SUPPORTING STATEMENT
Survey of Law Enforcement Personnel in Schools

Overview

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) requests clearance to conduct a new data collection titled the Survey of Law Enforcement Personnel in Schools (SLEPS). SLEPS will provide a better understanding of the roles, functions, and supporting infrastructure of police officers in public K-12 schools. One of the primary goals of SLEPS is to generate detailed, accurate, and reliable national statistics describing the scope, size, characteristics, and functions of law enforcement personnel who work and interact in a school environment. To accomplish this goal, the SLEPS will employ a two-phase approach with a sample of agencies from another BJS data collection, the 2018 Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA; OMB 1121-0346). The first phase of SLEPS will survey law enforcement agencies (LEAs) and the second phase will survey officers from those agencies who work in schools. The 2018 CSLLEA asks agencies to report how many full-time sworn officers served as school resource officers (SROs) or whose primary duties were related to safety in K-12 schools for the last pay period of the 2017-2018 school year. To be considered within scope of SLEPS, an agency must employ at least one full-time sworn SRO.

This new data collection supports BJS's effort in describing the operations of law enforcement agencies and pairs it with the information need surrounding law enforcement in schools. BJS has a strong background in conducting agency surveys, such as the CSLLEA and the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS; OMB 1121-0240) Survey. The SLEPS SRO survey will be BJS's first officer-level survey. BJS conducted extensive testing to ensure success in both phases of SLEPS, including cognitive testing of the LEA and SRO instruments followed by a pre-test of data collection protocols at both the agency and officer levels.

In the first phase, BJS will sample approximately 1,982 agencies of approximately 6,000 law enforcement agencies with at least one full-time SRO. Agencies will be sampled on agency type and the number of school resource officers (SROs) employed. Agency type is stratified into school-based and non-school-based agencies. Non-school-based agencies are then stratified into local police (municipal, county, and regional police) and sheriffs' offices. Local police and sheriffs' offices are then stratified by the number of SROs employed: 1 SRO, 2-4 SROs, 5-9 SROs, 10-24 SROs, and 25+ SROs. School-based agencies are not stratified by the number of SROs because of the relatively small number of agencies that fall into this group and 100% of this agency type will be included in the sample.

These law enforcement agencies will receive a 32-item survey (Attachment 1) asking about agency characteristics; SRO program characteristics; SRO policies and assigned responsibilities; SRO recruitment, training, and supervision; SRO staffing; SRO training; and SRO activities. An officer roster form (Attachment 2) is included with the agency survey, requesting that the agency provide a list of its SROs. The officer rosters are necessary to develop an SRO frame to be used for the second phase of SLEPS.

In the second phase, BJS will sample approximately 4,137 SROs of approximately 18,000 SROs nationally. SROs will be sampled based on the type of agency by which they are employed and

the number of SROs employed by the agency. The same stratification by agency type and number of SROs employed that is used for the agency survey will be used for the officer survey. These officers will receive a 32-item survey (Attachment 3) asking about the officer's experience and characteristics, training, activities while working in schools, and characteristics of their primarily assigned school.

BJS will use web-based data collection for the SLEPS to promote high response rates, rapid data collection, and simplified data verification and report preparation. All proper data security protocols will be followed. BJS has selected the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International to act as the data collection agent for this program.

A. Justification

1. Necessity of Information Collection

The Comprehensive School Safety Initiative (CSSI), a research-focused program to increase the safety of schools nationwide, was authorized in the 2014 Department of Justice Appropriations Act (Public Law 113-76). This initiative is overseen by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). One topic identified by NIJ as needing further research was the presence of law enforcement in schools, as no comprehensive national-level data exists on the extent of law enforcement involvement in the nation's schools or on their typical roles and responsibilities. To address the lack of national, detailed data, NIJ entered into an interagency agreement with BJS to systematically collect in-depth information regarding the roles, responsibilities, and actions of local law enforcement in schools.

Under Title 34, United States Code, Section 10132, 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, tribal, and local levels. It disseminates high quality information and statistics to inform policy makers, researchers, criminal justice practitioners, and the general public. The Criminal Justice Statistics Program encompasses a wide range of criminal justice topics, including victimization, law enforcement, prosecution, courts and sentencing, and corrections. Law enforcement agencies are the primary point of entry into the criminal justice system and play a crucial gate-keeping function in receiving reports of offenses, investigating crimes, making arrests, and detaining suspects. The presence of law enforcement within the environment of the nation's schools represents a critical information gap. Information on their roles and functions is crucial to inform research and policy on SRO programs and SLEPS will provide insight toward filling this gap.

