

B. COLLECTIONS OF INFORMATION EMPLOYING STATISTICAL METHODS

This data collection will be a census of juveniles in custody on the reference date. In the best of all possible scenarios, statistical estimation would not be required. However, given the inevitable facility nonresponse and item nonresponse, OJJDP (as in previous years) will work with the Census Bureau to ensure valid and reliable procedures to estimate the population characteristics.

1. Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods

For this census, OJJDP has defined the universe to include all facilities that hold juveniles as offenders. An “offender” is defined as a youth who has committed a crime or status offense¹ and who is being held because of that offense. It is important that the juvenile be held for the offense and not for some other problem behavior such as alcohol or drug abuse. Also, it is important that the facility specifically be holding the youth for the offense. OJJDP has defined “juveniles” to be any person under 18 years of age, although many states define the age of majority differently (e.g., age 16 in New York and 17 in Wisconsin).

OJJDP intends to survey all public and private facilities in the United States that fulfill these requirements. The 2011 CJRP included a total of 2,472 facilities: 1,080 public and 1,392 private residential facilities. They ran the gamut of environments from open facilities in which the youth reside in a home environment to the high-security training schools that house upwards of 400 youth.

OJJDP has determined that a census will serve the government’s interest better than a sample survey. Based on the input from OJJDP’s outside consultants, the Office determined that a nationally representative sample of facilities would not suffice. States wish to make comparisons among themselves, and given that juvenile justice policy is made at the state level, a national sample would not serve their purposes. Most states have only a few facilities (some just one or two). To create a sample large enough to make adequate state-level estimates, OJJDP would in effect conduct a census in many states. Thus, creation of the state-level estimates of residential placement would almost require a national census.

¹“Status offenses” are offenses that are illegal for minors but not for adults. For example, truancy or running away may be a status offense depending on the state in which the juvenile resides. Other status offenses include incorp, underage drinking, and curfew violations.

2. Information Collection Procedures

To maintain an accurate and complete list of all facilities of interest, OJJDP annually funds a broad agreement with the Census Bureau to maintain a list that includes the facilities' names, addresses, locations, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, and classification information. Although the CJRP collection occurs, biennially, the universe of juvenile residential facilities is supported and maintained on an annual basis because it is used for both the CJRP and Juvenile Residential Facilities Census (JRFC), which occur in alternating years.

To maintain this list, the Census Bureau regularly receives resource materials from OJJDP and other professional and state juvenile justice organizations, and periodically contacts OJJDP grantees, juvenile justice stakeholders, and state juvenile justice agency personnel to gather information on new facilities (births), facility closings (deaths), and changes in facility characteristics. Some of the individuals and organizations contacted to provide updates to the juvenile justice facility universe include:

- Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators;
- National Partnership for Juvenile Services, which is a partnership of: the Council for Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth, the Juvenile Justice Trainers Association, the National Association for Juvenile Correctional Agencies, and the National Juvenile Detention Association;
- State Juvenile Justice Specialists (these individuals oversee the management of OJJDP's State Formula and Block grant funds); and
- State Compliance Monitors (these individuals oversee the monitoring of juvenile justice and adult facilities within the state for compliance with requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act).

Since the initiation of the CJRP in 1997, positive, long-term relationships have developed among the data collection agents at the Census Bureau, OJJDP, and the CJRP/JRFC respondents. Many of the updates result from direct respondent contact with the Census Bureau. Often, new or changed information is written in on submitted CJRP or JRFC survey forms, prompting follow-up as necessary. Additionally, a non-deliverable form returned via the United States Postal Service or a non-response will prompt the Census Bureau to initiate research on a facility to gain updated information. This outreach is often as simple as contacting the respondent on file or a state agency. Depending on the outcome, a more in-depth search may be implemented, at times with OJJDP assistance.

During 2012 (the most recent period for which data are available--through the JRFC), the U.S. Census Bureau identified 154 facilities that reported a total of 156 changes affecting the JRFC/CJRP universe. Please see attached spreadsheets for further information. (Note there are three tabs in the spreadsheet.) These changes include information updates (changes to respondent contact, facility

address and facility name) and status changes (facility births, deaths, merges, and temporary closures).

As for the actual collection of the information through the Census Bureau, OJJDP will pursue the following schedule.

Schedule for Collecting Facility Information	
Time Frame	Action
4 weeks before reference date	Mail advance notice letter
2 weeks before reference date	Mail survey forms
1 week after reference date	Mail reminder letters (non-respondents only)
4 weeks after reference date	Mail a second-notice survey form (non-respondents only)
6 weeks after reference date	Begin telephone follow-up

This schedule was developed based on experience with other censuses and experience in testing and administering the CJRP in previous years. Should circumstances require changes (most likely to move forward the telephone follow-ups), the schedule will be changed accordingly.

