

REQUEST FOR OMB CLEARANCE

Activities to Assess the Feasibility of Creating and Maintaining a National Registry of Child Maltreatment Perpetrators

July 14, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. JUSTIFICATION.....	1
A.1. Circumstances Making the Collection of Information Necessary.....	1
A.2. Purpose and Use of Information Collection.....	2
A.3. Use of Information Technology and Burden Reduction.....	2
A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication.....	3
A.5. Involvement of Small Entities.....	4
A.6. Consequences If Information Collected Less Frequently.....	4
A.7. Consistency with Guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2).....	4
A.8. Consultation Outside the Agency.....	4
A.9. Payments to Respondents.....	5
A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality.....	5
A.11. Questions of a Sensitive Nature	6
A.12. Estimates of Annualized Hour Burden.....	6
A.13. Estimates of Other Total Annualized Cost Burden to Respondents or Record Keepers/Capital Costs.....	7
A.14. Estimates of Annualized Cost to the Government	8
A.15. Changes in Burden.....	8
A.16. Time Schedule, Publication and Analysis Plans.....	8
A.17. Display of Expiration Date.....	9
A.18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions.....	9
B. STATISTICAL METHODS.....	10
B.1. Respondents Universe and Sampling Methods.....	10
B.2. Information Collection Procedures.....	10
B.3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates and Deal with Nonresponse.....	12
B.4. Tests of Procedures.....	13
B.5. Individuals Consulted on Statistical Aspects and Individuals Collecting and/or Analyzing Data.....	13

Appendices:

- Appendix A Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006
- Appendix B US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (2009). *Interim Report to the Congress on the Feasibility of a National Child Abuse Registry.*
- Appendix C Current Legal Mandates and Policies on Information on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators Questionnaire
- Appendix D Current Practices on Sharing Information on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators Questionnaire
- Appendix E Technical Information on Data Repositories on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators Questionnaire
- Appendix F 60-Day Federal Register Notice
- Appendix G Lists of Experts for Outside Consultations
- Appendix H Guidelines and Procedures for Preparing a Data File for the Prevalence Study
- Appendix I Letter of Study Introduction to States
- Appendix J Instructions on How to Complete the Key Informant Survey Questionnaires

A. JUSTIFICATION

A.1. *Circumstances Making the Collection of Information Necessary*

Since the 1960s, most States have established Statewide child abuse registries to record information on past child abuse investigations. The passage of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1974 allocated funds to States to improve their child protection programs and further enabled States to establish child abuse registries. According to the Child Welfare Information Gateway (2005), 42 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and Guam are required by statute to operate child abuse registries. At present, States wishing to determine whether an individual has been identified in another State as a substantiated child maltreatment perpetrator must approach other States individually.

Section 633 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (the Adam Walsh Act) (See appendix A) directs the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to establish a *national* child maltreatment registry *and to conduct a feasibility study* regarding implementation issues. As described in the statutory language, the feasibility study would examine the costs and benefits of a national child abuse registry, make recommendations regarding a due process procedure, and make recommendations regarding data standards that should be considered in implementing such a registry.

An initial feasibility study was conducted internally by the HHS with results detailed in the *Interim Report to the Congress on the Feasibility of a National Child Abuse Registry* (Interim Report) (See appendix B). The study was a wide-ranging analysis that included a comprehensive literature review, analysis of State statutes, review of the content of State registries, stakeholder discussions, and an analysis of the potential impact of due process considerations and the requirements of the Privacy Act. The interim study identified three areas where further data were clearly needed in order to properly assess the feasibility of implementing such a registry.