Currently, BJS has limited data available on the presence of law enforcement in schools. BJS collected the number of school resource officers (SROs) or other sworn personnel whose primary duties are related to school safety on the 1997, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2007, and 2016 LEMAS Survey (the question asking about the number of SROs was not included in the 2013 LEMAS). The LEMAS is limited to general-purpose law enforcement agencies and therefore does not include school-based agencies. BJS also collected the count of SROs on the 2000 and 2008 Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA) and is currently collecting the number of SROs on the 2018 CSLLEA. The narrow scope of the school safety question on these

questionnaires provides no insight on the roles of officers in schools or on the infrastructure in place to support these officers.

SLEPS will examine law enforcement's role in ensuring safety in schools, complementing information gathered through other BJS statistical series. For example, through its National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS; OMB 1121-0111) and its School Crime Supplement (SCS; OMB 1121-0184), BJS provides statistics on criminal victimizations occurring at school. The SCS to the NCVS asks about school-related topics such as alcohol and drug availability; fighting, bullying, and hate-related behaviors; fear and avoidance behaviors; gun and weapon carrying; and gangs at school. During the 2015-2016 school year, 79% of public schools reported that at least one crime occurred at their school, amounting to an estimated 1.4 million crimes. During the same school year, 47% of public schools reported to the police a crime incident that occurred at school, amounting to 449,000 crimes (Musu-Gillette, Zhang, Wang, Zhang, Kemp, Diliberti, & Oudekerk, 2018).

While BJS has regularly reported statistics on the prevalence and characteristics of victimizations at school through the NCVS and the SCS, information regarding law enforcement officers in schools has been limited to measures on the CSLLEA and LEMAS collections, which allow BJS to only produce estimates on the number of LEAs in the United States with SROs and the number of SROs. At this time, there is no national-level information on the roles, functions, and regular activities of police officers assigned to schools nor on the infrastructure of law enforcement agencies that supports these officers. Such information is critical to inform research and policy on effective school resource officer (SRO) programs.[1]

2019 SLEPS Survey Content

BJS and RTI convened an expert working group of SROs, supervisors of SROs, and academics to gather input on topics of interest and relevance to the field (more detail on the expert working group is included in 8. Federal Register Publication and Outside Consultation).

Law Enforcement Agency Survey

Law Enforcement Agency Characteristics (Q1-Q3)

This section collects basic information, confirming the agency type and collecting how many full-time sworn officers were employed as of the reference date. The last question in this section determines the agency's eligibility for SLEPS, asking if the agency employs any officers assigned to work in public K-12 schools. Items in this section will allow for comparisons by agency type and size.

School Resource Officer Program Characteristics (Q4 – Q8)

This section collects information on the age and funding source(s) of the program, the number and types of schools served, and whether assignment as an SRO is permanent or part of a

---

[1] "Police officers assigned to schools" and "school resource officers" (SROs) are used interchangeably throughout this document.

rotation. Items in this section will be used to provide national estimates on program characteristics, such as how long SRO programs have been in place along with the extent to which an agency provides coverage to schools in their jurisdiction.

SRO Policies and Assigned Responsibilities (Q9 – Q14)

This section is designed to assess the types of agreements agencies have in place with the school(s) and/or school district(s) they work with along with any departmental policies in place. Examination of these items will produce estimates regarding the types of activities and characteristics that are officially documented through policies or agreements, such as officer functions, role with school discipline, and how SROs execute law enforcement tasks during school hours.

SRO Recruitment, Training, and Supervision (Q15 – Q19)

This section collects information on how officers are selected to fill the SRO position and how often supervisors visit schools to observe SROs. Agencies are also asked if they have access to data on measures related to SRO activities in schools, such as arrests, classes taught, and crimes reported at school. Examination of these items will provide insight on the SRO selection process and could provide a foundation for future collection of more detailed data on SRO activities from the agency perspective.

SRO Staffing (Q20)

This section collects the number of sworn and nonsworn agency personnel working in schools. This will be used to produce a national estimate of agency personnel working in schools, with particular attention to sworn officers in the following sections, the officer roster, and the officer survey.

Sworn SROs (Q21 – Q23)

This section collects data on the characteristics of the agency's SROs, including the number of sworn SROs by sex and race and whether the sworn officers have arrest powers and receive specialized training. These items will allow for a more detailed examination of SRO demographics and identify how officers are trained for the SRO role.

Training Topics Required for Sworn SROs (Q24 – Q26)

This section collects information on required training for SROs. The organization of the section is based upon the SRO triad model roles of law enforcement, mentoring, and teaching and asks about key activities and topics within each part of the triad. Examination of these items can help describe the differences and similarities in SRO training across agencies and can be used in comparison to the training topics and activities collected from SROs on the officer survey.

Activities Performed by Sworn SROs (Q27 – 30)

This section collects information on SRO activities as required by the agency across the elements of the SRO triad model. There is also a question about the issuance and allowance of police equipment on the school campus. These items will allow for examination of agency expectations of SROs and allow for comparisons across the types of activities. Additionally, estimates will be produced regarding the presence of police equipment in schools, including firearms and body-worn cameras.

