

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) seeks approval to continue its Annual Probation and Parole (P&P) Surveys for the period 2012-2014. The current collection approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is due to expire October 31, 2011. These establishment surveys collect data from the known universe of probation and parole supervising agencies in the United States to provide BJS with the capacity to report annually on changes in the size and composition of the community corrections populations, and to track key outcomes of offenders on probation or parole, such as completion of supervision terms and return to incarceration (or recidivism). The P&P surveys provide the only routine, national level data on the community corrections populations, and as such, the data obtained from them inform this key stage of the criminal justice process.

A. Justification

1. Necessity of Information Collection

Under Title 42, United States Code, Section 3732 (see Attachment 1), the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is directed to collect and analyze statistical information concerning the operation of the criminal justice system at the federal, state and local levels. The annual P&P surveys provide national and state-level data about offenders under community supervision, a core component of BJS' collections on the criminal justice system. Attachment 2 is the BJS flowchart that illustrates the sequence of events in the criminal justice system, and in particular community corrections within the corrections stage, which is the last stage of the criminal justice process. The flowchart not only demonstrates the relationship between sentencing and community corrections through the transition of offenders from sentencing directly to probation, but more importantly community corrections and institutional corrections (prisons or jails) through the transitions of prisoners to community corrections and from community corrections back to institutional corrections.

BJS has collected annual yearend counts and yearly movements of community corrections populations through its annual P&P surveys since 1977. The data from these surveys provide the only comprehensive overview of the total community supervision population, as well as the parole and probation populations at both the national and state levels. Data collected from these surveys also describe characteristics of the community supervision population, such as sex, racial composition, offense, supervision status, outcomes of supervision, including the rate at which probationers and parolees completed their supervision or failed (i.e., incarcerated in prison or jail either for a new offense or because their supervision was revoked, which are recidivism measures), and alternative programs, such as monitoring of offenders through a Global Positioning System (GPS).

Of the 7.2 million men and women under correctional supervision (that is, in prison or jail, or on probation or parole) at yearend 2009, more than two-thirds (70%) or over 5.0 million offenders were supervised in the community, either on probation (4,203,967) or parole (819,308). At year-end 2009, more than 2.2% of the U.S. adult resident population was under supervision in the community. In addition, about 2.31 million offenders entered probation supervision and 2.35 million exited during 2009, while 574,000 entered parole and 579,000 exited parole supervision during the year. As a consequence, during 2009, the community supervision population declined 0.9%, from 5,064,975 to 5,018,855. This was the first decline observed in the community supervision population since the P&P surveys began in 1980.

The size of the population under community supervision and the volume of movements onto and off of community supervision indicate the importance of the annual P&P surveys for understanding U.S. correctional systems. That these offenders are in the community and pose risks to public safety by reoffending also indicates the importance of tracking their outcomes as a basis for describing the operations of the United States' correctional systems.

The data gathered in the annual P&P surveys are not available from any other single data source, and these surveys fit within a larger BJS portfolio of establishment surveys that, together, cover all correctional populations in the United States. BJS' National Prisoner Statistics (NPS-1A and 1B OMB Control Number 1121-0102) series provides annual data on prison populations while the Annual Survey of Jails (ASJ) (OMB Control Number 1121-0094) provides national data on the local jail population. The annual P&P surveys complete BJS' annual coverage of correctional populations by providing the community corrections data. From these combined surveys, BJS has made known what has become the well-publicized fact that 1 in 32 adults in the United States are under some form of correctional supervision.¹

The data collected through the P&P surveys are also unique from other surveys conducted by BJS that collect some data on community corrections; however, those data are used to complement the annual P&P data. For example:

- The NPS collects data on the number of probation and parole violators returned to prison, but the P&P surveys separately measure the number of probationers and the number of parolees incarcerated in prison or jail, including the reason for incarceration (i.e., for a new offense or a violation of the conditions of their supervision). The NPS also provides the number of prisoners released to conditional supervision, including either to probation or parole, while the P&P surveys provide the total number of offenders placed under community supervision, including those offenders sentenced

¹ Glaze, L. E. (2010). *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2009*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC. See Attachment 3.

directly from a court to community supervision. However, the data collected from the NPS series and the probation and parole collections can be used together to better understand recidivism and the types of offenders who are released to the community.

- The ASJ provides data on conviction status of local jail inmates and convicted jail inmates include probation and parole violators, along with inmates who are held for a new offense. However, the number of probation and parole violators held in jail is not measured separately through ASJ, but the annual P&P surveys provide separate counts of the total number of probationers and the total number of parolees incarcerated in prison or jail.
- BJS' National Correctional Reporting Program (NCRP) (OMB Control Number 1121-0065) collects annual data consisting of individual-level records of entries to and exits from parole supervision. However, NCRP does not collect data on the characteristics of the yearend, stock parole population, which is collected through the Annual Parole Survey through aggregate counts, and not all states participate in the NCRP, while the Annual Parole Survey does include all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the federal system. As the NCRP provide individual-level records of offender movements off of parole and the offender records include variables that describe the age, race, sex, type of offense, and duration on parole, BJS can use the NCRP data with the Annual Parole Survey data to describe in more detail the characteristics of offenders entering and exiting parole in states that contribute data to both programs, as well as in generating national estimates to describe changes in the composition of offenders entering and exiting parole. For example, although the Annual Parole Survey collects aggregate data about general offense categories, NCRP collects more detailed offense data through the individual-level records, and by combining data from both collections, BJS can generate more detailed breakdowns of the offenses of the parole population.
- Every other year since 1986, BJS' National Judicial Reporting Program (NJRP) (OMB Control Number 1121-0130 which expired April 30, 2008) has collected felony sentencing data from state courts, including the number of felons entering (i.e., sentenced to) probation supervision. In comparison, the Annual Probation Survey provides data on both movements onto and off of probation supervision as well as the yearend, stock population, and includes both felons and misdemeanants sentenced to probation; the misdemeanor probation population represents a significant portion (47%) of the total probation population.² In addition, while the NJRP data can only be used to generate national estimates, the Annual Probation Survey provides both national and state-specific estimates.

² Glaze, L.E., Bonczar, T.P., and Zhang, F.. (2010). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2009*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC. See Attachment 4.

- BJS' Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (SISFCF) and Survey of Inmates in Local Jails (SILJ), or inmate surveys, collect data from a large nationally representative samples of prison and local jail inmates through personal interviews. Specific topics include criminal history, socioeconomic conditions, drug and alcohol use and treatment, and mental health and medical problems. The information from the surveys, conducted every 5-6 years due to collection costs, can be used to better understand the criminal history of inmates, including those who had prior probation and parole sentences and the number of prior sentences, which are data not collected through the annual P&P surveys. In addition, the inmate surveys collect drug treatment data, including if inmates received treatment when they were on probation or parole. Because this type of information is not collected through the P&P surveys, the data allow for a better understanding of the needs of the community corrections population and the ways in which those needs are or are not currently addressed.

