

SUPPORTING STATEMENT

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) seeks approval to continue its Annual Surveys of Probation and Parole (ASPP) for the 2014-2016 data collection period. The current collection approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) is due to expire August 31, 2014. These establishment surveys provide BJS with the capacity to report annually on changes in the size and composition of the community corrections populations in the United States. The surveys also track key outcomes of offenders on probation or parole, such as completion of supervision terms and return to incarceration (or recidivism). Data are collected from the known universe of probation and parole supervising agencies, using central reporters wherever possible to minimize burden the public. The ASPP provides the only national level, regularly collected, data on the community corrections populations, and, as such, they 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), 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 ASPP provides national and state-level data about offenders under community supervision, a core component of BJS's 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 shows the relationship between sentencing and community corrections through the transition of offenders from sentencing directly to probation. It also illustrates the relationship between 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 on and off supervision for the community corrections populations through the ASPP 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 the sex, racial composition, most serious offense, and their supervision status. Data collected also describe the outcomes of supervision, including the rate at which probationers and parolees completed their supervision and their recidivism rates (i.e., rates of incarceration in prison or jail either for a new offense or because of violation of the conditions of their supervision.)

The size of the population under community supervision and the volume of movements onto and off of community supervision indicate the importance of the ASPP for understanding the U.S. correctional systems. Of the 6.9 million men and women under correctional supervision (that is, in prison or jail, or on probation or parole) at yearend 2012, more than two-thirds (69 percent) or nearly 4.8 million offenders were supervised in the community, either on probation (3,942,800) or parole (851,200). At yearend 2012, about 2 percent of the United States adult resident population was under supervision in the community.¹ During 2012, an estimated 4.1 million adults moved onto or off probation, and nearly 1 million adults moved onto and off parole. Driven by an excess of probation exits (2.09 million) over probation entries (2.05 million), the community supervision population declined 0.8 percent during 2012, from an estimated 4,821,800 to an estimated 4,781,300. The estimated number of parole exits (496,100) during 2012 was the same as the estimate of parole entries. The fact that these offenders are in the community and pose risks to the public by reoffending indicates the importance of tracking their outcomes to inform the operations of the United States' correctional systems. During 2012, 15 percent of parolees and 8 percent of probationers were incarcerated either as a result of violating the conditions of their supervision or a new offense.²

The data gathered in the ASPP 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's National Prisoner Statistics (NPS-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 ASPP provides the community corrections data, thus completing BJS's coverage of correctional populations. These combined surveys are the source of the well-publicized fact that 1 in 35 adults in the United States were under some form of correctional supervision at yearend 2012.³

The data gathered through the ASPP are distinct from other BJS collections that gather data related to community corrections. Data from the ASPP complements but does not duplicate the data obtained from other BJS data collections.

- The NPS collects data on the number of probation and parole violators returned to prison. ASPP expands on this information to 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 ASPP provides the total number of offenders placed under

¹ Glaze, L. and Herberman, E. (2013) *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2012*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC, <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpus12.pdf>. (See Attachment 3.)

² Maruschak, L. and Bonczar, T. (2013) *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2012*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC, <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus12.pdf>. (See Attachment 4.)

³ Glaze, L. and Herberman, E., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 3).

community supervision, including those offenders sentenced directly from a court to community supervision. However, the data collected from the NPS series and the ASPP collections can be used together to better understand recidivism and the types of offenders that are released to the community.

- The ASJ provides data on conviction status of local jail inmates and convicted jail inmates including 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. The ASPP provides data not available through ASJ on counts of the total number of probationers and the total number of parolees incarcerated in prison or jail.
- BJS's 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. Furthermore, not all states have participated in the NCRP, while the Annual Parole Survey includes all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the federal system.
- Every other year from 1986 to 2006, BJS's National Judicial Reporting Program (NJRP) (OMB Control Number 1121-0130, expired April 30, 2008) collected felony sentencing data from state courts, including the number of felons entering (i.e., sentenced to) probation supervision. The NJRP data for 1986 to 2006 can be used to produce national estimates. In comparison, the Annual Probation Survey provides estimates of 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 (45 percent) of the total probation population.⁴ The Annual Probation Survey has continued to provide both national and state-specific estimates as BJS works on the redesign of the NJRP collection to produce both national and state estimates.
- BJS's Survey of Prison Inmates (SPI), formerly known as the Survey of Prisoners in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (OMB Control Number 1121-0152) and the Survey of Inmates in Local Jails (SILJ) (OMB Control Number 1121-0098), collect data from large nationally representative samples of prison and local jail inmates through personal interviews. The surveys are conducted only periodically (new versions of these surveys are currently under development) due to collection costs and the need to balance the burden of these data collections with other BJS data collection activities, such as the National Inmate Survey (OMB 1121-0311), the primary data collection vehicle for the Prison Rape Elimination Act⁵ The type of information that is gathered in personal interviews

⁴ Maruschak, L. and Bonczar, T., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 4).

⁵ The BJS National Prison Rape Statistics Program gathers mandated data on the incidence and prevalence of sexual assault in correctional facilities under the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (PREA; P.L. 108-

with prison and jail inmates is not readily available from the administrative records that are the source of information for the ASPP. The inmate survey data compliment the ASPP by gathering information about those who returned to incarceration following a period of time on probation and parole. This includes information such as their history of drug abuse, and whether they received treatment while on probation and parole, or in prison. It also includes information about the severity of their offense, ties to the community, employment history, substance abuse, and medical problems. In addition to providing information about those formerly on probation or parole, the information gathered by SPI also helps to better understand the risk inmates pose upon release into the community, and their need for community supervision.