- *Prevalence Study.* The study found existing data concerning individuals who had been substantiated perpetrators in multiple States to be regional and anecdotal. No data were available that would support national estimates of the number of perpetrators who were also listed as substantiated perpetrators in other States. These estimates are deemed essential to assess the potential benefits of a national child abuse registry.
- *State Systems Review.* The review of the content of State data systems in the earlier study was based largely on secondary data sources and therefore incomplete and, to some extent, unavoidably outdated. A thorough and up-to-date crosswalk of content and data standards of existing State child abuse registries is needed to adequately inform data standards for a national registry, requiring original data collection.
- *Further Assessment of State Interest.* The study determined that more detailed information was needed regarding States' interest in participating in a voluntary national registry, including a deeper exploration of the factors that might hinder

participation. Such information was considered vital given the lack of incentives in the legislation for or against participation.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) has contracted with Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc. (WRMA) and its partner, the American Bar Association (ABA) Center on Children and the Law, to conduct the feasibility study. This study will include two components, a Prevalence Study and a Key Informant Survey, which will fill the information gaps that the HHS interim report indicated must be addressed in order to fulfill the statutory requirements identified above. The study is funded through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' FY 2009 appropriations for child abuse discretionary activities as directed by Congress.

A.2. Purpose and Use of Information Collection

Results of this study will be used to inform HHS and Congress about the feasibility of implementing a national registry, including potential costs and benefits, and will also help inform the content, structure and functioning of such a registry should it be established. The Prevalence Study will provide national estimates of the number of persons who have been found to be substantiated perpetrators in more than one State. The Key Informant Survey will collect information in several areas including: current legal mandates and policies concerning the sharing of information on substantiated perpetrators; existing practices for sharing information on child maltreatment perpetrators with other States; the structure and content of State repositories of data on child maltreatment perpetrators; and perceived benefits and costs to participation in a national registry that may affect States future participation.

This is a one-time data collection effort that will address the data gaps discussed in section A.1, above. Results from the study will be incorporated into an HHS final report to the Congress on the feasibility of a national child abuse registry, a follow-up to the interim report delivered last year (See appendix B). In addition, a research brief reporting selected results from the Prevalence Study will be disseminated on the HHS web site to better inform the States and the interested public.

A.3. Use of Information Technology and Burden Reduction

Below is a description of the use of information technology and how the burden on the respondents in this study will be reduced.

The Prevalence Study will rely wherever possible on data elements from an existing electronic data source, the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS), thereby minimizing the burden on States to supply data for the study. NCANDS does not, however, include all of the information that would allow the identification of the same perpetrator in multiple States, a core requirement for the study. In NCANDS, names are absent and the individual IDs are encrypted by the States prior to the submission of their data. It is therefore necessary to collect selected

identity and demographic characteristics on substantiated perpetrators from the States so that cross-State identification of perpetrators is possible. Burden on the States will be minimized by supplying them with a listing of NCANDS identification numbers, and software to encode perpetrator names. The States will be asked to decrypt the NCANDS IDs, link them to perpetrator records in their child welfare administrative data systems, and extract and encode the perpetrator's name, and also date of birth. This procedure will result in identifiers which are encoded by the same algorithm, thereby allowing cross-State comparisons. The information each State extracts and encodes will be uploaded to a secure online Web site and subsequently the data will be linked back to the NCANDS records.

The second component of the study, the Key Informant Survey, consists of three questionnaires with the following titles (See appendices C-E):

- Current Legal Mandates and Policies on Information on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators;
- Current Practices on Sharing Information on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators; and
- Technical Information on Data Repositories of Child Maltreatment Perpetrators.

The questionnaires will be administered as Web-based surveys using Survey Monkey™. The Web-based methodology offers key informants the ability to respond to questions at times that best fit their schedules and at their own pace. Further, each survey has been streamlined to collect only necessary data while minimizing respondent burden, with questionnaire length ranging from 21 to 45 questions.

Recruitment for the study will be carried out using a variety of means including e-mail, telephone, and the U.S. mail.

A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

Based on a careful review of the Interim Report (See appendix B), discussions with knowledgeable HHS staff, and a review of existing child welfare databases, it appears that there are no existing data collection efforts that are duplicative of data being collected for this study.

NCANDS data contains a great deal of data on child maltreatment perpetrators, but, as discussed above, lacks the information needed to identify perpetrators who have been found to be substantiated perpetrators in more than one State.