The data collected through the annual P&P surveys provide important information for policy development and criminal justice planning, and are essential to the support of criminal justice information systems at all levels of government. The information gathered through these surveys represents a long-standing effort to provide national and state-level data on the probation and parole populations; the P&P surveys are the only ongoing annual collections on the community corrections populations, and they take into account comparable reporting and consistent efforts to present comparable data across years and jurisdictions. These qualities allow data users, in particular individual states, to rely on the BJS P&P data as a source of trend and comparative data on the community corrections populations. The burden involved in collecting the annual P&P data is warranted by these uses and that the P&P data are used far and wide by the components of the U.S. Department of Justice, Congress, community corrections associations and networks, nonprofit organizations, researchers, journalists, and students as a source of national and comparative data on community corrections populations (see examples below in item 2, "Needs and Uses").

2. Needs and Uses

BJS' Assessment of Needs and Uses

To assess the need for the data gathered from the annual P&P collections, BJS has actively engaged the community corrections field to learn more about emerging topics in the field and substantive issues in which data gaps exist, as well as to solicit feedback from stakeholders about how they use the P&P data, the measurement challenges posed by the surveys, and ideas for improving BJS statistical products to make the presentation of the data more useful.

Using opportunities provided by routine association conferences and meetings, meetings of key stakeholders convened by other federal agencies, and other venues, BJS has sought facts and opinions about community corrections issues from stakeholders and used this information in making decisions about these collections and the reports issued from them. For example, BJS attends APPA's semi-annual conferences and uses the opportunity to address community corrections issues through workshop presentations, and also through convening a small workgroup meeting of community corrections data providers, practitioners, and researchers to obtain feedback from the field. Other opportunities that have allowed BJS to engage the community corrections field include the National Institute of Justice's (NIJ) annual meeting of the Community Corrections Research Network (CCRN), the National Institute of Corrections' (NIC) semi-annual meetings of the State Executives of Probation and Parole Network (SEPPN), and the American Correctional Association's (ACA) semi-annual conferences. The efforts BJS has made to engage the community corrections field have also continued to provide BJS with the opportunity to stay involved with a broader effort by the field, such as NIJ's CCRN and NIC's SEPPN, to develop a set of performance measures. BJS' participation in these discussions has provided an additional way to gather information about key issues in the field, to think of ways in which there might be overlap between the performance measures and BJS statistical data, and to develop relationships with key officials in the field of community corrections that can assist BJS' data collection efforts.

Data Users: Needs and Uses Identified

Through these interactions with stakeholders, they have repeatedly reinforced the point that the annual P&P surveys provide the community corrections field with data that support their contentions about the importance of community corrections relative to institutional corrections (prisons and jails). Community corrections account for 70% of all adults under correctional supervision, while institutional corrections account for the remaining 30%, and there has been growing reliance by the community corrections field on the BJS annual reports that document the size and composition of the probation and parole populations.³ Because BJS routinely publishes data on the size of the prison and jail populations, the field expects the same for the community corrections populations. This is so because about 75% of state prisoners will return to the community at some point under some form of conditional release, including probation, parole, or some other type of post-custody release supervision, and about a third of parole discharges and 16% of probation discharges result in a return to incarceration.^{4,5}

³ Glaze, L. E. (2010). *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2009*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC. See Attachment 3.

⁴ West, H.C., Sabol, W.J., & Greenman, S.J. (2010). *Prisoners in 2009*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC. <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/p09.pdf>

⁵ Glaze, L.E., Bonczar, T.P., and Zhang, F.. (2010). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2009*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC. See Attachment 4.

Some state-level officials rely on the historical P&P data to track changes over time and anticipate trends in their state's community corrections populations. The BJS data fill a gap in their information systems, as some states information systems do not retain historical population data. Therefore, tracking trends in their state's community corrections populations are only possible through the annual P&P data collected and reported on by BJS.

Stakeholders have also expressed that the P&P data on outcomes of supervision provide them with an indication of the effectiveness of their agencies at managing the populations and the potential impact on public safety, and also allow the legislative, judicial, and executive government decision-makers to measure the effects of revoked sentences and re-incarceration sentencing, release policies, alternative sanctions, reentry, and recidivism on the sources of growth and change in the community corrections population. In addition, stakeholders have indicated that the annual P&P parole data are also used by them to make relative comparisons of performance. Many state officials use the data to compare what is happening in their state with the nation as a whole and relative to other states within their region, similar in population size, or that have similar supervision policies and/or practices.

In addition to the needs and uses of the annual P&P data among the community corrections stakeholders, other users include Congress, various components of the U.S. Department of Justice, other federal agencies, nonprofit organizations, independent researchers, the media, and the public. Below is a list of those users, and the community corrections stakeholders, along with specific descriptions and examples of the ways in which BJS' P&P data are utilized:

U.S. Congress – to evaluate the adequacy of community corrections agencies to meet the needs of the growing probation and parole population and to assess the needs, relative to crime, incarceration, and recidivism rates, for new or improved initiatives or laws aimed at ensuring the safety of the general public and effectiveness of reentry programs. For example, the Criminal Justice Reinvestment Act of 2009 (S 2772 and H.R. 4080) cites BJS data gathered through the P&P surveys. The purpose of the Act is to understand factors associated with growth in the correctional populations and to develop and implement policy options to manage the growth and improve effectiveness of current spending and investment to increase public safety. The legislation cites the BJS P&P data to illustrate the size of the community supervision population, the growth in the population since 1980, and the rate of community supervision in the United States.

National Institute of Corrections (NIC) – to shape and promote correctional practices and public policy, establish standards, evaluate current conditions of the prison, jail, and community corrections populations, respond to the needs of corrections by providing assistance and educational opportunities to correctional staff and administrators. NIC's SEPPN uses the BJS national and

state-level data on P&P population flows and outcomes in their work in developing performance measures for community corrections.

Office of Justice Programs (OJP) – regularly, the Assistant Attorney General’s (AAG) office requests BJS data on community corrections on a variety of topics. Most recently, requests have focused on the current size of the community corrections population, the decline in the population during 2009, and the volume of offenders moving onto and off of probation and parole. The most recent P&P data provided by BJS to the AAG will be included on a “Corrections and Reentry” page of a new website that OJP is launching in the summer of 2011. The objective of the site is to provide users with information about the extent of the evidence of the effectiveness of justice-related programs.

