax: 208 624-1346
dburrell@co.fremont.id.us

Ken Tomlinson
Management Analyst
Colorado Division of Probation Services
1301 Pennsylvania St, Ste300
Denver, CO 80203
Phone: (303) 837-3636 Ext. 3636
ken.tomlinson@judicial.state.co.us

John (Stan) S Clarkson
Research Director
N.C. Dept of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
1801 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1801
Phone: (919) 733-3388 Ext. 8195
stan.clarkson@ncmail.net

Dana Wilks
Management Analyst
Division of Probation Services
1301 Pennsylvania St, Ste 300
Denver, CO 80203
Phone: (303) 837-2343 Ext. 3343
dana.wilks@judicial.state.co.us

Brent A Laman
Deputy Chief Probation Officer
Hamilton County Juvenile Court
800 Broadway
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Phone: 513-236-4636
brent.laman@juvcourt.hamilton-co.org