



Shifting Data Quality Follow-Up Methods for a Time-Series Collection of Local and State Agencies

FCSM 2018 RESEARCH AND POLICY CONFERENCE

Chris Ellis¹, Scott Ginder¹, Megan Waggy¹, Mary Cowhig²

¹ RTI International; ² Bureau of Justice Statistics

Overview of Presentation

- Acknowledgements
- Mortality in Correctional Institutions (MCI) and Annual Survey of Jails (ASJ) collections
- Introduction to Data Quality Follow-up (DQFU)
- Research Questions
- Revisiting DQFU definitions and protocols
- Results of modified DQFU protocol
 - Timing of contacts
 - Timing of resolutions
 - Case resolution rates
 - Item response rates
 - Budgetary
- Lessons Learned
- Conclusions

Acknowledgements

- Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS)
 - Mary Cowhig, Program Manager for MCI collection
 - Zhen Zeng, Program Manager for ASJ collection
- RTI International
 - Scott Ginder, MCI-ASJ Analysis and Reporting Task Leader
 - Megan Waggy, MCI-ASJ Data Collection Manager

The views expressed in this presentation do not necessarily reflect the official policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Bureau of Justice Statistics; nor does mention of trade names, commercial practices, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This presentation is sponsored by RTI International's Survey Research Division.



Mortality in Correctional Institutions

- Formerly known as Deaths in Custody Reporting Program (DCRP)
- Primary source of mortality statistics within the American correctional system
 - 50 state Departments of Corrections (DOCs)
 - Approximately 2,900 local jail jurisdictions
- Multimode data collection
 - Respondents are typically prison and jail administrators
 - Respondent submission of agency administrative data
 - Two forms: individual death reports and annual summary
 - Web, paper, fax, e-mail, bulk data file, and (during nonresponse follow-up) telephone

MCI Mortality in
Correctional Institutions




Annual Survey of Jails

- Collects data annually from a sample of local jail jurisdictions
- Data are used to estimate:
 - Number, characteristics of jail inmates
 - Jail capacity
 - Other key jail population statistics
- The 2015–2016 ASJ was integrated into the MCI collection, whereby ASJ jails
 - Received tailored communications
 - Submitted data via an expanded form
 - Still provided customary MCI data
 - Submitted data via the same multimodes as MCI



MCI

ASJ




RY2015-2016 MCI-ASJ

DQFU = Data Quality Follow-Up

- MCI and ASJ DQFU
 - Post-data submission contacts to agencies
 - Focused on outstanding data quality issues
 - More involved than question-level web validation
 - Cross-variable or even cross-form consistency checks
 - Cross-year comparisons, given time-series nature of collection
 - Conducted by project team members
 - Completed via telephone and e-mail

Overarching Data Collection Protocol for MCI-ASJ



Historical Approach to DQFU

- Traditional DQFU
 - June–July of collection cycle
 - Initiated after the bulk of national data received
- Challenges of Traditional DQFU
 - Delayed contact with early responders (up to 4.5 months)
 - Potential change in agency data suppliers (e.g., attrition, transfer)
 - Limited window of time for DQFU
 - Required relatively high number of staff
 - Increased per person costs (e.g., training hours, management time)
- Potential benefits of Early* DQFU
 - Greater ease of correcting the data (respondent recall, recency effect)?
 - Improved agency- and item-level resolution rates?
 - Improved efficiency of making agency contacts?


* *Initiating DQFU within 2 weeks of data submission throughout data collection window.*

Research Questions

1. Will data quality throughout data collection be enhanced through earlier, real-time contacting of responding agencies?
2. For agencies undergoing Early DQFU, what impact is there on time-to-contact and time-to-resolve?
3. Will conducting DQFU over an extended period, versus a compressed period, lead to lower cost per case resolutions?
4. What impact will doing DQFU on a continual basis, starting earlier in the collection schedule, have on project planning and resources?


Two-Stage Redesign of DQFU

- Initial pilot of Early DQFU for RY2015
- Full implementation of Early DQFU for RY2016



Local Jails: Early DQFU Application

PERCENT OF DQFU CASES RECEIVING EARLY DQFU




Results of Full Implementation of Early DQFU Protocol

Local Jails: Time From Response to DQFU Contact

- Early DQFU is resulting in
 - Contact to agencies closer to their initiation of forms
 - Sooner initial contact with agency during the DQFU period
- Traditional DQFU contact times are also improved
 - Still needed for partial responders
 - Times likely benefitting from most cases going through Early DQFU
- Overall, Early DQFU is resulting in earlier contact to all agencies

AVERAGE ELAPSED DAYS


■ ASF Start to DQFU Start ■ DQFU Start to 1st DQFU Contact



Average Annual Summary Form start date was 30 days later in 2016 than 2014 and 2015 because of timing of launch.