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) – to improve knowledge and understanding of crime and justice issues. NIJ’s CCRN also uses the BJS national and state-level on probation and parole population flows and outcomes in their work in developing performance measures for community corrections. In addition, publications sponsored by NIJ cite BJS P&P data, in particular the size of the community corrections population. For example:

Bales, W., Mann, K., Blomberg, T., Gaes, G., Barrick, K., Dhungana, K., & McManus, B. (2010). *A Quantitative and Qualitative Assessment of Electronic Monitoring*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Klein, A., Wilson, D., Crowe, A., & DeMichele, M. (2008). *Evaluation of the Rhode Island Probation Specialized Domestic Violence Supervision Unit*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) – to justify the allocation of funding for grant programs, such as BJA’s State Criminal Justice Reform and Recidivism program, which is part of the Criminal Justice Reinvestment Act of 2009. The data are used to illustrate the size and growth in the community corrections population to assist policy makers develop the information they need to make informed decisions and develop strategies that will reduce criminal justice costs, improve public safety through a reduction in recidivism, and improve outcomes for offenders reentering the community. Also, see BJA-funded publications listed under “American Probation and Parole Association (APPA)” below that have also used the BJS P&P data.

State governments (i.e. community corrections agencies) – to assess conditions within their own jurisdictions relative to others and at the national level. For example, the state of Georgia uses the BJS data on parole outcomes to provide national and state comparative benchmarks in managing its parole supervision program. Some state-level officials rely on the BJS’ historical P&P

data to assess trends in their state's community corrections population over time, as well as anticipate future trends.

American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) – to encourage public awareness of probation and parole, develop standards for probation and parole programs, educate the community corrections field, and to establish training programs for probation and parole officers and executives. APPA's quarterly newsletter, *Community Corrections Headlines*, announces the release of the annual BJS report on community corrections to the field and also provides a link to the report on the BJS website. APPA publishes a professional journal, *Perspectives*, which has cited BJS probation and parole data, in particular the size of the populations and the growth in the populations over time. APPA's website also hosts a page for APPA publications and reports and a number of them have cited BJS' annual P&P data. Some examples are:

Burrell, W. (2005.) *Trends in Probation and Parole in the States*. In *The Book of the States*, vol. 37, edited by Keon S. Chi. Lexington, KY Council of State Governments.

DeMichele, M. & Payne, B. (2009), *Offender Supervision with Electronic Technology: Community Corrections Resource*, funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DeMichele, M. (2007). *Probation and Parole's Growing Caseloads and Workload Allocation: Strategies for Managerial Decision Making*. Lexington, KY: American Probation and Parole Association.

Layton, L., McFarland, D., & Kincaid, D. *Official's Guide to Community Corrections Options, Second Edition*, funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

The PEW Foundation's report "One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections" used BJS' P&P data to report on the size of the community supervision population, and along with BJS' NPS and ASJ data, reported on the size of the total correctional population. PEW cited the finding reported in numerous BJS press releases and products on the prevalence of correctional supervision in the United States. Through their use of BJS' P&P data, PEW has echoed BJS' findings about the majority of growth in the correctional population over time being attributed to the growth in the community corrections populations. PEW has in turn used this information to make their case for reducing costs of institutional corrections and reallocating resources to supervision of the largest component of the correctional population, the probation and parole populations. Other PEW reports, such as *When Offenders Break the Rules: Smart Responses to Parole and Probation Violations*, have also cited the annual P&P data to illustrate the size of the populations and the growth in the populations over time.

Other non-profit organizations — the Sentencing Project released an article (December 2010) titled *New BJS Report Shows First Decline in Correctional Populations in Decades* which indicates the declines in the probation and parole populations measured through the annual P&P surveys are in large part a result of changes in policies and not necessarily a direct outcome of crime rates. Some other examples of the uses of BJS' P&P data by other non-profit organizations are listed below:

Burke, P., & Tonry, M. (2006). *Transition and Reentry for Safer Communities: A Call to Action for Parole*. Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy.

Jannetta, J., Elderbroom, B., Solomon, A., Cahill, M., Parthasarathy, B., & Burrell, W. (2009) *An Evolving Field: Findings from the 2008 Parole Practices Study*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Jannetta, J. & Halberstadt, R. (2010) *Kiosk Supervision for the District of Columbia*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Solomon, A., Kachnowski, V., & Bhati, A. (2005) *Does Parole Work? Analyzing the Impact of Postprison Supervision on Rearrest Outcomes*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Solomon, A., Osborne J., Winterfield, L., Elderbroom, B., Burke, P., Stroker, R., Rhine, E., & Burrell, W. (2008). *Putting Public Safety First: 13 Parole Supervision Strategies to Enhance Reentry Outcomes (Paper)*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Solomon, A., Osborne, J., Winterfield, L., Elderbroom, B., Burke, P., Stroker, R., Rhine, E., & Burrell, W. (2008). *Putting Public Safety First: 13 Strategies for Successful Supervision and Reentry (Policy Brief)*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Independent researchers – to estimate the impact of incarceration and community corrections on crime, to evaluate community corrections and criminal justice policies and practices, and to develop effective programs and supervision strategies. The P&P data have been used to conduct a variety of research, for example:

Lin, J., Grattet, R., Petersilia, J. (2010) “‘Back-End Sentencing’ and Reimprisonment: Individual, Organizational, and Community Predictors of Parole Sanctioning Decisions.” *American Society of Criminology*, 48(3), pp. 759-795.

Petersilia, J. (2003). *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Siegel, L. & Bartollas, C. (2011). *Corrections Today*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Stinchcomb, J.B. (2011). *Corrections*. New York, NY: Routledge.

National Criminal Justice Reference Service– to support research, policy, and program development in the criminal justice field, and in particular community corrections, by hosting a link to the most recent BJS report on the community corrections population on their “Corrections” page for “Parole and Probation” (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Topics/Topic.aspx?topicid=17>).

Media – to inform the public about current trends in the community corrections populations. For example, the Washington Examiner published an article (December 2010) titled *More on Probation, Parole in Region; Prison Population Drops* which focused on population changes in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia and compared those changes to changes observed at the national level.

The public – to make informed decisions about crime and punishment within their own jurisdictions. BJS’s Corrections Unit’s staff receive regular inquiries from ASKBJs, BJS’ online information request mechanism. The P&P data are relied on to answer questions about trends in growth in the probation and parole populations, factors related to changes in the populations, such as outcomes of offenders supervised in the community and trends in outcomes, the volume of offenders entering and exiting community supervision, the types of offenses for which offenders are supervised on probation or parole, the use of electronic monitoring to supervise offenders, and offender characteristics, such as the sex and racial compositions of the community corrections populations.

BJS has made the annual P&P data available to community corrections executives, data providers, and associations, Congress, components of the U.S. Department of Justice, researchers, the media, and the public through multiple products, including tables published on the BJS website, timely press releases, and annual bulletins that report the most recent national findings related to the size of the community corrections populations, changes in the populations, and factors related to those changes. These reports include *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2009* (see Attachment 4), and in 2009 a new report released by BJS titled *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2009* (see Attachment 3). In addition to providing summary data on the total correctional population, this new report allowed BJS to focus more attention on how data from the P&P surveys changed in relation to other components of the correctional population, as well as the size of the community corrections population relative to institutional corrections.