Typically, OJJDP has been able to achieve a high response rate (90 to 95 percent) for its facility-based censuses. Such a level of response has proven sufficient for purposes of the designated analysis. The Office expects to continue this high response rate in future administrations of the CJRP.

3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates

OJJDP and the Census Bureau are committed to very high response rates and high-quality data. In 2011, there were a total of 2,472 “in scope” facilities in the universe. For the 2011 CJRP, the response rate was 92 percent (full response), representing 2,280 respondent facilities (this is a significant increase from the 2007 CJRP which had a 76 percent full response rate). An additional 76 facilities provided “critical item information,” and 116 facilities did not respond.

In acknowledgement of the importance of maintaining a high response rate, OJJDP continues to explore and use new techniques which we expect will increase and maintain the existing response rate:

- Electronic reporting in a manner acceptable to the respondent (e.g., in 2011, the Census Bureau implemented a user friendly online reporting mechanism that has yielded good results);
- Streamlined forms and clear response instructions (e.g., the addition of facility type definitions noted under Section A.15);

- Continued support at the Census Bureau through a toll-free number to answer any questions that arise;
- Continuous contact with respondents through e-mail and paper mail (see the schedule for mailout and reminder notices, above); and
- Call-back procedures that continue until data closeout in April/May of the following year.

OJJDP anticipates this ongoing effort to engage respondents will continue to yield positive outcomes.

4. Tests of Procedures

The development of the CJRP followed a solid development design. The Center for Survey Methods Research at the Census Bureau began with semistructured exploratory interviews of 20 respondents. The respondents were varied based on size and type of facility. These interviews were designed to learn how respondents think about the population in their facilities and how they understand various important concepts OJJDP wishes to report on (for example, delinquent versus status offense).

Results of these interviews informed the development of a test instrument, which was reviewed and refined by OJJDP staff and a group of consultants. CSMR used the refined draft instrument to conduct multiple rounds of cognitive interviews with respondents. Based on these interviews, CSMR and OJJDP produced an instrument for pretesting. Using a reference date of October 30, 1996, the Governments Division of the Census Bureau conducted a pre-test of 400 facilities. This test included a small sample of facilities (96) that would receive the Children in Custody (CIC) form so that CSMR could compare the results of these two tests to more accurately judge how the CJRP form performed compared with the CIC. Statisticians at the Center for Survey Methods Research (CSMR) at the Census Bureau analyzed the data and submitted a report to OJJDP.

Since the first full administration of the CJRP in 1997, OJJDP has worked with the Census Bureau to establish and maintain appropriate statistical procedures for the data files. As part of the normal procedures for each CJRP file, the Economic Statistical Methods and Programming Division (ESMPD) of the Census Bureau analyzes the quality of the data and develops methods for imputing for facility nonresponse and item nonresponse. ESMPD provides a detailed report for each file. This report demonstrates the quality of the data collection efforts and the procedures the Governments Division uses to collect the CJRP data. The draft Imputation Report for the 2011 collection is included in Attachment J. A complete Imputation report for the 2009 CJRP is available upon request.

5. Statistical Consultants

Presently, OJJDP funds an Interagency Agreement (IAA) with the Governments Division of the Census Bureau to perform data collection and to maintain the data file and address lists. This IAA also funds the imputation activity (ESMPD) related to the CJRP file. OJJDP funds an IAA with the National Center of Juvenile Justice to host and maintain the statistical briefing book, and funds an evaluation management contract with CSR, Incorporated.

Relevant Contacts:

Stephen Simoncini
Chief, Criminal Justice Statistics Branch
Governments Division
US Census Bureau

Crecilla Scott
Supervisory Statistician, Criminal Justice Statistics Branch
Governments Division
US Census Bureau

Josh Guinta
Statistician, Criminal Justice Statistics Branch
Governments Division
US Census Bureau

Heather West
Supervisory Statistician, Criminal Justice Statistics Branch
Governments Division
US Census Bureau

Suzanne Dorinski
Mathematical Statistician
Governments Division
US Census Bureau

Terri Craig
Chief, Statistical Methods Branch
Governments Division
US Census Bureau

Carma Hogue
Assitant Division Chief, Statistical Research and Methodology
Governments Division
US Census Bureau

Melissa Sickmund and Charles Puzzanchera

National Center for Juvenile Justice
Pittsburgh, PA

Monica Robber and Barbara Allen-Hagan
CSR Incorporated
Arlington, VA