- BJS's National Former Prisoner Survey (NFPS) (OMB Control Number 1121-0316), as a part of the BJS National Prison Rape Statistics Program, gathered data on sexual victimization experienced by former state prisoners during their prior term of incarceration, including any time served in a local jail, state prison, or post-release community correctional facility.⁶ The NFPS data serve to enrich our understanding of the summary counts obtained through the Annual Parole Survey by collecting sensitive data from adults under active post-incarceration supervision in the community using computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) and audio computer-assisted self-interviewing (ACASI) data collection methods. Information collected by the NFPS included current supervision status, employment status, housing, and living arrangements of persons recently released from prison, and the personal criminal histories associated with these other characteristics. While the nationally representative data gathered by NFPS serves to broaden our understanding of the post-incarceration population, they nevertheless do not serve as a substitute for the state and national level data gathered by the Annual Parole Survey that enables BJS to track changes in this population over time.
- The 2006 Census of State Parole Supervising Agencies (OMB Control Number 1121-0169) collected information about the organizational structure of the agencies, staffing, supervision levels of offenders, and whether the parole agency had a role in considering prisoners for release, setting the conditions of supervision, and conducting parole revocation hearings. It also provided information, by state, on the use of drug abuse testing, various treatment programs, and the availability of housing and employment assistance programs. The Annual Parole Survey, in contrast, focuses on the number, characteristics, and flow of the individuals on post-prison supervision.

The data collected through the ASPP 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 ASPP is the only ongoing annual collection on

79).

⁶ *Ibid.*

the community corrections populations, and is the result of efforts to present comparable data across years and jurisdictions. These qualities allow data users, in particular individual states, to rely on the BJS ASPP data as a source of trend and comparative data on the community corrections populations. The burden involved in collecting the ASPP data is warranted by these uses and by the fact that the ASPP data are used by a broad array of organizations and individuals including 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

Assessment of Needs and Uses

The need for data on the correctional population has grown in importance and meaning, given the massive growth in that population in the last several decades. This was among the conclusions reached by the Committee on National Statistics (CNSTAT) report on BJS programs.⁷ Indeed, data from the BJS’s ASPP, ASJ, and NPS programs document that the total correctional population grew by more than 5 million from an estimated 1,842,100 in 1980, to an estimated 6,937,600 in 2012.⁸ As significant as the prison population has become, the CNSTAT report noted the rapid escalation of the community corrections population over this same time, in particular, the rapid growth of the probation population.⁹ The same BJS surveys document that two thirds, or 3.4 million, of the growth in the total correctional population was accounted for by community corrections population, and more than 80 percent (2.8 million) of the growth in the community corrections population was the result of an increase in adult probation.¹⁰ Without the ASPP, this type of basic information would not exist.

To assess the need for the data gathered from the ASPP collections, BJS has also solicited feedback from stakeholders about how they use the data during the semi-annual association conferences, and meetings of key stakeholders convened by other federal agencies. At the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) conferences, BJS regularly convenes a small workgroup of community corrections data providers, practitioners, and researchers to obtain feedback from the field. BJS has also participated in meetings of the APPA’s Research

⁷ Groves, R. & Cork D. (Eds.) (2009). *Ensuring the Quality, Credibility, and Relevance of U.S. Justice Statistics*. Washington, DC: National Research Council of the National Academies, p. 91. Retrieved from <http://www.nap.edu>.

⁸ Glaze, L. and Herberman, E., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 3), and Glaze, L. and Parks, E. (2012) *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2011*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC, <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpus11.pdf>.

⁹ Groves, R. & Cork D. (Eds.), *op. cit.*

¹⁰ Maruschak, L. and Bonczar, T., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 4); Maruschak, L. and Parks, E. (2012) *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2011*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC, <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus11.pdf>; and *Correctional Populations in the United States, 1994*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC, <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpius94a.pdf>.

Committee. Other opportunities that have allowed BJS to engage the community corrections field have included the National Institute of Corrections' (NIC), semi-annual meetings of the State Executives of Probation and Parole Network (SEPPN), the American Correctional Association's (ACA) semi-annual conferences, and annual meetings of the former Community Corrections Research Network (CCRN) of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). BJS has also consulted with colleagues from NIC, NIJ, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP).

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, to seek facts and opinions about community corrections issues from stakeholders, and to improve the ASPP collections to make them responsive to stakeholder needs. This information has been used to address measurement challenges, to make the presentation of data in reports more useful, and to make the data more accessible. BJS's participation in these discussions has also provided an additional way to gather information about key issues in the field and to develop relationships with key officials in the field of community corrections that can assist BJS's data collection efforts. BJS disseminates data from its community corrections collection in workshop presentations at the conferences of the APPA and other national associations.

Data Users: Needs and Uses Identified

Through these interactions, stakeholders have repeatedly reinforced the point that the ASPP provides the community corrections field with data that enable them to argue the importance of community corrections relative to institutional corrections (prisons and jails). The community corrections population is a key component of the total correctional population, accounting for nearly 69 percent of the total adult correctional population, with institutional corrections accounting for the balance.¹¹ Just as BJS routinely publishes data on the size of the prison and jail populations, the field expects the same for the community corrections populations. The relationship between the incarcerated and community corrections populations indicates why this is so. Reports published by BJS indicate that approximately 70 percent of state prisoners who return to the community do so under some form of conditional release, including probation, parole, or some other type of post-custody release supervision, and 25 percent of parole discharges and 15 percent of probation discharges result in a return to incarceration.^{12,13} ASPP data on outcomes of supervision are also used by others to understand national trends in recidivism rates and the rates of successful completion among the community supervision populations.¹⁴

¹¹ Glaze, L. and Herberman, E., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 3).