Since 2006, BJS has also made efforts to enhance the reporting of the annual P&P data based on the community corrections field's interest in comparing and understanding the circumstances within other states. Since 2006, BJS has not only published the annual P&P bulletin focusing on the national findings, but has also published detailed state tables providing data on the characteristics of the probation and parole populations and other state-level information. The 2008 and 2009 reports not only included the detailed state-level tables, but also included state-specific notes explaining some of the state data in particular tables, including some of the caveats of the data reported, to assist readers and data users in interpretation. Another enhancement BJS has made in reporting the community corrections data has been to track and describe changes in reporting within particular jurisdictions over time to not only assist readers and data users in interpreting the national trends, but also the trends within those specific states and the limitations in making comparisons to data from previous years. BJS has received positive feedback from the field about these enhancements to the annual P&P statistical product. For instance, the Director of Field Operations at the Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles has contacted BJS directly after the release of both the 2008 and 2009 reports with positive feedback. In addition to the enhancements related to the state-specific tables and notes, the Director indicated that he has been "impressed" with the way in which BJS has highlighted the most important findings and described the different factors related to population changes. His most recent comments about the 2009 report included the following statement: "The report is of greater utility to our profession because of the modifications that you have made in recent years and your solicitation of feedback from practitioners."

The Future of BJS' Community Corrections Collections

The need for clear, concise, and standardized definitions to improvement measurement of the P&P survey constructs has been repeatedly reinforced by community corrections stakeholders because of the field's use of the data to make various comparisons at both the national and state levels. The field acknowledges that states vary widely in the way in which they conduct supervision because of the differences related to supervision policies and practices across states, the ways in which they measure constructs, and the ways in which they track information. These differences necessitate uniform definitions to ensure comparability across states, and BJS has always strived to make the data as comparable and consistent as possible. BJS has continued to work with stakeholders to identify problematic definitions and has made efforts to refine definitions to improve comprehension or to address changes in the nature of probation and parole supervision, and thereby enhance data quality. For example, historically the P&P surveys have measured the number of probationers and parolees supervised actively, which means they regularly report to a probation or parole authority through any one of multiple reporting modes (i.e., mail, telephone, and in-person visits). Recently, stakeholders have

expressed the need to include electronic reporting, such as reporting through kiosk systems, as part of the definition of “active” supervision. (This change is reflected in the current drafts of the P&P questionnaires for approval and addressed again in section B, item 4, “Testing of Procedures.) More probation and parole agencies have adopted this method of supervision to supervise low-risk offenders because it not only can replace in-person visits and is convenient to both offenders and officers, but also allows agencies to shift resources to moderate- and high-risk probationers and parolees who need more intensive interventions and monitoring.

Discussions with the community corrections field have also provided BJS with opportunities to obtain feedback and input about substantive topics of importance to the field but ones in which data are lacking. For example, APPA, and other associations such as the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), have identified hazardous duty statistics as a key priority issue for them. APPA has a standing committee on health and safety of community corrections officers, and for several years BJS has participated in committee meetings to discuss the need for routine hazardous duty data — for example, officers killed or assaulted — specifically incident-level data, that can be used to improve officer safety through training or other means, such as protective equipment. Because BJS’ current P&P surveys do not have the capacity to collect incident-level data, but rather aggregate data, and because the unit of analysis in the annual P&P collections is the offender and not the officer, BJS has determined that these surveys are not the appropriate vehicle to collect the data. However, BJS currently has plans to explore the feasibility of collecting these data through a project that is scheduled to begin in October 2011. The scope of the project involves designing and testing an incident-based reporting system to collect data on the number and characteristics of assaults and homicides against probation and parole officers, and determining the feasibility of a national implementation. After the design of the reporting system has been completed, BJS will return to OMB for approval in order to conduct a pilot study to test the new data collection vehicle.

Other issues and substantive themes have also emerged through discussions with community corrections stakeholders. For example, APPA and community corrections researchers have expressed the need for a complete frame of all public and private probation supervising agencies and offices in the United States.⁶ While BJS would rely on this work to systematically assess, and potentially improve, the coverage of population universe for the Annual Probation Survey, the field has expressed the need for the frame to conduct future research, such as national surveys of probationers or probation officers.⁷ These same stakeholders have identified an information gap related to the structure, organization, and functions of probation agencies, as well as

⁶ The last time a census of probation agencies and offices was conducted was in 1991 when BJS administered the 1991 Census of Probation and Parole Agencies (OMB #1121-0169). The last time a census of parole agencies and offices was conducted was in 2006 when BJS administered the 2006 Census of Adult Parole Supervising Agencies (also OMB #1121-0169).

information about staffing and even more importantly, officers' caseloads and workload given the increase in the probation population over time.⁸ To fulfill these needs of the field, BJS is currently working on a project with Westat, Inc. through a cooperative agreement to develop a comprehensive roster of probation supervising agencies and offices and to design a questionnaire to measure key constructs that will allow BJS to provide both national and state-specific estimates of the organization, characteristics, and operations of adult probation supervising agencies. BJS and Westat, Inc. are currently working on designing the questionnaire and developing the frame through available sources, such as the Annual Probation Survey agencies, commercial databases or directories; membership lists of professional associations; state and local government publications, websites, and other sources; U.S. Census Bureau's Government Integrated; and other sources. Once the questionnaire is completed, BJS will return to OMB for approval for the national implementation of the 2012 Census of Adult Probation Supervising Agencies (CAPSA).

3. Use of Information Technology

Historically, the Annual Parole Survey has been primarily a mail questionnaire but an online form reporting option was provided to respondents beginning with the 2006 collection. Currently, the main mode of data collection for the Annual Parole Survey is the web instrument. As of May 19, 2011, with 78% of parole respondents having submitted their responses for the 2010 reference year, 81% (35 of 43 respondents) had provided their data via the web, with the remainder of respondents choosing to either provide the data by mail or fax or through follow-up interviews conducted by way of telephone or email (see Attachment 5). Use of the web by parole respondents has grown steadily from 56% in 2007 (30 of 54 respondents), to 64% in 2008 (35/55), to 69% in 2009 (38/55), the last year for which data collection is complete. The relatively rapid adoption of the web among parole agency respondents since its introduction in 2006 (for which only anecdotal information is available) is a reflection of the fact that almost all parole respondents are central reporters (i.e., agencies that report data for the entire state or multiple jurisdictions) and these central reporting offices are typically more technologically advanced, and more accustomed to working online and with submitting data electronically.

The questions on the web option mimic the look of the presentation of the questions on the paper version, and the web option includes the OMB number,

⁷ The last time a national survey of probationers was conducted was in 1995 when BJS administered the Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995. The findings were reported in: Bonczar, T.P. (1997) *Characteristics of Adults on Probation, 1995*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, D.C. <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/cap95.pdf>. A national survey of probation officers has never been conducted.