Officer Roster Request (Q31 – Q32)

This section asks the agency respondent if the agency is willing to provide a roster of officers working in schools from which a sample of officers will be selected to receive an officer-level survey on the topics of officer characteristics, training, and activities in schools. If the agency is willing to provide a roster, they are asked to identify a point of contact to distribute the officer survey. A single point of contact is requested to streamline the process of administering the officer survey.

Officer Roster Form

This form requests agencies to provide a list of their sworn officers working in schools, including some type of identifier for the officer, officer rank, officer race, and officer sex. The rosters will be compiled to develop an officer frame from which a sample of officers will be selected to receive the officer survey. The agency has the option to anonymize the list in the event that they do not wish to directly identify officers. Officer rank will be used in addressing the officer survey materials. Officer race and sex will be used for nonresponse bias analysis and will also be used as a way to confirm that the correct officer received the survey, as the officer survey asks for race and sex. The information collected on the roster will not be used for any publications and will not be released publicly.

School Resource Officer Survey

SRO Characteristics (Q1 – Q12)

This section collects information on the officer's background, including length of time as a sworn officer, length of time as an SRO, and certification. It also includes characteristics of the officer's assignment to schools. The section concludes with officer demographic questions. The demographic questions serve as a check back to the roster information to help ensure the correct officer completed the survey. The other officer information collected in this section will produce estimates pertaining to the extent of officer experience, both in overall career and in schools.

SRO Training (Q13 – Q15)

This section collects information on the topics on which SROs have received training. These data will be examined across the triad model to produce estimates reflecting the level of training received by officers to perform each of these roles in schools.

SRO Activities (Q16 – Q23)

This section asks SROs about the activities in which they've recently engaged in while working in schools and factors that may impact their activities and interactions, such as discretion around arrest decisions and if they speak any other languages that are useful in their assigned school(s). Officer activities will be examined across the triad model to demonstrate how SROs balance their different roles.

Primarily Assigned School Characteristics (Q24 – Q31)

This section asks SROs about the school to which they are primarily assigned. The focus is on the SRO's primary assignment so as to provide a specific reference for SROs working in multiple schools because the aspects covered in this section may vary across the officer's schools. Officers are asked about their average hours spent in the school, what equipment they usually carry, and other security measures. The officer is also asked to provide the name and location of the school to provide the potential for linking with other data collections.

In several instances, the questions on the agency and officer survey mirror one another. This approach will allow BJS to estimate SRO training (Q24-26 on the agency survey and Q13-15 on the SRO survey) beyond what is required by the agency and the degree to which SROs engage in the law enforcement, mentoring, and training (Q27-29 on the agency survey; Q16-18 on the SRO survey) activities required by their agencies.

2. Needs and Uses

<u>Department of Justice Needs and Uses</u>

A number of information needs will be served by SLEPS. Most importantly, there is a lack of information on the infrastructure that supports law enforcement officers in schools and the roles and functions that officers assigned to schools perform. These information gaps currently prevent federal and local agencies from making informed decisions about efforts to keep children safe in public schools. Findings from SLEPS can be used to develop federal funding strategies and other platforms to ensure that officers in schools are deployed and serve in a manner that promotes school safety, prevents violence and other problem behaviors, supports healthy behaviors among students, and responds effectively when violence occurs.

The SLEPS instruments are designed to measure the prevalence of officers in schools, infrastructure to support officers in schools, and the roles and functions of officers in schools. SLEPS will include two instruments: one to collect information from agencies that employ officers in schools and a second to collect information from the officers themselves. The LEA survey topics include the practices, policies, and procedures law enforcement agencies use to oversee and support officers working in schools; formal agreements with the schools in which officers work; the number of personnel who interact with schools; training; common roles and responsibilities of officers in schools; and the types of SRO activities monitored by the agency. SROs will be asked about their law enforcement, mentoring, and teaching activities over the past

30 days; topics on which they have received training; the extent of their law enforcement experience; and characteristics of their primarily assigned school.

SLEPS is the first BJS data collection designed to collect information directly from law enforcement officers about their roles and functions. BJS will rely on recommendations generated from the SLEPS to inform methodologies for future officer-level data collections.