Another database that collects information on child maltreatment is the National Survey of Child and Adolescents Well-Being (NSCAW). NSCAW offers nationally representative longitudinal data on families that have been in contact with the child welfare system. The data are collected from a rich variety of sources and cover a wealth of topics, but the survey contains no data on multistate perpetration among child maltreatment perpetrators in the study. In addition, it does not address the issues covered in our Key Informant Survey.

The National Sex Offender Registry (NSOR) includes convicted sex offenders for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and participating Tribes. The NSOR includes only a small proportion of the people who would be included in a national registry of child maltreatment perpetrators, it includes only those substantiated for sexual abuse that have also been tried and found guilty of such abuse in a court of law.

The National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) includes records on persons who are not eligible to purchase firearms in the United States. Some substantiated maltreatment perpetrators would also have records in this data system, but the overlap is likely to be small.

Survivor Connections, Inc. (<http://survivorconnections.net>) maintains a confidential database of rape, incest, sexual assault, and child molestation perpetrators who were reported by victims. Another database is the National Center on Shaken Baby Syndrome (<http://www.dontshake.org>), which collects information on the child, perpetrator, and the legal outcomes of the cases. Neither meets the data collection requirements for the feasibility study as they are focused on a narrow population of perpetrators, and collect data using much different methodologies than those used by State child maltreatment perpetrator registries.

A.5. Involvement of Small Entities

No small businesses will be involved in this study. The survey respondents are designated staff of State governments.

A.6. Consequences If Information Collected Less Frequently

This is a one-time only data collection effort.

A.7. Special Circumstances Relating to the Guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2)

There are no special circumstances for the collection of this information. Respondents will not have to report information more than quarterly, prepare a written response in fewer than 30 days, submit more than an original and two copies of any document, retain records for more than three years, or submit proprietary trade secrets.

A.8. Consultation Outside the Agency

A 60-Day Federal Register Notice was published in the Federal Register on April 20, 2010, vol. 75, No. 75; pp. 20598 to 20599 (See appendix F). No public comments were received.

Expert advice was solicited concerning the questionnaires to be used for this study in December 2009, and January 2010. Experts reviewed draft questionnaires and were asked to 1) identify any confusing terms or phrasing of both question and response options and to suggest alternative

wording, if possible; 2) identify response options that are applicable to an item, but missing from those currently provided; and 3) identify important questions that were missing. Expert names, affiliations, and contact information are listed in appendix G. Their suggestions were incorporated into the final survey instruments.

On January 20, 2010, an overview of this feasibility study was presented to participants in the annual National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System State Technical Assistance Meeting held in Rockville, MD. Representatives from approximately 40 State child welfare departments were present. In the discussion period that followed, participants made several useful suggestions regarding data collection methodologies. In particular, a recommendation to make the initial set of data provided to the States for the Prevalence Study available in alternative formats to facilitate processing was incorporated into the study design. A complete list of attendees is found in appendix G.

A pilot test of the data collection design involving five States was carried out from January through late-March 2010 including Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Minnesota, and New Mexico. All five States participated in piloting the Key Informant Survey questionnaires (though Connecticut was unable to complete the legal/policy questionnaire), and four (Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, and Minnesota) participated in piloting the Prevalence Study.

A.9. Payments to Respondents

No payments or gifts will be provided to any respondents for this study.

A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality

The Prevalence Study component will gather information on individuals who have been substantiated for child maltreatment. Prevalence Study results will be used to create national estimates of interstate child maltreatment perpetrators, determine whether interstate perpetrators are substantiated for more serious forms of maltreatment than other perpetrators, and estimate the percent of all interstate perpetrators who are substantiated in adjacent States.