⁸ A 1999 NIC report is the most recent report that provides some of this information. Krauth, B., & Linke, L. (1999). *State Organizational Structures for Delivering Adult Probation Services*. Longmont, CO: NIC Information Center, National Institute of Corrections, U. S. Department of Justice.

general information/contact information, instructions, and burden statement (see Attachment 6).

BJS will attempt to achieve the goal of obtaining 100% of parole data online within the next data collection cycle given the advantages of web surveys compared to other modes, including reduced costs, in particular related to data entry (easier to process data, as responses could be downloaded to a spreadsheet, data analysis package, or a database); dynamic error checking capability and the ability to incorporate complex skip patterns, thereby reducing the potential for response errors; the inclusion of pop-up instructions for selected questions; and the use of drop-down boxes.^{9,10,11} Most of these advantages are not possibilities for paper surveys. For the 2011 Annual Parole Survey, BJS will utilize a multi-mode design in which respondents will be directed to the primary mode of data collection, the web, by providing them with instructions for submitting their data via the web. Paper forms, including electronic .pdf copies, will continue to be available as a back-up mode of submission if respondents indicate they prefer that mode.

As the following table shows, respondents to the Annual Probation Survey have also steadily increased their use of the web, rising from 19% in 2007 (89 of a total 464 respondents in 2007) to 33% (155/466) in 2009. As of May 19, 2011, with 91% of probation respondents having provided their data, 37% had provided their data via the web for the 2010 reference year.

Some smaller probation agencies at the local level have been unable to complete the CJ-8 Annual Probation Survey long form (see Attachment 7; draft 2011 form). They may have limited record keeping systems and limited financial and personnel resources which would permit them to do additional tabulations necessary, may not need or use detailed data in the management of their supervision population, and may not wish to invest in the collection of the additional data elements requested by the long form. The CJ-8A Annual Probation Survey (Short Form) (see Attachment 8; draft 2011 form) was created, and approved by OMB in the 2001 submission, to minimize burden while nevertheless collecting basic information which is currently available. The determination of who is to get the CJ-8A (Short Form) has been based on the capacity to report the data, as determined by past reporting and conversations with individual respondents. (See part A, item 5, "Impact on Small Businesses or Entities/Efforts to Minimize Burden" for more information regarding agencies that receive the short form.) There is no short form for the Annual Parole Survey; the short form only applies to the Annual Probation Survey.

⁹ Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: the tailored design methods*. Second edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

¹⁰ Cobanoglu, C., Warde, B., & Moreo, P.J. (2001). *A comparison of mail, fax, and Web-based survey methods*. *International Journal of Market Research*, 43(4), 441-452.

¹¹ Skitka, L. J., & Sargis, E. G. (2006). The Internet as psychological laboratory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 529-555.

Percentage of probation forms submitted by web, by type of form and year

Year	Type of form		
	All	Long form (CJ-8)	Short form (CJ-8A)
2007	19% (89/464)	--*	--*
2008	21% (100/467)	23% (79/343)	17% (21/124)
2009	33% (155/466)	39% (118/306)	23% (37/160)
2010*	37% (157/422)	44% (120/273)	25% (37/149)

*Data on method of return by type of form were not collected in 2007. No data are available for 2006, the first year in which the web option was offered.

**As of May 19, 2011

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent the number of respondents who submitted their data utilizing that particular option divided by the total number of respondents in that category.

Rates of submission of probation data via the web for the 2010 reference year were nearly 20% higher among those submitting the long form (CJ-8), as compared with the short form (CJ-8A) as of May 19, 2011. Rates were highest among state agencies, with 86% (36/42) of those who have already submitted their data having done so via the web (not shown in table).

BJS will attempt to achieve the goal of having the majority of probation agency respondents submitting their data via the web during the 2011 reference year collection by employing methods similar to those to be used among parole respondents. All 306 agencies which complete the long form (CJ-8), and those agencies which have previously submitted the short form (CJ-8A) via the web, will initially only be provided with instructions for submitting their data via the web. Paper forms, including electronic .pdf copies, will be available upon the request of respondents, and at the time of the initial survey request, will be sent to selected smaller agencies that receive the short form and have previously responding using the paper option. (See section B, item 3, “Methods to Maximize Response” for more information.)

Following the completion of the 2011 data collection, BJS will reevaluate the effectiveness of this strategy, and will make adjustments with the goal of doubling the current rate of web submission among probation agency respondents to at least 75% within three years (by the 2013 reference year). As part of the assessment, BJS will analyze data collected through its planned census of probation supervising agencies (2012 CAPSA, referenced above) including whether the selected smaller agencies that receive the short form have access to the web and whether they submitted their 2012 CAPSA data via the web. This will assist BJS in determining whether the paper forms should not be sent along with the initial survey request to the selected smaller agencies that receive the short form, and instead only provide the instructions to them for submitting their data via the web in an attempt to increase response rates for the

web option among this group. To also aid in the achievement of this goal, BJS will explore the development of a friendlier web interface which displays questions to respondents in a guided fashion, with just one question per page. In contrast to scrolling web surveys, which has been the design of the web interface for the P&P collection since 2006, the interactive features make the web-based survey more user-friendly and may result in higher completion rates.¹²

BJS also relies upon information technology to disseminate information from the P&P surveys via bulletins, press releases, and spreadsheets made available to the public on the BJS website at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2233>. Data from the P&P surveys are also prominently featured in the new 2009 BJS report on the total correctional population, and made available to the public via bulletin, press release, and spreadsheets on the BJS website at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2316>.

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

BJS staff have completed reviews of other surveys, reviews of other federal data collections, and reviews of literature in order to identify duplication. This review has led to a conclusion that the annual P&P surveys uniquely provide information that is not collected elsewhere. Along the way, BJS staff have also noted how other collections complement BJS collections.

The National Survey of Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), which is sponsored by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), is an annual household survey which conducts interviews with randomly selected individuals in the non-institutionalized population age 12 or older. The purpose of the survey is to provide yearly national and state level estimates of alcohol, tobacco, illicit drug, non-medical prescription drug use, and other health-related issues, including mental health. The NSDUH also collects data on the number of persons who were on probation or parole in the 12 months prior to the interview, which is different from BJS' surveys which provide a one-day snapshot of the populations. In addition, the BJS' P&P Surveys collect data on the probation and parole population movements and outcomes, which the NSDUH does not. For example, the BJS surveys collect data on revocation of supervision, return to prison or jail, and completion of community supervision. In addition, the BJS surveys collect data on the criminal justice system characteristics of both populations, such as offense type, maximum sentence, and supervision status, which the NSDUH does not. Hence, the BJS data provide information that allows users to integrate information about probation and parole populations into the larger criminal justice system.