The list below details the type of information that will be available through the 2019 SLEPS LEA data:

- Number and type of public schools served by LEAs
- Percent of LEAs with an SRO-specific departmental policy
- Number and type of agreements in place between LEAs and schools/school districts
- Percent of LEAs with policies or agreements determining SRO program characteristics, such as primary functions, role of SROs in school discipline, SRO schedule, and SRO supervision
- Percent of LEAs with access to data on SRO activities
- Number of sworn and nonsworn personnel assigned to public schools
- Sex, race and Hispanic origin of sworn SROs
- Percent of LEAs with sworn SROs with arrest powers in schools
- Percent of LEAs with sworn SROs with specialized SRO training
- Percent of LEAs offering training to sworn SROs on topics within law enforcement, prevention/planning, and social/behavioral issues
- Percent of LEAs requiring specific activities of sworn SROs across the triad model elements of law enforcement, mentoring, and teaching
- Percent of LEAs that issue various pieces of equipment (e.g., firearm, body-worn camera) and whether they are allowed on the school campus

The list below details the type of information that will be available through the 2019 SLEPS SRO data:

- Average length of time as a sworn officer
- Average length of time as an SRO
- Average length of time as an SRO at the current assignment
- Percent of SROs serving in a single permanent assignment compared to rotating to other assignments
- Percent of SROs with a national and/or state certification
- Average number of schools assigned to an SRO
- Percent of SROs with training on topics within law enforcement, prevention/planning, and social/behavioral issues
- Percent of SROs who engaged in specific law enforcement, mentoring, and teaching activities in their past 30 days of work in schools
- Percentage of SRO duty time spent across the triad model elements
- Percentage of SROs who arrested a student within the past year for specified offenses
- Percentage of SROs who speak another language and use this language in schools
- Average hours spent in the primarily assigned school
- Percentage of SROs that work in schools with other specified security measures

SLEPS data can be used by other federal agencies to assess and inform programs designed to promote safety in schools. Safety in schools is promoted through prevention and intervention programs such as Safe Schools/Healthy Students (supported by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration) and security measures that can include security cameras, metal detectors, and law enforcement officers in schools. Although programs to support SROs have existed for more than 50 years, the number of SROs saw significant expansion from the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s. From 1997 to 2007, the number of school-based law enforcement officers employed by local police departments rose 38%, from approximately 9,400 to 13,000, while the total number of full-time sworn officers in local police departments rose 10%, from approximately 420,000 to 463,000 (Reaves, 2000; Reaves, 2010). The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 authorized grants from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) to hire officers in schools, supporting the rise in SROs (Wolff, 2014). The growth of SROs is also due in part to school shootings that have raised public fears about lethal violence at schools (Theriot, 2013). SRO expansion has also been fueled by legislation requiring all types of schools to address issues such as hate crimes and gang-related activities (Cray & Weiler, 2011). During the 2015-2016 school year, 57% of public schools reported having any security staff present at school and 42% of public schools reported that they had an SRO present (Musu-Gillette, Zhang, Wang, Zhang, Kemp, Diliberti, & Oudekerk, 2018). Information from SLEPS could be used to evaluate these programs to increase and support officers in schools.

SLEPS will also collect data on the funding sources of SRO programs, oversight of officers, and training provided to SROs. These data can inform national training and advocacy groups, such as the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) and state and local funding priorities. Information on training, oversight, and the presence of memoranda of understanding (MOUs) is advocated by NASRO, COPS, and other organizations, but there are currently no statistics on whether and how often these elements are in place. COPS recommends MOUs to clearly document the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the individuals and partners involved, including SROs, school officials, law enforcement agencies, education departments, students, and parents. Training in bullying deterrence, positive school discipline, substance abuse topics, truancy and dropout prevention, and school crisis planning may help SROs more effectively carry out their duties. Statistics on training are often maintained by individual training providers (e.g., technical colleges, NASRO, and Strategies for Youth), but they currently cannot provide a national estimate of the number of SROs trained and the type of training they receive.

Without comprehensive statistics and information on what officers in schools do, the impact of these officers on schools safety is difficult to evaluate. SROs are typically intended to carry out their duties in accordance with the 'triad model,' which includes roles of law enforcers, counselors, and educators. Information on the degree to which SROs carry out any of those functions is currently limited. The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS; OMB 1850-0761), conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), provides some information on these functions, but from the perspective of school principals, not SROs. The degree to which SROs carry out various functions is critical to research on the impact of law enforcement officers in schools, as SROs can contribute to school safety not only through their surveillance and enforcement functions, but also by improving relations between youth and

police. Current evidence on the effect of law enforcement on school safety is mixed (e.g., Brown & Benedict, 2005; Johnson, 1999; Na & Gottfredson, 2013), and some studies have suggested that law enforcement officers in schools may criminalize minor infractions that otherwise would have been handled through school disciplinary procedures. An emphasis on law enforcement roles for SROs may also stem from legislation such as the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 and other policies that require "zero tolerance" on weapons, drugs, and alcohol in schools. SLEPS will provide information on the extent to which LEAs provide support for and SROs engage in each element of the triad model through questions about departmental policies, training provided by the agency, training and certification received by SROs, and specific activities conducted by SROs in their assigned schools.

Anticipated Products

BJS anticipates producing two reports from the SLEPS data collection. Detailed information on the reports to be produced is discussed under 16. Project Schedule and Publication/Analysis Plans.