Each record would contain sufficient identifying information, including date of birth and encoded name, to allow for records to be matched across States with reasonable accuracy. The name encoding process (using NYSIIS name coding) is a crucial step in safeguarding the confidentiality of these individuals, allowing for matching without the need for identifiable names attached to individual records. Even so, records would contain date of birth, county of residence, and other identifying information that might allow someone looking for a particular person to identify his/her record. To assure confidentiality, stringent security procedures and standards would be incorporated to protect and safeguard the data from unauthorized access. All data transferred over the Internet would take place via secured channels. Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) certifies that 128-256 bit encryption technologies are employed to support complete and secure data transfer. The security of electronic and non-electronic (i.e., hard copy) data would be

maintained in several ways. For electronic data, only individuals with valid network accounts and passwords would be allowed access to sensitive information. Sensitive non-electronic data would be handled only in secured (locked) areas. Sensitive data would be stored in locked filing cabinets or other appropriate fire-safe secure containers. Staff who have access to the data would be also required to sign a confidentiality agreement that lists the laws and policies that aim to protect sensitive information and insure the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of those systems.

For the Key Informant Survey component of the study, respondents will be asked to report about state policies and procedures, and the likelihood of participation in any future national registry of child maltreatment perpetrators. Respondent names, titles, emails, and telephone numbers will be collected for survey recruitment purposes only. This information would be kept in a separate file from the answers to the survey questions and linked by a unique identification number. Both files would be stored in different directories on password protected computers. Surveys would be completed online using the survey service, Survey Monkey™ (www.surveymonkey.com). Results will be used to classify States into clusters with similar policies, practices, and data issues that may impede or facilitate a fully functional national registry. When reporting results, most responses will be aggregated, though some individual State responses will be highlighted when appropriate. All responses will be identified by state, not by the name of the respondent.

A.11. Questions of a Sensitive Nature

The Prevalence Study will include sensitive data on individuals found to be perpetrators of child maltreatment including information on the maltreatment finding, the nature of the maltreatment, date of birth, and the race/ethnicity of the perpetrator. Sensitive data related to maltreatment and date of birth are needed to identify multi-state perpetrators, and to determine whether multi-state perpetrators tend to commit more serious forms of maltreatment. The data on race and ethnicity will be used in order to reduce false multi-state matches. No names or national or state cross reference identifiers will be collected. Measures that will be taken to safeguard these data are detailed in section A.10, above. No data of a sensitive nature are being collected through the Key Informant Survey.

A.12. Estimates of Annualized Hour Burden

The proposed data collection effort will include three classes of respondents: (1) State IT staff who will extract and encode perpetrator names from a given NCANDS list of perpetrators for the Prevalence Study (See appendix H); (2) attorneys representing the child welfare agency who will respond to the Current Legal Mandates and Policies on Information on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators Questionnaire (See appendix C); and (3) State administrators who will respond to the Current Practices on Sharing Information on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators (See appendix D) and Technical Information on Data Repositories on Child Maltreatment Perpetrators (See appendix E).

Burden estimates are based on an assumption of complete participation of all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico in all aspects of the data collection. A total of 54 respondents are anticipated for the Key Informant Survey because several states have more than one data repository, and separate surveys would need to be filled out for each repository. Average burden hours are based on our pilot study which included the following States: New Mexico, Minnesota, Illinois, Delaware, and Connecticut. Average hourly wages, used to estimate cost burden, are based on the general Federal GS hourly pay scale for 2010 for grades considered to be comparable to the position of targeted respondents (GS-12 for IT staff, GS-14 for Attorney, GS-12 for State Administrator, all at Step 3).

Exhibit 1 provides estimates by data collection instrument for number of respondents, average burden hours per response, and total burden hours. Total burden hours to the States are estimated to be 2,298 hours, at a cost of \$72,149 over the course of the project. The total duration of the study will be 28 months, though the data collection period will last approximately 6 months, to commence once the data collection is approved.