¹² Manfreda, L.K., Batagelj, Z., and Vehovar, V. (2002) Design of web survey questionnaires: Three basic experiments, *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication* 7(3), and Couper, M.P. (2008). *Designing effective web surveys*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

The National Criminal Justice Treatment Practices Survey (NCJTPS), which was sponsored by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), was a survey that provided data on existing treatment programs across all correctional settings, including prison, jails, probation and parole agencies, and local community correction agencies for juvenile and adult offenders. The NCJTPS collected data on the number of probationers and parolees supervised by agencies at the time of the interview, but definitional differences exist between the NCJTPS and the BJS surveys. Some sub-populations fell within the scope of the NCJTPS which do not fall within the scope of the BJS surveys. In addition, the national-level estimates provided by the NCJTPS are associated with large standard errors because the sample size was small, which is not a limitation of the BJS data because the data are a complete enumeration of all probation and parole offenders that fall within the scope of the BJS surveys. Lastly, the NCJTPS cannot provide state-level estimates, and as is the case with the NSDUH as well, did not collect data on population movements, outcomes, or characteristics of the probation and parole population.

The International Survey of Releasing Authorities was sponsored by the Association of Paroling Authorities International (APAI), Center for Research on Youth and Social Policy (CRYSP) at the University of Pennsylvania, the Pew Foundation, and the Georgia State Board of Pardons and Paroles. This survey collected data from every parole releasing authority that was a member of APAI at the time of the survey (2007) and provided data about parole policies and practices. No parole population data was collected, which is the main objective of the BJS parole survey.

In addition to the P&P Surveys, the BJS maintains the Federal Judicial Statistics Program (FJSP) whose key purpose is to examine the unique characteristics of the federal system, and to report on changes and trends on a federal fiscal year basis. The FJSP provides data on federal offenders under supervision for the BJS annual P&P surveys, but the FJSP data are limited only to federal offenders and do not cover state populations. With the knowledge and consent of BJS' respondent at the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AOUSC), federal data collected by the FJSP from AOUSC are used to fulfill the federal data needs of the P&P surveys.

Although some probation and parole data has been collected through other surveys, no exact duplicative efforts were uncovered during a search of the National Criminal Justice Service repository. BJS is the only federal government agency that collects aggregate data on the probation and parole stock population, the movements of the parole and probation population, outcomes of the population, characteristics of the parole and probation population, and collects all of this data at both the national and state levels. No other organizations collect comparable data on parole and probation.

5. Impact on Small Businesses or Entities/Efforts to Minimize Burden

Survey forms are sent to central reporters whenever possible to minimize the reporting burden. Since the last OMB submission, two local respondents were added for the Annual Probation Survey. This increase was necessary as the information from these two agencies was not available from a central state reporter. One respondent was also added to the Annual Parole Survey, so as to comply with a request from the Pennsylvania state respondent to separately report data for the state and for counties on two separate forms. Separate reporting for the state and counties served to reduce the burden for this respondent by eliminating the need to footnote the data to indicate those items for which only partial (state) data have been available.

As noted in part A, item 3, "Use of Information Technology" received OMB approval in 2001, to collect critical information from local-level probation agencies using the CJ-8A Annual Probation Survey (Short Form) (attachment 8; draft 2011 form) that have been unable to provide the longer list of data elements requested by the CJ-8 Annual Probation Survey long form (see Attachment 7; draft 2011 form). Use of the short form serves to minimize the burden while nevertheless collecting basic information which is currently available. Although the determination of who is to get the CJ-8A (Short Form) has been based on the capacity to report the data, as determined by past reporting and conversations with individual respondents, the respondents who have been offered this option have been primarily small entities. Agencies that received the CJ-8A (Short Form) accounted for about 5% of the more than 4.2 million offenders on probation at yearend 2009. The average yearend probation population was 1,378, among agencies that received the CJ-8A (Short Form) in 2009, while those that had received the long form, CJ-8, was 13,020, or nearly 10 times larger.

The CJ-8A (Short Form) includes what BJS considers to be key data elements necessary to track changes in the total population under community supervision; these core elements have been collected since the P&P series began. This approach to minimizing burden is also believed to be the best approach to maximizing response rates with a minimal effect on data quality.

Since the last OMB submission, the number of respondents receiving the CJ-8A (Short Form) was increased from 120 to 160 respondents, with a corresponding decrease in the number of respondents who are being sent the Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8, long form. While evidence that the CJ-8 (Long Form) was placing a burden on these agencies was the primary reason these agencies were switched to the CJ-8A (Short Form), as will be described below, the objective of this strategy was to reduce the burden on small entities that lack the resources to complete the long form. At yearend 2009, these 40 agencies had an average probation population of 1,518, or just 10% larger than among all 160 agencies sent the short form (1,378; see above).

Just prior to the 2009 collection year, 34 respondents were identified as having provided only a minimal amount of data in the previous two data collection cycles, and as having been chronically late in providing a response. Many of these respondents cited an inability to provide detailed information as the reason for their late responses. In an effort to improve response rates, these 34 respondents were converted to the CJ-8A short form at the outset of the 2009 collection cycle in lieu of the CJ-8 long form. Conversions to the CJ-8A short form resulted in more timely submissions among these 34 respondents, and an overall increase in the number of data elements they provided, thereby improving the overall data quality of the Annual Probation Survey. Over the course of the 2009 collection, 18 of the 34 respondents (53%) provided more information for reference year 2009 than in either of the two previous years, 13 (38%) provided the same amount of information, and just 3 (9%) provided less. Note that an additional 6 respondents already had been converted from a CJ-8 long form to a CJ-8A short form during the 2007 and 2008 data collection cycles for similar reasons.

6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

Less than annual collection of P&P surveys would both result in a break in series—as noted previously, these two surveys have been collected annually since 1977—and a diminution in BJS capacities to track changes in community supervision populations. One of the main purposes of these surveys is to provide comparative data across states on community corrections. Less than annual collection of the data could preclude BJS from describing changes in the year in which they occurred, such as the first decline observed in the community supervision population during 2009 since the P&P surveys began in 1980, and the ability to determine which states have had a significant impact on the changes in the community corrections population over time. This would diminish the usefulness of these data for the broader stakeholder community, and it would diminish BJS' capacity to provide accurate measures of the growth and change in these populations.

7. Special Circumstances Influencing Collection

There are no special circumstances in conducting this information collection. Collection is consistent with the guidelines as listed in 5 CFR 1320.6. These data will be collected in a manner consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6.

8. Federal Register Publication and Outside Consultation

The research under this clearance is consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6. The 60-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 76, Number 59, pages 17152-17153 on March 28, 2011. The 30-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 76, Number 106, pages 31989-31991, on June 2, 2011. No public

comments were received in response to the 60-day notice.