Upon completion of the project, the final dataset and supporting documentation will be made available to the public in an online archive in multiple statistical platform formats. Access to these data permits analysts to identify the specific responses of individual agencies and to conduct statistical analyses about the roles and functions of both law enforcement agencies and officers in schools.

3. Use of Information Technology

The 2019 SLEPS has been primarily designed for online data collection in which respondents are directed to a web survey through mailed and emailed instructions. The web survey is hosted by BJS's data collection agent, RTI International (RTI).[2]

The instruments have been designed using commercially available survey software that will allow RTI to send an email to respondents explaining the SLEPS data collection and containing a hyperlink to the questionnaire. Respondents will access the survey website using a unique username and password provided by RTI.

The web survey application will incorporate consistency checks to validate data entries and machine edits that check for inconsistent, out-of-range, or missing responses. These automated processes will help ensure data quality and minimize respondent burden resulting from follow-up contact to resolve data discrepancies or other issues. Respondents will be able to start the survey, break off, and later resume from the point in the survey where they last entered data. The survey software will allow for real-time online tracking of respondents thereby allowing BJS to track the completion of each agency's and each officer's responses. Additionally, the web system supports the export of survey data and paradata in various formats specified by BJS.

---

[2] BJS's cooperative agreement with RTI for the 2019 SLEPS was the result of a competition (2015 Survey of Law Enforcement in Schools, Solicitation, BJS-2014-3928; see https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/sleps15_sol.pdf).

Considering that SROs may not have convenient access to a desktop due to the nature of their jobs, the survey will also be accessible via mobile device. Additionally, SROs will be able to switch between a desktop and mobile device with no loss of progress.

Agencies and officers may have various reasons why they do not respond via the internet. For example, some might not have reliable internet access and some agencies might find it difficult to complete online because of the need to involve multiple people in preparing the response. Agencies and officers that require paper access will have multiple methods of receiving paper versions of the instrument. Hard copies will be sent via mail during routine non-response follow-up. Agencies and officers will be able to download a PDF version of their respective survey from the survey site that can be printed or, in the case of the agency survey, emailed to agency staff to gather information from various staff members. Respondents can then gather data in hard copy and a) enter it into the online survey instrument, b) scan and email the completed survey form, c) fax the completed survey form, d) mail the completed survey form.

To process completed hard copy surveys, RTI will use TeleForm, a software package that employs Optical Character Recognition (OCR) to electronically convert scanned images of handwritten, typewritten, or printed text into machine-encoded text. RTI programmers will use this package to program the questionnaires, creating scannable forms to be converted into digital data. This OCR approach increases cost-effectiveness and improves data quality by allowing for data capture through optical scanning, reducing errors associated with manual data entry processes.

As an additional quality assurance measure, all text and constrained print fields will be double-keyed by operators. Any blank choice fields will be checked in case the respondent did not fill in the bubble adequately and TeleForm did not "see" the mark. These steps ensure the best quality data from the scanned forms. The optical scanning process will also index and archive the scanned instrument images and made available for retrieval by project staff for data quality follow-up, if needed.

All personnel involved in scanning are trained and then observed across the first few forms entered to ensure that the prescribed procedures are followed. Operators will be monitored, with quality being checked daily as forms are scanned. As forms are completed, those flagged with an issue during scanning are resolved and once the scanning and verification processes are complete, final datasets are created and imported into the project's data files.

The BJS-produced findings from the SLEPS will be provided to the public in electronic format. These reports will be available on the BJS website as PDF files.

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

At this time, there are no known data collection efforts which significantly overlap the currently presented SLEPS. BJS collects the number of SROs in the LEMAS and CSLLEA data collections and SLEPS is designed to build upon these to produce a deeper understanding of the topic. There are no publicly-known plans to collect these data as part of any other federal project. BJS also administers the SCS to the NCVS, which only asks the respondent if their school has security guards or assigned police officers. Respondents are children ages 12 to 18 living in NCVS-interviewed households who attended school during the previous six months (grades 6

through 12). Approximately 13,700 persons in NCVS households were eligible to participate in the 2017 SCS.

SSOCS, which surveys principals at a nationally representative sample of over 3,000 public schools, asks about the presence and activities of school security staff, including sworn law enforcement personnel. SSOCS has been administered six times in the following schools years: 1999-2000, 2003-2004, 2005-2006, 2007-2008, 2009-2010, and 2015-2016. SSOCS data contains only high-level details on the school's security staff as a whole. The survey asks about equipment, activities, and general times when security is present at the school (e.g., student arrival/dismissal) across all types of school security (sworn law enforcement officers, security guards, and security personnel), and distinction among each type is not possible. While there is a level of overlap between the SSOCS and SLEPS data collections (e.g., both surveys ask about the functions of SROs and the equipment they carry), this overlap is negligible. SSOCS does not provide the detailed information we seek to gain regarding law enforcement agencies with officers working in schools and the infrastructure within these agencies to support school safety. Additionally, SSOCS does not collect data on officer characteristics such as training and experience.