Exhibit 1. Estimated Annualized Burden Table

Instrument	Type of Respondent	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses per Respondent	Average Burden Hours per Response	Total Burden Hours
Prevalence Study	State IT Staff	52	1	39	2028
Key Informant Survey: Legal/Policy Questionnaire	Attorney from Child Welfare Agency	54	1	2	108
Key Informant Survey: Practices Questionnaire	State Administrator	54	1	1	54
Key Informant Survey: Technical Information on Data Repositories Questionnaire	State administrator	54	1	2	108
Total		214			2298

A.13. Estimates of Other Total Annualized Cost Burden to Respondents or Record Keepers/Capital Costs

There are no capital or start-up costs for respondents.

A.14. Estimates of Annualized Cost to the Government

The estimated contract costs to the government for all data collection activities under Contract No. HHSP23320095656WC is \$280,100 for 28 months. These costs include: preparation of the OMB clearance submission; development of the design document; study recruitment; and all

other aspects of data collection. In addition, we estimate 200 hours of federal staff time at an average hourly wage of \$63.25 (GS-15), for a total of \$12,650 over the same time period. The total cost for data collection for the entire project is estimated at \$292,750, and the annualized cost is approximately \$125,500.

A.15. Changes in Burden

This data collection is new and does not represent any changes in estimates of respondent burden or cost.

A.16. Time Schedule, Publication and Analysis Plans

Tabulations and Statistical Analysis

The Prevalence Study data will be stored in a SQL Server 2005 database management system. The analysis of the data will consist of: 1) creating multi-state matches; 2) creating national estimates of the number and rate of multi-state perpetrators; 3) comparing the maltreatment profiles of multi-state child maltreatment perpetrators to in-state child maltreatment perpetrators; and 4) estimating the total percentage of interstate child maltreatment perpetrators who were identified in geographically adjacent States.

The Key Informant Survey results will be downloaded from Survey Monkey™ into an Excel database. The analysis will consist of classifying States into categories of similar policies, practices, data issues, or other factors. Frequency distributions of responses will also be analyzed.

These analyses will address the particular issues identified in the Interim Report (See appendix B) as necessary to address the feasibility of a national child maltreatment registry as required by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (See section A.1, above, for details).

Statistical analyses will be primarily simple descriptives including both national and State-based tables. For example, a table reporting the total number and rate of multi-state perpetrators for each State will be produced.

More complex modeling techniques will be required to create national estimates using decennial census State-to-State migration rates to fill in any missing migration streams to and from non-participating States. The Census Bureau has calculated State-to-State migration streams for each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia, for persons ages 5-64. In-migration rates generated from these tables will be used together with the known rates from the prevalence study database to fill in the data gaps.

Publication and Analysis Plans

A final report on the full study and a research brief on the Prevalence Study component will be completed by October 1, 2011, and submitted to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, HHS. The final report will describe the overall study and present findings on the Prevalence Study and the results of the Key Informant Survey. The report will be adapted by HHS for use as a report to Congress on a national child abuse registry. The research

brief will include a summary of the Prevalence Study and its findings and will be published on the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation’s website.

Exhibit 2 lists the schedule for data collection activities and completion of the final report and research brief. Recruitment is scheduled to begin September 15, 2010, with data collection starting on October 1 and continuing through February 26, 2011, a period of five months. Data analysis will start November 1, 2010 and continue through April 30, 2011, approximately two months after data collection ends. This schedule assumes OMB clearance approval before or by August 31, 2010. Dates for recruitment, data collection, and analysis will be adjusted accordingly if approval comes significantly before or after that date.

Drafts of the report and the research brief will be delivered on August 1, 2011, with final drafts delivered by October 1, 2011.

Exhibit 2. Project Schedule

Task	Dates
State Introduction and Recruitment	September 15, 2010 to February 1, 2011
Data Collection	October 1, 2010 to February 26, 2011
Extract and Encoding Process	October 1, 2010 to February 26, 2011
Data Analysis	November 1, 2010 to April 30, 2011
Draft Report and Research Brief	August 1, 2011
Final Report and Research Brief	October 1, 2011
Two Briefings	October 1, 2011 to January 27, 2012

A.17. Display of Expiration Date

The OMB approval number and expiration date will be provided on all data collection instruments.

A.18. Exceptions to Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

There are no exceptions to the certification.