BJS has consulted with states' departments of corrections staff, administrators from both state and local probation and parole agencies, local probation and parole officers and researchers, and criminal justice experts to collect a wide range of opinions in order to improve survey measurement, data collection, reporting, procedures, data analysis, and presentation. The following individuals provided valuable advice and comments on the content and design of these data collection instruments:

Mr. William Adams
FJSRC Analyst
The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 261-5506

Ms. Barbara Broderick
Chief Probation Officer
Maricopa County Adult Probation
111 S. 3rd Avenue
P.O. Box 3407
Phoenix, AZ 85030
(602) 506-7244

Ms. Cynthia Burke, Director
Criminal Justice Research
SANDAG
401 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 699-1910

Ms. Peggy Burke
Center for Effective Public Policy
8403 Colesville Road, Suite 720
Silver Spring, MD 20910
(301) 589-3505

Mr. William D. Burrell, Consultant
37 Cliveden Court
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648
(609) 895-0212

Mr. Matthew DeMichele
Senior Research Associate
American Probation and Parole Association

c/o The Council of State Governments
2760 Research Park Drive
Lexington, KY 40511-8482

Mr. Kermit Humphries
Community Corrections Branch
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20534
(202) 307-3106, Ext. 136

Mr. Calvin Johnson, Director
Research and Evaluation
Court Services & Offender Supervision Agency
633 Indiana Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 220-5300

Ms. Jean Kuehl, Assistant Director
Department of Correctional Services
Sixth Judicial District
951 29th Avenue SW
Cedar Rapids, IA 52404
(319) 398-3675

Mr. William McDevitt, Jr.
PA Board of Probation & Parole
1101 S. Front Street, Suite 5500
Harrisburg, PA 17104
(717) 787-7461

Ms. Catherine McVey, Chair
Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole
1101 South Front Street, Suite 5100
Harrisburg, PA 17104-2517
(717) 787-5699

Ms. Geraldine Nagy, Director
Travis County Adult Probation Department
411 W. 13th St., # 400
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 854-4600

Mr. Mario Paporozzi
University of North Carolina at Pembroke
Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, Professor and Department Chair
P.O. Box 1510

One University Drive
Pembroke, NC 28372 1510
(910) 522-5783

Ms. Faye Taxman, Professor
Administration of Justice Program
George Mason University
10900 University Blvd.
Manassas, VA 20110
(703) 993-8555

Mr. Steve Van Dine
Research, Chief, Bureau of Research
Ohio Department of Rehabilitation & Correction
770 West Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43222
(614) 752-1269

Mr. Carl Wicklund, Executive Director
American Probation and Parole Association
c/o The Council of State Governments
2760 Research Park Drive
Lexington, KY 40511-8482
(606) 244-8216

9. Paying Respondents

Participation in the P&P surveys is voluntary and no gifts or incentives will be given.

10. Assurance of Confidentiality

According to 42 U.S.C. 3735 Section 304, the information gathered in this data collection shall be used only for statistical or research purposes, and shall be gathered in a manner that precludes their use for law enforcement or any purpose relating to a particular individual other than statistical or research purposes. The data collected through the P&P surveys represent institutional characteristics of publicly-administered or funded facilities and are, therefore, in the public domain. The individual probation or parole agencies that do submit data are notified that BJS will only publish aggregate counts at the state level. In addition, no individually identifiable information is provided and all counts are simply too large to attribute to an individual.

11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

Not applicable. There are no questions of a sensitive nature included in the P&P surveys. In addition, the data collected and published from the surveys are aggregate counts from which the identity of specific private persons cannot reasonably be determined.

12. Estimate of Hour Burden

A separate form will be used for each survey. The CJ-7 will be sent to 55 state, federal, and local parole departments, the CJ-8 will be sent to 306 state, federal and local probation departments, and the CJ-8A will be sent to 160 local probation departments. The respondent burden is kept to a minimum by centrally collecting data from state departments whenever possible and by distributing the CJ-8A (Short Form) to local probation agencies with limited record-keeping and/or information systems and limited financial and personnel resources. The federal data are now obtained indirectly from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts through BJS’ Federal Justice Statistics Program; we have chosen to include the collection of federal data in this calculation. The burden hours include the average time required per respondent to complete the survey plus the average time devoted to follow-up contact conducted by the data collection agent or BJS to resolve discrepancies in the data reported by respondents or to collect data/estimates from respondents on missing data elements. The burden hours will be:

<i>Type of form</i>	<i>Number of respondents</i>	<i>Average time to complete forms</i>	<i>Average follow-up time</i>	<i>Total average time required</i>	<i>Annual reporting hours</i>
CJ-7	55	1.5	0.25	1.75	96
CJ-8	306	1.5	0.25	1.75	536
CJ-8A	160	0.5	0.125	0.625	100
Total	521	1.19	0.21	1.40	732

13. Estimate of Respondent Cost

Survey packets will be mailed to each respondent, and questionnaires along with a self-addressed stamped envelope will be mailed to respondents upon request. (See section A, item 16, “Project Schedule” for more information about the survey packet and other data collection materials.) The information requested is normally maintained electronically as administrative records in the parole and probation agencies. The only costs respondents will incur are costs associated with their time. Other than these costs, there are no additional costs to the respondent.

At an estimate of \$30 per hour, both the CJ-7 and CJ-8 forms are estimated to take 1.5 hours each per year plus an additional 0.25 hours for follow-up efforts for a total cost of \$52.50 per respondent. The estimated total burden for all 55 CJ-7 respondents and all 306 CJ-8 respondents is \$18,953. The CJ-8A (Short

Form) is estimated to take 0.5 hours per year plus an additional 0.125 hours for follow-up for a total cost of \$18.75 per respondent, and a total estimated respondent cost of \$3,000 for all 160 CJ-8A (Short Form) respondents. The total respondent cost for the entire collection is \$21,953. However, by distributing the CJ-8A (Short Form) to 160 local probation agencies, BJS is relieving each of those respondents of an estimated 1 hour per year plus an additional 0.125 hours of follow-up efforts, or \$33.75, for a total cost savings of \$5,400.

14. Cost to the Federal Government

Currently, the division of labor for a data collection cycle on the annual P&P surveys is as follows: The Census Bureau maintains and updates the website and database, conducts the mail-out of survey packages, conducts follow-up efforts, collects the data, and prepares a dataset for BJS analysis. BJS staff analyze the data, prepare statistical tables, write reports based on these data, and archive the data for public use.

Based upon actual costs incurred during 2008 and 2009, the estimated costs to the government associated with the collection, processing, and publication of reports, preparation of data tables, and archiving data for these two annual collections are projected for collecting and processing the 2011 reference year data and are shown in the table that follows. Total estimated costs of about \$229,700 are divided between Census collection costs (\$170,000) and BJS analysis, reporting and dissemination costs (about \$57,700). Both BJS and Census costs include salary, fringe, and overhead. Census costs include costs in addition to salary as described in the table below.