¹² Carson, A. and Golinelli, D. (2013). *Prisoners in 2012, Trends in Admissions and Releases, 1991–2012*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC, <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p12tar9112.pdf>.

¹³ Maruschak, L. and Bonczar, T., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 4).

¹⁴ American Probation and Parole Association (2013). *Effective Responses to Offender Behavior: Lessons Learned for Probation and Parole Supervision*.

Stakeholders have indicated that they use the ASPP data 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 with similar supervision policies and/or practices.¹⁵ This information is critically important to stakeholders in their efforts to understand the effectiveness of supervision strategies to reduce revocation rates in probationers and parolees and the potential impact on public safety. In addition, stakeholders note that the data on outcomes in community corrections allow decision-makers within the legislative, judicial, and executive government branches to measure the effectiveness of policies (e.g., sentencing practices, release policies) and interventions (e.g., the use of alternative sanctions, reentry programs) on recidivism.

Understanding special populations on community supervision:

Data from the ASPP collection provides a basis for understanding the nature of special populations under community supervision. For example, stakeholders such as the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) have used ASPP data to understand the size and movement of the community supervision populations in their efforts to understand the extent of mental health and substance abuse disorders within this population.¹⁶ Data from the ASPP collection has been used to understand the numbers of women under supervision of the criminal justice system.¹⁷

Users of the ASPP data include Congress, various components of the United States 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 examples of the ways in which BJS's ASPP 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 public safety. For example, the Criminal Justice Reinvestment Act of 2009 (S 2772 and H.R. 4080) cited BJS data gathered through the ASPP. The purpose of the Act was to understand factors associated with growth in the correctional populations and to develop and implement policy options to manage the growth and improve

(<http://www.appa-net.org/eWeb/docs/APPA/pubs/EROBLLPPS-Report.pdf>)

¹⁵ For example, see Lawrence, S. (2012). California in Context: How Does California's Criminal Justice System Compare to Other States? The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy (https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/bccj/CA_in_Context_Policy_Brief_Sept_2012_Final.pdf)

¹⁶ Feucht, T. E. and Gfroerer, J. (2011). Mental and Substance Use Disorders among Adult Men on Probation or Parole: Some Success against a Persistent Challenge. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (available at <http://www.samhsa.gov/data/2k11/MentalDisorders/MentalDisorders.pdf>)

¹⁷ The Sentencing Project (2012), available at http://www.sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/cc_Incarcerated_Women_Factsheet_Sep24sp.pdf.

effectiveness of current spending and investment to increase public safety. The legislation cites the BJS ASPP 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; and 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 ASPP population flows and outcomes in their work in developing performance measures for community corrections.

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) – to improve knowledge and understanding of crime and justice issues, NIJ has used BJS national and state-level data on probation and parole population flows and outcomes in their work to develop performance measures for community corrections. In addition, publications sponsored by NIJ cite BJS ASPP 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. BJA utilizes data from the ASPP collection as the basis for understanding the size of the population on correctional control as targeted through their Justice Reinvestment Initiative which attempts to provide policymakers with resources to improve the criminal justice system (https://www.bja.gov/Programs/jri_background.html). BJA has also funded publications that have used the ASPP data, such as through the APPA (see below).

State governments (i.e., community corrections agencies) – to assess conditions within their own jurisdictions relative to others and to the nation overall. For example, in response to a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court to reduce overcrowding in its prisons (Brown v. Plata, 2011), California has transferred responsibility for “most non-serious, non-violent, non-sexual (N3) felons from the state to the counties.” The use of the ASPP data has enabled California to place its counts in a national context, and to make comparisons

to changes that have been occurring in other jurisdictions with large correctional populations.¹⁸

Some state-level officials rely on the historical ASPP 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 is only possible through the annual ASPP data collected and reported on by BJS.

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 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.

The Council of State Governments, a national nonprofit organization that coordinates the work of The Reentry Policy Council, cites population and recidivism statistics from the BJS probation and parole surveys on its Justice Center, National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC), "Reentry Facts & Trends" webpage (<http://csgjusticecenter.org/reentry/facts-trends/>). The Council was established in 2001 to assist state government officials grappling with the increasing number of people leaving prisons and jails to return to the communities they left behind.

The PEW Foundation's report "One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections" (2008) used BJS's ASPP data to report on the size of the community supervision population, and along with BJS's 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 ASPP data, PEW has echoed BJS's 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*

¹⁸ See Quan, L, Abarbanel, S., and Mukamal, D., Reallocation of Responsibility: Changes to the Correctional System in California Post-Realignment, Stanford Criminal Justice Center, January 2014 (available at <http://www.law.stanford.edu/organizations/programs-and-centers/stanford-criminal-justice-center-scjc/new-reports>).

Violations (2007), have also cited the ASPP data to illustrate the size of the populations and the growth in the populations over time.¹⁹

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 ASPP are in large part a result of changes in policies and not necessarily a direct outcome of crime rates.²⁰ Some other examples of the uses of ASPP data by other non-profit organizations are listed below:

Jannetta, J. & Halberstadt, R. (2010) *Kiosk Supervision for the District of Columbia*. 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.

Subramanian, R. & Tublitz, R. (2012). *Realigning Justice Resources: A Review of Population and Spending Shifts in Prison and Community Corrections*. Vera Institute of Justice.

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. For example, Phelps (2013), who primarily relied on data from the Annual Probation Survey and prison data from NPS, evaluated the link between probation and prison to understand the role of probation in the increase of the number of individuals involved in the criminal justice system over the past four decades.²¹ She conducted multilevel analyses of the link between probation and prison, including an analysis of national trends in probation supervision and imprisonment, an examination of state-level variation, and regression analyses that estimated the effect of year-to-year changes in probation rates on changes in incarceration. Phelps concluded that policies that rely more heavily on probation as a sanction, may in fact endorse policies that have the opposite effect. The ASPP data also have been used to conduct a variety of other research, for example:

Burrell, B.S. (2012). *Community Corrections Management: Issues and Strategies*. Civic Research Institute, Inc.: Kingston, NJ.