B. COLLECTION OF INFORMATION INVOLVING STATISTICAL METHODS

B.1. Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods

The universe for this data collection effort is the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico (hereafter *the States*). Every attempt will be made to collect data from every member of the universe rather than sampling the States. This approach will provide the maximum amount of data, and will allow all States the opportunity to offer their input and consultation on a matter that may have significant impacts on their future work.

For each State, data will be collected from the child welfare agency director and individual staff that he/she will designate as qualified and available to respond to each of the data collection instruments, including the Prevalence Study and the topical questionnaires in the Key Informant Survey.

B.2. Information Collection Procedures

This study will seek the participation of all State child welfare agencies, which are the most likely contributors to a possible national registry of child maltreatment perpetrators, in the 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In States that have more than one data repository for information on maltreatment perpetrators, other agencies that maintain relevant data will also be asked to participate.

Recruitment

Recruitment will be multi-faceted since there are two different types of participation being asked of the States: 1) submission of data to gain a greater understanding of the prevalence of perpetrators who may have been substantiated in other States (the Prevalence Study), and 2) response to questionnaires on legal and policy issues, current practices related to requesting and responding to inquiries, and data repository technical issues (the Key Informant Survey). The recruitment of participants to the study will include several activities, as follows.

- Identifying State Primary Contacts—Information on potential contacts in each State is being assembled, and will be updated prior to beginning formal recruitment.
- Awareness Building—State child welfare agencies will be informed of the study and their input sought as to the best recruitment strategies.
- Recruitment Package and Methods—Once OMB approval is received, recruitment materials, providing information and soliciting involvement in the study, will be sent to each of the previously identified State contacts. Both pre- and post-telephone contacts will be made to facilitate recruitment.
- Procedures When Initial Response is Negative—It is anticipated that a number of State contacts will initially refuse participation. A number of additional recruitment steps will be taken to maximize participation rates (See section B.3, below).
- Procedures When Response is Positive—Once designated respondents have been identified, they will be contacted and provided information on the Prevalence Study or

on how to access the survey questionnaires, as appropriate. The recruiters will work closely to answer all questions related to participation, confirm participation as necessary, and monitor the response rates to each study component. Additional assistance will be provided as needed.

Primary contacts for each State (child welfare directors) will be asked to identify by name, title, agency, email address, and telephone number the individuals who will be responsible for assisting with the Prevalence Study and Key Informant Survey.

Drafts of letters and materials to be used in the recruitment process are located in appendices H, I, J.

Data Collection

The National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) and State child welfare information systems are the sources for the data to be used in the Prevalence Study component of the larger study.

NCANDS was chosen as the initial data source for the study for several reasons. It contains information on almost all substantiated maltreatment perpetrators in the U.S. by State for the last five years. It includes comparable data for most States and the District of Columbia, greatly facilitating interstate comparisons. It contains the information needed to examine interstate perpetrators by adjacency and maltreatment type. In addition, it contains measures that are useful for identifying interstate perpetrators. Finally, using NCANDS data allows the study team to do all of the matching work and most of the data preparation, minimizing the burden on participating States. The Children's Bureau has approved the use of NCANDS data files for this study.

State information systems will be the source of name information and selected perpetrator demographic characteristics required for the matching procedure. To reduce the burden of State participation in the study and to preserve confidentiality, States will be provided with files containing the encrypted perpetrator IDs extracted from NCANDS and a program to encode names for matching purposes. States will extract name and perpetrator demographics from their information systems and will encode the names using the supplied software. The information they have extracted and encoded will be submitted and linked back to the NCANDS records by the study team. This will create records with the perpetrator encoded names, perpetrator demographics, maltreatment information, and child victim information required to support the analyses needed. Names will be similarly encoded for all states.

The type of encoding being proposed is typically referred to as Soundex or phonetic coding. It uses a phonetic algorithm for indexing names by sound, as pronounced in English. The goal is for similar names to be encoded to the same representation so that they can be matched despite minor differences in spelling. The resulting code is typically the first letter of the last name followed by a string of numbers and or alpha characters.