5. Efforts to Minimize Burden

The proposed SLEPS instruments were designed to reduce the respondents' burden in multiple ways. BJS engaged an expert group of law enforcement officers, schools safety researchers, and federal agency staff to identify the most pressing information needs that could be filled by SLEPS. Only those determined to be critical measures are included on the survey instruments. The instruments then went through cognitive testing procedures to ensure that the wording is clear and practical to all survey respondents. The instruments are designed to optimize web-based data collection, with built-in help text and skip patterns and mobile capability, while also supporting a paper version that may be more efficient for officers to complete as they are able in the course of their regular duties at school.

We expect that many respondents will make use of the online survey software to complete the survey. A number of web-based system functions will be in place to ease the burden of survey completion. RTI will utilize an intelligent log-in program for data collection, which will store agency information and responses, allowing for multi-session, non-sequential completion of the survey instrument. This will reduce the burden by allowing agencies to stop as needed. Help icons located next to each survey question will link respondents to item-specific information, additional guidance, and helpdesk contact information to facilitate requests for assistance.

A phone number and email address will be provided to respondents in the event that they have questions about the survey or encounter issues while trying to complete the survey. The help desk will respond to e-mails and telephone inquiries within one business day. Respondents will be able to access a PDF version of the survey online, which can be printed. Once completed, this paper version of the survey can be used to enter data into the web-based survey instrument or can be returned via email, fax, or mail.

6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

SLEPS is a first time data collection, designed to fill the need for information on the presence and functions of law enforcement in schools. Without the SLEPS data collection, policymakers, researchers, and practitioners will continue to have only incomplete, inconsistent, or no information about the tools that law enforcement agencies use to support officers in schools and coordinate with the schools they serve, and the roles that officers employ on a daily basis to ensure safety in schools and the well-being of students. This information is critical to (1) understand the roles that officers occupy in schools to impact school safety and student well-being; (2) assess the impact of federal funding programs to increase the number of officers in schools, to train those officers, or provide other support; (3) inform training and other support programs developed and implemented by practitioner organizations and federal agencies; and (4) support research on efforts to enhance the safety of schools. At this time, SLEPS is anticipated to be a one-time data collection effort, with no current plans to conduct this survey again.

7. Special Circumstances Influencing Collection

No special circumstances have been identified for this project.

8. Federal Register Publication and Outside Consultation

The research under this clearance is consistent with the guidelines in 5 C.F.R. 1320.6. The 60-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 84, Number 35, page 5504 on February 21, 2019 (Attachment 4). The 30-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 84, Number 95, pages 22167-22168 on May 16, 2019 (Attachment 5).

During the 60-day comment period, BJS received comments from three organizations (Attachments 6, 7, and 8). Some of the proposed items were incorporated, either into existing questions or as new questions, because they were straightforward concepts and complemented the current survey content. BJS revised training questions to ask about required training rather than training offered by agencies and also added response options to questions about SRO training and activities. Other proposed items were not incorporated because they referenced complex topics that would require testing new items, resulting in significant delays in the fielding of SLEPS, or because they would result in a duplication of effort from other surveys. Developing questions about topics such as arrests, referrals to law enforcement, and complaints against SROs would require cognitive interviews to test the clarity of items. Some of the proposed items are already collected by the Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection (OMB 1870-0504), which is a much larger data collection than SLEPS and is better suited to collect these items because it covers the universe of over 96,000 schools.

The project team engaged an advisory group at the outset of the project to provide input on key aspects of the survey design and implementation. The advisory group included:

- Leadership from law enforcement agencies with officers in schools,
- School resource officers,
- Representatives from law enforcement membership and school resource officer organizations,

- Experts on conducting research related to officers in schools, and
- Federal stakeholders.

The group convened on one occasion and consulted on critical information needs related to law enforcement personnel in schools, effective data collection strategies, recommendations for disseminating SLEPS findings, and future work in this area. The group identified priorities for agency- and officer-level data collection, as well as appropriate data collection methodologies. The project team followed up with members of the panel for feedback on draft instruments.

Table 1. Members of the SLEPS Expert Panel

Lieutenant Doyle Batten Commander, School Safety Section Anne Arundel County Police Department	Chief John Douglass Director of Safety and Security Shawnee Mission School District
Kelly Burke Program Manager, Juvenile Justice and Child Protection Initiatives International Association of the Chiefs of Police	Rachel Hansen National Center for Education Statistics, US Dept. of Education
Kathy Chandler National Center for Education Statistics, US Dept. of Education	Chief Inspector Carl Holmes Office of School Safety Philadelphia Police Department
Captain Andre Davis Commander, Community Resources Section Baltimore County (MD) Police Department	Aaron Kupchik Professor University of Delaware, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice
Corporal John Rogers School Resource Officer Greenbelt Police Department	Jack McDevitt Associate Dean of Research for the College of Social Sciences & Humanities Northeastern University
Lieutenant Mike Ward Administrative Lieutenant, Patrol Services Bureau Montgomery County (MD) Police Department	Phelan Wyrick Director, Crime and Crime Prevention Research Division National Institute of Justice, US Dept. of Justice
Kerri Williamson Training Director National Association of School Resource Officers	MPO Bill Zins School Resource Officer Newport News (VA) Police Department

9. Paying Respondents

Neither BJS nor RTI will provide any payment or gift of any type to respondents. Respondents will participate on a voluntary basis.