¹⁹ See <http://www.pewstates.org/research/reports/when-offenders-break-the-rules-85899375589>.

²⁰ See http://www.sentencingproject.org/detail/news.cfm?news_id=1050.

²¹ Phelps, Michelle. (2013). *The Paradox of Probation: Community Supervision in the Age of Mass Incarceration*. *Law & Policy* 35 (1-2): 51-80.

Laubepin, F. (2012). *Experiments in Punishment: Explaining Differences in the Scope of Penal Sanctioning in the American States*. Dissertation, University of Michigan.

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.

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 (NCJRS)– to support research, policy, and program development in the criminal justice field, and in particular community corrections, by hosting a link to the BJS community corrections web page on their “Corrections” page for “Parole and Probation” (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Topics/Topic.aspx?topicid=17>), and by including links to numerous BJS community corrections publications on their Community Corrections Resources page (<https://www.ncjrs.gov/communitycorrections/statistics.html>).

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 communities. BJS’s Corrections Unit’s staff receive regular inquiries from ASKBJS, BJS’s online information request mechanism. The ASPP 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 Global Positioning System (GPS) monitoring to supervise offenders, and offender characteristics, such as the sex and racial compositions of the community corrections populations.

BJS disseminates key statistics in press releases, annual bulletins, two new Corrections Statistical Analysis Tools or “webtools” (scheduled for release during summer, 2014, see Attachment 5), and ready access to probation and parole datasets at the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data

(<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/index.jsp>). (See part A, item 16, “Project Schedule and Publication/Analysis Plans” for more information.)

The Future of Community Corrections Collections

BJS has engaged in a number of ongoing efforts to expand and enhance its Community Corrections Statistics Program (CCSP) to fulfill its mission and to better serve the needs of various stakeholders. This includes the working group convened by BJS at APPA conferences to hear from APPA members about information gaps in the community corrections field. These community corrections researchers have identified the need for a frame of public and private probation supervising agencies and offices in the United States to conduct future research, such as national surveys of probationers or probation officers.²² These same stakeholders have identified an information gap related to the structure, organization, and functions of probation agencies.²³ They have also identified a need to assess the completeness of the Annual Probation Survey frame.

To address these needs, BJS plans to conduct the Census of Adult Probation Supervising Agencies (CAPSA) with Westat, through a cooperative agreement.²⁴ The data from the census is designed to provide both national and state-specific estimates of the organization, characteristics, and operations of felony-supervising and felony and misdemeanor supervising adult probation agencies, and to provide an updated frame of probation supervising agencies for future sample surveys. In addition, CAPSA, together with three additional questions proposed for inclusion in the 2014 Annual Probation Survey, is expected to enable BJS to systematically assess, and potentially improve, the coverage of the frame used for the Annual Probation Survey (see section B, item 1, “Universe and Respondent Selection” for more information).

Assessment of the coverage of the Annual Probation Survey frame is planned to take place during spring 2015. In the event this process results in the identification of one or more agencies (not previously included in the frame)

²² 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.

²³ 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. 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).

²⁴ A request to conduct the Census of Adult Probation Supervising Agencies was separately submitted to OMB in April, 2014.

within the scope of the Annual Probation Survey, BJS will submit a revised request to OMB prior to conducting the 2015 Annual Probation Survey.

BJS also has continued to work with community corrections stakeholders to obtain feedback and input about substantive topics of importance to the field but ones in which data are lacking. For example, APPA has a standing committee on health and safety of community corrections officers and BJS convenes a working group at the semi-annual conferences to hear from APPA members about key issues facing the community corrections field. Through these meetings and those with members from other associations such as the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), BJS has identified three areas where critical information gaps exist: staffing, hazardous duty statistics, and implementation of evidenced-based practices.

In response to these needs, BJS has been developing supplements in the areas of staffing and evidence based practices (EBP). BJS has also been working to determine the incident statistics that agencies record when a community corrections officer is killed or assaulted (CCOKA). BJS expects to separately submit a generic request to OMB to pilot test the staffing supplement to a purposely selected sample of 50 probation and parole agencies. The pilot test is being planned to be fielded at the same time as the 2014 ASPP to save on administrative costs. Because the respondents to the staffing supplements are expected to be different from the ASPP respondents, and because they will be limited to agencies that agree to participate in the pilot, this is not expected to have an effect on the 2014 ASPP response rates.

3. Use of Information Technology

BJS uses a multi-mode design in which respondents are directed to a web survey through printed instructions provided to designated respondents. The web survey is hosted by Westat, with which BJS has a cooperative agreement to conduct the ASPP.²⁵ Paper forms and electronic .pdf copies will continue to be available as a back-up mode of submission if respondents indicate they prefer that mode. Attachment 6 shows the screen-shots from the 2013 study questionnaires; these pages demonstrate the same page formats that web respondents will encounter as they complete the 2014 surveys.²⁶ Attachments 7 through 9 present the 2014

²⁵ BJS's cooperative agreement with Westat for the ASPP was the result of a competition (Annual Surveys of Probation and Parole, 2011-2014 Solicitation, 2011-BJS-2872; see http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/aspp1114_col.pdf) which was separate and independent of the competition which resulted in the selection of Westat to conduct the CAPSA (2011 Census of Adult Probation Supervising Agencies Solicitation, 2010-BJS-2663; see <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/capsa11sol.pdf>). BJS and Westat have been careful to maintain a complete separation between project tasks and funds associated with each project. Commitments to ASPP and to CAPSA are separately monitored by BJS to ensure that the execution of each project does not interfere with the other. This includes the assignment at BJS of different project monitors for ASPP and CAPSA.