The particular algorithm to be used in the Prevalence Study is the NYSIIS algorithm. It was developed and implemented in the New York State Identification and Intelligence System in 1970. It is considered to be an improvement over a more widely known phonetic coding system, providing an accuracy increase of 2.7% over the traditional Soundex algorithm.¹ NYSIIS differs from Soundex in that it retains information about the position of vowels in the encoded name.

The States will be provided with a software application that will handle the encoding procedure. In addition, States will be given instructions that address extracting name and perpetrator demographics from their systems, running the encoding and formatting application, and submitting the resulting file. These instructions may be found in appendix H.

Data for the Key Informant Survey will be collected by web-based survey for the three questionnaires. These questionnaires can be found in appendices C, D, and E.

The Web-based approach is cost effective and will provide higher quality data than alternative methodologies. The flexibility of this methodology offers key informants the ability to respond to questions at times that best fit their schedules and at their own pace, and the minimal respondent burden provides the best means for reaching our recruitment goals.

The questionnaires will be formatted for online administration using Survey Monkey™ (www.surveymonkey.com). The data security features of the system have been reviewed and approved by Committees for the Protection of Human Subjects. The URL to access the online questionnaires will consist of a title representative of the survey, such as www.nationalregsurvey.com.

B.3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates and Deal with Nonresponse

In cases where the recruitment process concludes with the recruiter unable to convince a State to participate in the study, additional steps will be taken to facilitate successful recruitment. The first option will be to request that the State participate in one of the study components, the Prevalence Study or the Key Informant Survey. Ultimately, Directors who initially agree to one study component may eventually agree to full study participation. Follow-up requests will be made to investigate a change of mind after successfully gaining participation in the first study component.

Specific strategies will be further employed for States that refuse participation in both study components and will depend on the reason provided for refusal. When reason for non-participation is related to overall burden, a call back in 30 days will be made to see if the workload has changed. At this time, an offer will be made to administer the Key Informant Survey instruments by phone to reduce any perceived burden barriers. If necessary, the period for data collection will be extended in order to maximize participation.

¹ Rajkovic, P., and Jankovic, D. (2007) "Adaption and Application of Daitch-Mokotoff Soundex Algorithm on Serbian Names," *XVII Conference on Applied mathematics*, Novi Sad, Serbia

If Congress were to implement a National Registry of Child Maltreatment Perpetrators, this would have significant implications for the States in terms of both the benefits and potential costs of participation. For this reason, we expect the States will view this study as an important opportunity to influence the Congress’ decision on this matter, and will therefore be motivated to participate. Based on this expectation, and on previous experience with a study of similar respondents, conducted by the National Study of Child Protective Services Systems and Reform Efforts, an approximate overall 80 percent participation rate is expected.

In summary, a number of recruitment attempts will be made and various options for participation will be presented over the course of the data collection phase of the study to elicit full or partial study participation. The data and outcome of these attempts will be recorded in the State recruitment and tracking database.

B.4. Tests of Procedures

The survey instruments and data collection procedures for both the Prevalence Study and the Key Informant Survey were pilot-tested in five States: Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Minnesota, and New Mexico.

Results for the Prevalence Study were very positive, and revealed no problems requiring adjustments to the procedure or design. Analyses of responses to the Key Informant Survey questionnaires revealed minor problems with the clarity of a number of questions, which have been re-written for greater clarity.

B.5. Individuals Consulted on Statistical Aspects and Individuals Collecting and/or Analyzing Data.

All persons involved or expected to be involved in data collection design, data collection, and analysis are staff members of Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc. Contact information is supplied below.

Name	Email	Phone	Design	Data Collection	Analysis
Ying-Ying Yuan	yyuan@wrma.com	(301) 881-2590	√	√	√
Brett Brown	bbrown@wrma.com	(301) 881-2590	√	√	√
Fred Molitor	fmolitor@wrma.com	(916) 239-4020	√	√	√