10. Assurance of Confidentiality

According to 34 U.S.C. 10134, 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.

BJS will maintain information on people who participate in surveys so that subjects may be contacted again if needed for clarification regarding their responses. Electronic data with identifying information will only be obtained when necessary to sample or select personnel or to link information across multiple electronic data sources. All data will be protected according to the procedures discussed herein. Survey questions will only pertain to issues regarding school resource officer programs, either at the agency or officer level.

Final data files and accompanying documentation will be submitted to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data in accordance with BJS specifications. At the end of the project, BJS and its contractors will purge all of its records of any information (e.g., contact logs, notes, names within databases, etc.) that could be used to identify participating agencies or the responding personnel.

Appropriate measures will be taken to minimize the risk of disclosing confidential information. Prior to releasing any statistical tables to the public, tables will be examined for potential disclosure problems and appropriate steps will be taken to prevent such disclosure. In accordance with 28 C.F.R. §22.27, all individuals will be notified that compliance with the request for information is not mandatory and participation may be terminated at any time.

Project findings and reports prepared for dissemination will not contain information which can reasonably be expected to be identifiable to a private person, except as authorized by 28 C.F.R. §22.22.

The data collected through the 2019 SLEPS represent institutional characteristics of publicly-administered law enforcement agencies and functions of law enforcement officers acting in an official capacity to ensure safety in schools.

11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

No questions of a sensitive nature are proposed for the 2019 SLEPS.

12. Estimate of Hour Burden

BJS has estimated the respondent burden for the proposed SLEPS data collection at 3,743 hours (Table 2). This includes the average time required per agency to complete the LEA form and the average roster completion time for the percentage of agencies that are expected to return the roster. Also included is the average time devoted to reviewing materials and the average time for the point of contact to distribute and follow-up on the SRO surveys, and subsequently the average time required per officer to complete the SRO survey.

Table 2. Estimated Burden Hours for SLEPS

Data collection activity by respondent level	Average burden per respondent (minutes)	Sample Size	Est. burden hours
Agency level			
LEA survey	30	1,982	991.0
Roster	10	1,367	227.8
POC distribution of SRO survey materials	20	1,367	455.7
SRO level			
SRO survey	30	4,137	2,068.5
TOTAL HOURS			**3,743.0**

13. Estimate of Respondent Cost

The average total burden for each agency is estimated to be 30 minutes. Assuming a pay rate approximately equivalent to the GS-12/01 level ($73,375 per year), the estimated agency cost of employee time would be approximately $35.16 per hour. SLEPS will sample 1,982 agencies, resulting in an estimated agency cost of $34,844 to complete the survey.

BJS anticipates that approximately 1,367 LEAs will complete a roster form, which is estimated to take 10 minutes, resulting in an estimated cost of $8,011. The LEA's POC will then be asked to distribute SRO survey materials, which is estimated to take 20 minutes, resulting in an estimated cost of $16,021.

The average total burden for each officer is estimated to be 30 minutes. SLEPS will sample 4,137 SROs. Based on the estimated time burden per response and employee pay rate, the total SRO time cost burden is estimated at $72,728.

There are no anticipated costs to respondents beyond the employee time expended during completion of the survey instrument as addressed above. Therefore, the total cost burden to respondents associated with this clearance request is $131,604.

14. Cost to the Federal Government

The total expected cost to the Federal Government for this data collection is $1,731,975. The budget for this project is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Estimated Costs for the 2019 SLEPS

Category	Cost
BJS costs	
Staff salaries	
GS-12 Statistician (25%)	$24,500
GS-15 Supervisory Statistician (3%)	$4,000
GS-13 Editor (10%)	$10,000
Other Editorial Staff	$5,000
Front-Office Staff (GS-15 & Directors)	$2,000
Subtotal salaries	$45,500
Fringe benefits (28% of salaries)	$12,740
Subtotal: Salary & fringe	$58,240
Other administrative costs of salary & fringe (15%)	$8,736
Subtotal: BJS costs	**$66,976**
Data Collection Agent (RTI)	
Personnel (including fringe)	$774,005
Travel	$9,150
Supplies	$0
Consultants/Contracts	$179,628
Other	$54,467
Total indirect	$647,749
Subtotal: Data Collection Agent Costs	**$1,664,999**
TOTAL COSTS	**$1,731,975**

15. Reason for Change in Burden

N/A

16. Project Schedule and Publication/Analysis Plans

The LEA portion of the SLEPS data collection is scheduled to mail out in late August 2019 and conclude in January 2020. The SRO portion of the data collection will be conducted across 2 waves, with the first wave scheduled to begin in November 2019 and the second wave scheduled to begin in February 2020. The SRO data collection is scheduled to conclude in May 2020. Tables 4 and 5 contain the project schedule for the full data collection.