²⁶ Some smaller probation agencies have been unable to complete the CJ-8 Annual Probation Survey Long Form (Attachment 8). They may have limited record keeping systems and limited financial and personnel

hardcopy questionnaires. Both the web surveys and hardcopy questionnaires include the OMB number, general information/contact information, instructions, and burden statement.

Use of the web by respondents has grown steadily since the option was first offered in the 2007 surveys. Among parole respondents, submission by web increased from 56 percent in 2007 (30/54) to 91 percent in 2012 (48/53). Among probation respondents, participation using the web option has increased from 19 percent in 2007 (89/463) to 84 percent in 2012 (366/436).²⁷

BJS and Westat continue to work toward achieving 100 percent of data online 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 can 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.^{28,29,30} Most of these advantages are not possibilities for hardcopy questionnaires. (See section B, item 3, “Methods to Maximize Response” for more information.)

4. Efforts to Identify Duplication

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

- The Census of Adult Probation Supervising Agencies which, pending OMB approval, BJS plans have in the field starting in mid-June 2014 (reference date of June 30, 2014), has been designed to collect information on the characteristics of probation agencies; a request to conduct CAPSA is currently under review by OMB. The community corrections field has identified the 2014 CAPSA as an important source to fill current information gaps in the field by providing a clear picture of how adult probation in the United States is currently organized, the

resources that would permit them to do additional tabulations necessary, may not need or use detailed data in the management of their supervision population, or 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) (Attachment 9) was created, and approved by OMB in the 2001 submission, to minimize burden while nevertheless collecting basic information which is currently available.

²⁷ In 2007, there was 1 non-respondent each for probation and parole; in 2012, there were 32 non-respondents for probation.

²⁸ Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: the tailored design methods*. Second edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

²⁹ 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.

³⁰ Skitka, L. J., & Sargis, E. G. (2006). The Internet as psychological laboratory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 529-555.

supervision policies and practices agencies have established to administer adult probation, the various types of functions that agencies perform, and the different types of individuals supervised by probation agencies. The 2014 CAPSA will provide the first national data on probation agencies since BJS last collected data in 1991.

In contrast with CAPSA, the Annual Probation Survey collects information on the size and flow of offenders under community supervision, the characteristics of the population, and tracks key outcomes of offenders on probation, such as completion of supervision terms and returns to incarceration (or recidivism). The APS does not collect information about agency characteristics (other than population-related counts with a different reference date than CAPSA). Additionally, the APS is designed to collect aggregate counts and therefore relies on central reporters (some of which are not supervising agencies) when possible to provide the population data for all or part of the state. Because the focus in CAPSA is to obtain information on independent agencies, not all of the agencies that participate in the APS qualify for participation in CAPSA; and a significant number of the agencies that are covered by those central reporters in the APS, meaning that they do not participate themselves, qualify for participation in CAPSA. CAPSA, together with the coverage questions proposed for inclusion in the 2014 Annual Probation Survey, is expected to enable BJS to systematically assess, and potentially improve, the coverage of population universe for the Annual Probation Survey.

- 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 obtains data on federal offenders under supervision from the Office of Probation and Pretrial Services, Administrative Office of the United States Courts (AOUSC). The FJSP provides data on federal offenders under supervision for ASPP, but the FJSP data are limited to federal offenders and do not cover state populations. With the knowledge and consent of BJS's 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 ASPP.
- The National Survey of Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), which is sponsored by 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. This is different from the ASPP which provides counts of the population under supervision on a single day. In addition, ASPP collects 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.

- 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. The estimates obtained from ASPP do not share the same limitation as ASPP is, by design, a complete enumeration of all probation and parole offenders. 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 Association of Paroling Authorities International (APAI), is a nonprofit organization which was formed to discuss best practices and current issues surrounding conditional release, reentry into the community and public safety, occasionally conducts surveys of member practices. These surveys have not collected parole population data, which is the main objective of the BJS parole survey.

Although some probation and parole data have been collected through other surveys, no exact duplicative efforts were uncovered during a search of the National Criminal Justice Reference 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 these 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. As noted in part A, item 3, "Use of Information Technology," BJS first received OMB approval in 2001 to collect critical information from local-level probation agencies that are unable to respond to the full list of data elements requested on the Annual Probation Survey Long Form (Attachment 8)

using the Annual Probation Survey Short Form (Attachment 9). Use of the Short Form serves to minimize burden while nevertheless collecting basic information that is currently available. In the 2012 survey, 161 out of 468 probation reporters (34 percent) completed the Short Form; these reporters accounted for about 4 percent of the more than 3.9 million offenders on probation at yearend 2012. The average yearend probation population was 1,118 among agencies that completed the Short Form in 2012, while for those that completed the Long Form it was 13,024, or over 10 times larger. There is no short form for the Annual Parole Survey; the short form only applies to the Annual Probation Survey.

Response patterns from the 2013 survey demonstrate that the strategy is successful at increasing survey participation by the survey due date (February 28) and reducing nonresponse to the core items. As of February 28, 2014, the response rate among agencies completing the Short Form was 58 percent compared to 45 percent agencies completing the Long Form. Only 4 percent of agencies completing the Short Form failed to answer all core survey items compared to 10 percent of agencies completing the Long Form. These findings suggest that use of the Short Form is less burdensome and helps to control costs to the government by reducing the level of effort associated with follow-up for unit and item nonresponse.