<i>Estimated costs for 2011 probation and parole surveys</i>	
BJS costs	
Staff salaries	
GS-13 Statistician (25%)	\$28,936
GS-15 Supervisory Statistician (3%)	\$4,208
GS-15 Chief Editor (3%)	\$4,208
Other Editorial Staff	\$2,100
Front-Office Staff (GS-15 & Directors)	\$1,100
Subtotal salaries	\$40,552
Fringe benefits (28% of salaries)	\$11,354
Subtotal: Salary & fringe	\$51,906
Other administrative costs of salary & fringe (15%)	\$ 7,794
Subtotal: BJS costs	\$57,700
Census costs	
Staff, printing, mailout, fax and phone followup, programming, software & hardware maintenance, fringe benefits, and Census overhead)	\$170,000
Total estimated costs	\$229,700

Estimated Census expenditures have been revised downward from the \$225,000 estimated at the time of the last OMB submission for the 2008 P&P collection year, which included \$25,000 for web development expenses, and \$200,000 for

other Census costs (staff, printing, mailout, fax and phone followup, programming, software & hardware maintenance, fringe benefits, and Census overhead). With the development of a stable data collection website which needs only minimal maintenance to update it for subsequent data collection years, the \$25,000 budgeted for web development costs has been eliminated. Other Census costs have been reduced from an estimated \$200,000 for 2008 to \$170,000 for 2011 to reflect the return of unspent funds for the P&P collection.

During the upcoming year, BJS will reviews data collection procedures and seek ways to minimize data collection costs.

15. Reason for Change in Burden

Total burden hours, and for each type of form, increased because additional time was factored in to account for follow-up efforts conducted by the data collection agent or BJS to resolve discrepancies in the data reported by respondents or to collect data on missing data elements or determine if estimates can be easily provided. An additional 0.25 burden hours were added for follow-up efforts for each of the 55 respondents to the Annual Parole Survey, CJ-7, and each of the 306 respondents to the Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8 (Long Form), resulting in an increase in the burden of 90 hours. An additional 0.125 burden hours were added for follow-up efforts for each of the 160 respondents to the Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8A (Short Form), resulting in an increase in the burden of 20 hours. The total increase in burden hours resulting from the additional time for follow-up contact is 110 hours.

The number of respondents for the Annual Probation Survey increased from 464 to 466 due to the addition of two local probation agencies for the Annual Probation Survey to collect information that is not available from a central state reporter. Both respondents are being asked to complete the Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8 (Long Form) resulting in an increase in the burden of 3.0 hours plus an additional 0.5 hours for follow-up efforts, for a total increase of 3.5 hours.

Since the last OMB submission, the number of respondents receiving the CJ-8A (Short Form) was increased from 120 to 160 respondents, with a corresponding decrease in the number of respondents who are being sent the Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8 (Long Form). As explained in section A, item 5, "Impact on Small Businesses or Entities/Efforts to Minimize Burden", this was done following a review which revealed 40 respondents who were being asked to complete the CJ-8 long form had not been able to provide the additional data elements requested by the CJ-8 form as compared with the CJ-8A short form for at least two or more years. This change resulted in a net reduction of 1.0 hour plus an additional 0.125 hours for follow-up per respondent, resulting in a decrease in the burden of 45 hours.

As explained in section A, item 5, “Impact on Small Businesses or Entities/Efforts to Minimize Burden”, one respondent was also added to the Annual Parole Survey, so as to comply with a request from the Pennsylvania state respondent to separately report data for the state and for counties on two separate forms. Although separate reporting for the state and counties served to reduce the burden for this respondent by eliminating the need to footnote the data to indicate those items for which only partial (state) data have been available, this is counted as an additional respondent for OMB accounting purposes. This change resulted in the net addition of 1.5 hours plus an additional 0.25 hours for follow-up efforts, for an increase in the burden of 1.75 hours for the Annual Parole Survey.

These changes resulted in the total annual reporting hours increasing from 657 hours to 732 hours, a net increase of 75 hours.

16. Project Schedule

<u>Task</u>	<u>Start date</u>	<u>End date</u>
Data collection	December	May
Notification of impending due dates, nonresponse follow-up, thank you letters	February	May
Data editing, verification, final callbacks	February (March for callbacks)	June
Analysis	May	June
Report writing	July	August
Press release and final report released	November	November

To alert respondents to the upcoming 2011 survey, respondents will be e-mailed or faxed a flyer on December 1, 2011 to let them know to expect to receive a request to complete for the 2011 data collection, and the type of information that will be requested (see Attachment 9). A letter announcing the collection will be sent out in mid-December, requesting all parole agencies to submit data online by February 28, 2012 (see Attachment 10). Probation agencies which completed the long form for reference year 2010, and probation agencies which submitted the short form electronically for 2010, will also receive a letter asking them to submit data online by the same deadline. The cover letter will be

accompanied by two flyers, one of which reinforces the request to submit data online (see Attachment 11), and one which invites respondents to attend the BJS workshop at the American Probation and Parole Association winter conference (see Attachment 12). Paper forms, including electronic .pdf copies, will continue to be available as a back-up mode of submission to respondents upon request (see Attachments 7, 8, 13). Probation agencies which submitted the short form (CJ-8A) via mail for 2010, or provided their response by telephone, will be sent a packet containing a paper copy of the short form. Packets containing paper forms also will be automatically sent to short form nonrespondents who have missed the February 28, 2012 due date.

Because some agencies do not finish their final reports (upon which they base their responses) until mid-summer, the collection cannot be completed until that time. E-mails and faxes will be sent to nonrespondents in mid-February to alert them to the impending February 28, 2012 due date (see Attachments 14 and 15). E-mail and fax reminders will be sent a week after the survey due date to nonrespondents who did not complete the questionnaire by the due date; telephone calls will be made instead to respondents of state agencies and large probation agencies (agencies which had a probation population of approximate 10,000 or more on December 31, 2010, as recorded by the 2010 Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8, item 4) (see Attachment 16). Respondents will also be contacted by telephone or e-mail to discuss any inconsistencies in the reported data or to ask for information not reported on the forms (see Attachment 5), especially if the data were reported in the prior year. To build support, thank you letters will be sent to respondents who have completed their responses (see Attachment 17). The letters will also provide respondents with some information about the status of BJS' 2011 collections on community corrections, including the percent of responses that are complete at the time when the letters are mailed, as a means of building interest. Thank you letters will be sent in batches at the beginning of each month starting in February through June.

After a majority of respondents have submitted data, preliminary analysis will begin. These preliminary analyses are undertaken while data collection is still in progress in order to provide time for making callbacks to clarify data.

After all follow-up efforts and the analysis are completed, the report will be written and the data will be released to the public less than a year after they are collected. Not only does the data result in a published report, but the data will be made available through a Department of Justice press release and additional detailed tables, all of which be posted on the BJS website.

17. Expiration Date Approval

The OMB Control Number and the expiration date will be printed on the CJ-7, CJ-8, and CJ-8A (Short Form) forms and on the web option. See Attachment 6 for

screenshots of the 2011 web-reporting option in which the OMB control number is visible to respondents.

18. Exceptions to the Certification Statement

There are no exceptions to the Certification Statement. The Collection is consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.9.