Table 4. Project Schedule for LEA Survey

Stage	Type of contact	Attachment Number	Week
LEA pre-notification letter (mail)	All	7	1
LEA invitation package (mail)	All	8, 9	3
LEA reminder #1 (mail)	Nonrespondents	10	5
LEA data quality follow-up	Respondents		Variable
LEA reminder #2 (mail)	Nonrespondents	11	8
LEA reminder #3 (email)	Nonrespondents	12	10
LEA reminder #4 (mail reminder package)	Nonrespondents	13, 1, 2	12
Start LEA telephone nonresponse follow-up	Nonrespondents	14	15
LEA reminder #5 (email)	Nonrespondents	15	17
Mail end-of-study notification	Nonrespondents	16	21
Thank you letter	Respondents	17	Variable
Close data collection	N/A	--	24
Data cleaning and review	N/A	--	27
Data file delivery and documentation	N/A	--	35

Table 5. Project Schedule for the SRO Survey

Stage	Type of contact	Attachment Number	Week Wave 1	Week Wave 2
SRO sample construction	N/A	--	11	26
SRO survey invitation package (mail)	All	18, 19	14	29
SRO reminder #1 (email)	Nonrespondents	20	16	31
SRO reminder #2 (mail reminder package)	Nonrespondents	21, 22, 3	18	33
Start SRO telephone nonresponse follow-up	Nonrespondents	23	20	35
Mail SRO end-of-study notification	Nonrespondents	24	24	39
Thank you letter to POC	Respondents	25	Variable	Variable
Close data collection	N/A	--	42	42
Data cleaning and review	N/A	--	43	43
Data file delivery and documentation	N/A	--	51	51

BJS will be responsible for the statistical analysis and publication of the data from the 2019 SLEPS. Contingent on the processing and delivery of the final data files, BJS anticipates releasing two reports.

The first report will be based upon the agency data collection and describe the characteristics of SRO programs, including policies, recruitment and supervision of officers, and agency-provided training. BJS anticipates releasing this report by April 2021. The second report will be based upon the officer-level data collection and describe the roles and characteristics of officers in schools, including the degree to which they perform each of the three functions of the SRO triad model, as well as career experience and training. BJS anticipates releasing this report by July 2021.

17. Expiration Date Approval

The expiration date will be shown on the survey form.

18. Exceptions to the Certification Statement

BJS is not requesting an exception to the certification of this information collection.

19. Contacts for Statistical Aspects and Data Collection

a. BJS contacts include:

> Elizabeth Davis
> 202-305-2667
> Elizabeth.Davis@usdoj.gov

b. Persons consulted on statistical methodology:

> Lance Couzens
> RTI International

c. Persons consulted on data collection and analysis:

> Duren Banks, PhD
> RTI International
>
> Dustin Williams
> RTI International
>
> Sean Goodison, PhD
> Police Executive Research Forum

References

Brown, B., & Benedict, W.R. (2005). Classroom Cops, What Do the Students Think? A Case Study of Student Perceptions of School Police and Security Officers Conducted in an

Hispanic Community. *International Journal of Police Science & Management, 7(4),* 264-285.

Cray, M., & Weiler, S.C. (2011). Policy to Practice: A Look at National and State Implementation of School Resource Officer Programs. *The Clearing House, 84,* 164-170.

Johnson, I. M. (1999). School Violence: The Effectiveness of a School Resource Officer Program in a Southern City. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 27(2),* 173.

Musu-Gillette, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., Kemp, J., Diliberti, M., & Oudekerk, B.A. (2018). Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2017. National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC.

Na, C., & Gottfredson, D.C. (2011). Police Officers in Schools: Effects on School Crime and the Processing of Offending Behaviors. *Justice Quarterly, 30(4),* 619-650.

Reaves, B.A., & Goldberg, A.L. (2000). Local Police Departments, 1997. Washington, DC.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Reaves, B.A. (2010). Local Police Departments, 2007. Washington, DC.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Theriot, M.T. (2013). The Impact of School Resource Officer Interaction on Students' Feelings about School and School Police. *Crime & Delinquency 2016, 62(4),* 446-469.

Wolff, K.C. (2014). Arrest Decision Making by School Resource Officers. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 12(2),* 137-151.