The Short Form (CJ-8A) includes what BJS considers to be key data elements necessary to track changes in the total population under probation supervision; these core elements have been collected since the ASPP series began. This approach to minimizing burden is also believed to be the best approach to maximizing response.

6. Consequences of Less Frequent Collection

Less than annual collection of the ASPP data would both result in a break in series—as noted previously, these two surveys have been collected annually since 1977—and in a reduced ability/capacity to track changes in the community supervision populations. One of the main purposes of these surveys is to provide comparative data across states and years 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 in 2012 when a decline in the population under community supervision was observed for the fourth year in a row, 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's 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 79, Number 60, pages 17775-17576 on March 28, 2014 (see Attachment 10). The 30-day notice for public commentary was published in the Federal Register, Volume 79, Number 106, pages 31983-31984, on June 3, 2014 (see Attachment 11). Following the publication of the 60-day notice, BJS received and responded to one request for a copy of the proposed information collection instrument and instructions. No other comments were received.

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
Senior Research Associate
Justice Policy Center
The Urban Institute
2100 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 261-5506

Patrick Barrera, Southern Regional Vice President
Probation Association of New Jersey
617 Union Avenue, Bldg. 2-20
Brielle, NJ 08730
(732) 223-1799

Ms. Peggy Burke, Principal
The Center for Effective Public Policy
8605 Cameron Street, Suite 514
Silver Spring, MD 20910
(301) 589-9383

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

Alison Cook-Davis, Research Analyst
Policy, Planning, & Analysis Division
Maricopa County Adult Probation
620 West Jackson Street, Suite 3098
Phoenix, AZ 85003
(602) 372-0846

Jennifer Ferguson, Research Analyst
Maricopa County Adult Probation
620 W. Jackson Street, Suite 3098
Phoenix, AZ 85003
(602) 506-0488

Mack Jenkins, Chief Probation Officer
San Diego County Probation Department
9444 Balboa Avenue, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 514-3148

Stuart Jenkins, Director
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
8610 Shoal Creek Boulevard
P.O. Box 13401
Austin, Texas 78711
(512) 406-5404

Fred Klunk, Director
Statistical Reporting and Evidence-Based Program Evaluation Office
Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole
1101 South Front Street
Harrisburg, PA 17104
(717) 787-5699

Nathan Lowe, Research Assistant
American Probation and Parole Association
c/o The Council of State Governments
3560 Iron Works Pike
P.O. Box 11910
Lexington, KY 40578-1910
(859) 244-8057

Natalie Pearl, Director
Research Unit
San Diego County Probation Department
94444 Balboa Avenue, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 514-3148

Charlene Rhyne, Senior Research and Evaluation Analyst
Multnomah County Department of Community Service
501 Southeast Hawthorne Boulevard
Portland, OR 97214
(503) 823-4000

Julie Tice, Chief Probation Officer
East Liverpool Municipal Court – Adult Probation
126 West 6th Street
East Liverpool, OH 43920
(330) 386-9254

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
3560 Iron Works Pike
P.O. Box 11910
Lexington, KY 40578-1910
(606) 244-8203

Gary Yates, Chief Probation Officer
Butler County Ohio Probation
314 High Street, 3rd Floor
Hamilton, OH 45011
(512) 785-5815

9. Paying Respondents

Participation in the ASPP 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 ASPP represent institutional characteristics of publicly-administered or funded facilities and are, therefore, in the public domain. In addition, no individually identifiable information is provided. All information obtained consists of aggregate counts of the population under supervision by an agency, thereby severely limiting the potential for the information to be used to identify an individual. Respondents are notified in written communication that participation is voluntary. BJS does not archive or otherwise publish the names, telephone numbers, or email addresses of the persons responsible for completing the questionnaires.

11. Justification for Sensitive Questions

Not applicable. There are no questions of a sensitive nature included in the ASPP. 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

To calculate the burden associated with the conduct of the ASPP, it is assumed that the CJ-7 will be used to collect data from 53 state, federal, and local parole departments, the CJ-8 will be used with 307 state, federal, and local probation

departments, and the CJ-8A will be used with 161 local probation departments. As in past survey cycles, the respondent burden will be kept to a minimum by collecting data from central state departments whenever possible and by distributing the CJ-8A to local probation agencies with limited record-keeping and/or information systems and limited financial and personnel resources.

As a result of the Public Safety Realignment in California in 2011, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Department of Juvenile Justice no longer supervises parolees; therefore, the agency has been removed from the parole frame. During collection of data for the 2012 reference year, BJS was also informed of the closing of the municipal agency in Alabama that had been providing parole supervision.

The federal data probation and parole data are obtained indirectly from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts through BJS’s 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 a standard 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:

Table 1. Burden hours

Type of form	Number of respondents	Average time to complete form	Average follow-up time	Total average time required	Annual reporting hours
CJ-7	53	1.5	0.25	1.75	93
CJ-8	307	1.6	0.25	1.85	568
CJ-8A	161	0.6	0.125	0.725	117
Total	521	1.28	0.21	1.49	778

13. Estimate of Respondent Cost

Web survey invitations will be mailed and emailed to each respondent (see Attachment 13), and hardcopy questionnaires along with a self-addressed stamped envelope will be mailed to respondents upon request (see Attachments 7, 8, and 9). (See part A, item 16, “Project Schedule” for more information about the survey invitations 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.

The CJ-7 form is expected to take 1.5 hours per response plus 0.25 hours for follow-up. Using the rate of \$30 per hour, the cost of the 53 CJ-7 forms is estimated to be \$2,790, with a cost to each respondent of \$52.64. The CJ-8 forms are estimated to take 1.6 hours each per response plus 0.25 hours for follow-up efforts. The estimated burden of the 307 CJ-8 respondents is \$17,040, or \$55.50 per respondent. The CJ-8A is estimated to take 0.6 hours per response plus 0.25 hours for follow-up, for a total cost of \$21.80 per respondent, and a total estimated respondent cost of \$3,510 for the 161 CJ-8A respondents. The total respondent cost for the entire collection is \$23,340 for the 2014 data collection year. By distributing the CJ-8A to 161 local probation agencies, BJS is relieving each of those respondents of an estimated 1 hour per response plus 0.125 hours of follow-up efforts, or \$33.91, for a total cost savings of \$5,460.

14. Cost to the Federal Government

Currently, the division of labor for a data collection cycle of the ASPP is as follows: Westat maintains and updates the website and database, conducts the mail-out of survey invitations, collects the data, conducts follow-up efforts, and prepares a dataset and statistical tables for BJS analysis. BJS staff analyze the data, write reports based on these data, and archive the data for public use.

Based upon actual costs incurred during 2012, the estimated costs to the government associated with the collection and processing of data, preparation of statistical tables, publication of reports, and archiving of data for these two annual collections are shown in the table that follows. The estimated total cost of \$364,293 are divided between Westat (\$298,000) and BJS (\$66,293). Both BJS and Westat costs include salary, fringe, and overhead. Westat costs include costs in addition to salary as described in table 2.

Table 2. Estimated costs for 2014 probation and parole surveys**BJS costs**

Staff salaries	
GS-12 Statistician (25%)	\$30,248
GS-14 Statistician (3%)	3,507
GS-14 Supervisory Statistician (3%)	3,507
GS-15 Chief Editor (3%)	3,875
Other Editorial Staff	2,400
Front-Office Staff (GS-15 & Directors)	1,500
Subtotal salaries	\$45,036
Fringe benefits (28% of salaries)	\$12,610
Subtotal: Salary & fringe	\$57,646
Other administrative costs of salary & fringe (15%)	\$8,647
Subtotal: BJS costs	\$66,293

Westat costs

Staff, printing, mailout, fax and telephone followup, programming, software and hardware maintenance, fringe benefits, and Westat overhead)	\$298,000
Total estimated costs	\$364,293

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

15. Reason for Change in Burden

Starting with the 2014 ASPP, the burden for the Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8, and the Annual Probation Survey (Short Form), CJ-8A, is expected to increase by 5 minutes per response due to the addition of three questions to identify the probation agencies for which each reporter provided data. The information is being requested to assess completeness of coverage for the Annual Probation Survey. (See part B, item 1, "Universe and Respondent Selection" on the need for this information. See part B, item 4, "Testing of Procedures," for information on the reporting burden associated with these items.)

16. Project Schedule and Publication/Analysis Plans

Table 3. Project schedule

Task	Start date	End date
Data collection	December	May
Notification of impending due dates, nonresponse follow-up, thank-you letters	February	April
Data editing, verification, final callbacks	February	May
Analysis	May	June
Report writing	June	July
Press release and final report released	September	September

To alert reporters of the upcoming 2014 survey, an email message and a pre-notification letter will be sent in mid-November 2014. This correspondence will let them know to expect a request to complete a survey for the 2014 data collection, and the type of information that will be requested. The pre-notification letter will include a Designation Form to indicate the person within the reporting agency best suited to respond to the survey (Attachment 12). A survey invitation announcing the collection will be sent in mid-December, requesting all parole and probation agencies to submit their web survey by February 28 of the following year (Attachment 13). Paper forms, including electronic .pdf copies, will continue to be available as a back-up mode of submission to respondents upon request (Attachments 7, 8, 9).

Thank-you/reminder letters will be emailed to agencies in mid-February to alert them to the impending due date (Attachment 14). Upon submission of each web survey, the respondent will automatically receive a thank-you email (Attachment 15).

A second thank-you/reminder email will be sent a week after the survey due date has passed to those who have not completed the questionnaire by that date (Attachment 16). A third thank-you/reminder letter will be emailed in mid-April; two weeks before the end of the data collection period (Attachment 17).

After the survey due date, targeted non-response follow-up calls will be made to state agencies and large probation agencies that have not yet submitted their surveys (Attachment 18). Throughout data collection, respondents will also be contacted by telephone or email to discuss any inconsistencies in their reported data or to ask for information not completed in the survey (Attachment 19), especially if the data were reported in the prior year. A follow-up letter will be sent to the agency head whenever this results in the revision of the data that was originally submitted (Attachment 20).

After the surveys have been reviewed and verified for completeness, a thank-you letter will be sent to the agency head. The completion thank-you letters will include a URL for the most recent BJS Probation and Parole report as a means of building interest in the survey data (Attachment 21). After the final closeout of data collection, agencies which did not submit a survey will receive a final closeout letter describing the status of their submission and encouraging their participation in the future. There are three versions of the letter, indicating whether they submitted no data, partial data, or data that required clarification that was never received (Attachments 22, 23, 24).

Early in data collection, preliminary analysis of the submitted surveys 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.

Information Dissemination from the Annual Probation and Parole Surveys

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. Multiple products are made available through the BJS website enable BJS to disseminate key statistics which are of importance to community corrections executives, data providers, and associations, Congress, components of the United States Department of Justice, researchers, the media, and the public. These key statistics appear in table 4 (see page 26).

Modes of dissemination include timely press releases, annual bulletins, two new Corrections Statistical Analysis Tools or “webtools” (scheduled for release during summer, 2014, see Attachment 5), and ready access to probation and parole datasets at the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/index.jsp>).

Table 4. Key statistics on community corrections

Key statistic	ASPP data element	Relevant questionnaire item	
		Annual Probation Survey, CJ-8	Annual Parole Survey, CJ-7
Number under supervision	Yearend population	Q4	Q4
Annual change in population	Yearend population, previous year and current year	Q4	Q4
Number of movements	Total entries during the year	Q2e, Q3i	Q2g, Q3h
	Total exits during the year		
Annual change in movements	Total entries previous year and current year	Q2e, Q3i	Q2g, Q3h
	Total exits previous year and current year		
Supervision rate per 100,000 U.S. adult residents	Yearend population	Q4	Q4
Turnover rate	Total exits	Q3i; Q1, Q4	Q3h; Q1, Q4
	Beginning and yearend population (average)		
Completion rate	Type of exit – completion	Q3a, Q3g1; Q1, Q4	Q3a, Qf1; Q1, Q4
	Beginning and yearend population (average)		
Incarceration rate	Type of exit – incarceration (total)	Q3b1 to Q3b5; Q1, Q4	Q3b1 to Q3b5; Q1, Q4
	Beginning and yearend population (average)		
Mean time under supervision	Total exits	Q3i; Q1, Q4	Q3h; Q1, Q4
	Beginning and yearend population (average)		
	(Inverse of turnover rate times 12)		
Rate of incarceration of at risk population	Type of exit – incarceration	Q3b1 to Qb5; Q1, Q2e	Q3b1 to Qb5; Q1, Q2g
	Beginning year population plus total entries		
Mortality rate	Type of exit – death	Q3f; Q1, Q4	Q3e; Q1, Q4
	Beginning and yearend population (average)		
Number and proportion of offenders by sex	Number of men; number of women	Q6a to Q6d	Q9a to Q9d
	Yearend population		
Number and proportion of offenders by race	Number by each racial category	Q7a to Q7j	Q10a to Q10j
	Yearend population		
Number and proportion of offenders by type of offense	Number of violent, property, drug etc.	Q9a to Q9j	Q11a to Q11h
	Yearend population		
Number and proportion of probationers by severity of offense	Number of felons; number of misdemeanants	Q8a to Q8e	--
	Yearend population		

Annual bulletins in BJS “Probation and Parole Population Series” (<http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbse&sid=42>), including *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2012* 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.³¹ BJS also publishes data from the ASPP series in its Correctional Populations in the United States Series (<http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbse&sid=5>), including *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2012*.³² In addition to providing summary data

³¹ Maruschak, L. and Bonczar, T., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 4).

³² Glaze, L. and Herberman, E., *op. cit.* (see Attachment 3).

on the total correctional population, the correctional populations series allows BJS to focus more attention on how data from the ASPP changed in relation to other components of the correctional population, as well as the size of the community corrections population relative to institutional corrections.

BJS also worked hard over the last several years to archive data from the ASPP at the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/NACJD/index.jsp>) maintained by the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan. Making the data available through the NACJD was deemed to be essential to encouraging external researchers to use these data. The ASPP data have been archived starting with the data for 1994, the earliest year for which these data exist in electronic form, through 2011. The archiving of these datasets included the development of a common set of mnemonic variable names and variable crosswalks to document the years for which each specific variable is available, and the preparation of codebooks, including compilations, by jurisdiction, of the notes provided by individual respondents to the ASPP. This effort was undertaken with the realization that providing the data only in tabular format, first as part of BJS Correctional Populations in the United States series (last published in 1998, <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=690>), and subsequently as a series of unpublished statistical tables that were disseminated to users on request was hampering access to these data.

The first Annual Probation Survey datasets for years prior to 2000 were released starting in June, 2011, and the first Annual Parole Survey datasets for these same years were released in September, 2012, with the bulk of each collection having been released in May, 2013. BJS has set a goal of archiving the data from each subsequent year soon after the date of release of its annual report in its Probation and Parole in United States series. Utilization statistics from the NACJD website indicate that the effort to encourage external research is succeeding based on utilization statistics that were prepared on April 10, 2014. Since date of first release, a total of 456 unique users downloaded one or more of Annual Probation Survey datasets. A total of 312 unique users downloaded one or more of the Annual Parole Survey datasets since the date of their first release.

To further facilitate access to the ASPP data, BJS has embarked upon the development of two “Corrections Statistical Analysis Tools”, or “webtools” – one each for probation and for parole – planned for release during summer, 2014; see Attachment 5 for a sample screenshot. These webtools are being designed to operate in a manner similar to the “Corrections Statistical Analysis Tool (CSAT) – Prisoners”, <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=nps> which allows users to generate tables on the numbers and rates of prisoners under the jurisdiction of federal or state correctional authorities from National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) Program.

The ASPP webtools will allow the public to prepare custom tables for the yearend probation or parole population by geographical level (including the U.S. total,

federal population, state total, and one or more specific states and the District of Columbia), for one or more years. The rate of supervision for the total number of parolees or adults on probation will also be available. Users also will be able to prepare custom tables for total annual entries and exits to/from probation or parole, and characteristics of these populations, also for a specific geographical level(s) and year(s). Users will be provided with access to jurisdiction notes that apply to the specific information that is being displayed, based on information submitted by the respondents. These are the same jurisdiction notes that accompany the archived files. All tables may be viewed on the website or downloaded using point and click (Excel or csv format).

In addition to the preparation of custom tables, each webtool will serve as a central point of access to the ASPP questionnaires, definitions, methodology, a set of tables already prepared by BJS (“Quick tables”), and a link to the archived ASPP files at the NACJD.

17. Expiration Date Approval

The OMB Control Number and the expiration date will be printed on the CJ-7, CJ-8, and CJ-8A forms and on the web survey (Attachments 6, 7, 8, 9).

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.