Local Jails: Time From First DQFU Contact to Resolution

AVERAGE ELAPSED DAYS FROM FIRST DQFU CONTACT TO RESOLUTION



Local Jails: Resolution of DQFU cases


CASE RESOLUTION RATES



- Compared to 2014, resolution rates for 2015 DQFU cases decreased (-3.6%)
 - 2015 was initial integration of ASJ with MCI, so likely primary factor
- 2016 rates were the highest across all three comparison groups

Local Jails: Item Response Rates, Selected ASF Items


FINAL ASF ITEM RESPONSE RATES



MCI: Item Response Rates, Selected Death Record Items





FINAL DEATH RECORD ITEM RESPONSE RATES

■ 2014 ■ 2015 ■ 2016



DQFU Resolution Rates & HPC (Hours per Complete)

- **RY2014** – Traditional DQFU; MCI-only (short form)
- **RY2015** – Early DQFU followed by traditional DQFU, MCI/**ASJ**
- **RY2016** – **Early DQFU** followed by traditional DQFU, MCI/**ASJ**


	RY2014	RY2015	RY2016
% Resolved	82%	78.4% 	84.6% 
Hours per Case	0.71	0.98 	0.85 

Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned – What Defines a DQFU Case

- New Early DQFU protocol required redefining when cases could/should be worked:
 - Had the agency submitted all of their data?
 - If an agency was still working on their form, for example, we don't want to ask them about data quality errors just yet.
 - Had we (RTI) completed our internal review of the data?
 - MCI reviews all text fields to facilitate recoding.
 - MCI reviews all reported causes of death (COD) to ensure that information provided is sufficient for medical coding.

Lessons Learned – What Defines a DQFU Case (cont.)



Lesson Learned: Be organized!

Conclusions

Conclusions



1. Will data quality throughout data collection be enhanced through earlier, real-time contacting of responding agencies?
 - As measured by resolution of cases needing DQFU
 - Average RY2016 resolution rates for local jails improved compared to RY2015 and RY2014
 - Resolution rates improved for MCI-only and ASJ agencies from RY2015 to RY2016
 - As measured by impact on key variable item-level response rates
 - Annual summary form rates already averaged 98%-99% per item
 - With the application of the Early DQFU protocol, these rates were sustained
 - Thus, the impact of Early DQFU for RY2016 had very little impact on item-level response rates

Conclusions (cont.)

2. For agencies undergoing Early DQFU what impact is there on time-to-contact and time-to-resolve?
 - Time from when a form was begun – Early DQFU in RY2016 resulted in contacting agencies 12 days sooner than in RY2015.
 - Time from when DQFU began until initial contact – also decreased under the new, Early DQFU methodology.
 - Time from initial contact to resolution – markedly decreased with the Early DQFU methodology.

Conclusions (cont.)

3. Will conducting DQFU over an extended period, versus a compressed period, lead to lower cost-per-case resolutions?
- As a reminder, there was an increased resolution rate from RY2015 to RY2016
 - In addition to this boost in successful resolutions, efficiency (measured by hours per case) also improved

	RY2015	RY2016
% Resolved	78.4%	84.6% 
Hours per Case	0.98	0.85 

Conclusions (cont.)

4. What impact will doing DQFU on a continual basis, starting earlier in the collection schedule, have on project planning and resources?
 - One significant impact was having to move DQFU-related programming up to coincide with data collection launch programming

Conclusions (cont.)

4. What impact will doing DQFU on a continual basis, starting earlier in the collection schedule, have on project planning and resources (cont.)?
 - Starting DQFU sooner and conducting it over a longer period of time did allow for fewer staff, which
 - Decreased training hours
 - Decreased management time associated with staff count
 - Allowed for increased knowledge and experience among team
 - Conversely, a longer DQFU production period did require
 - Increased number of staff meetings (usually 1/week)
 - Increased subtask management time

delivering **the promise of science**
for global good



Chris Ellis

Senior Survey Director

Senior Program Manager

Security & Resilience Program

ellis@rti.org

919.541.6480

Supplemental Slide (for Q&A)

Historical DQFU – Number and Percent of Responders

Scope of Traditional Data Quality Follow-Up (DQFU)*	RY2012 [~]	RY2013 [^]	RY2014
# of Responding Agencies	2,720	2,724	2,771
# of Agencies At Start of DQFU	655	1,434	1,072
% of Agencies At Start of DQFU	24%	53%	39%

* As of June, which is typically the start date of DQFU.

~ RY2012 DQ machine edits involved less year-to-year comparing of data.

^ RY2013 combined MCI/DCRP and the Census of Jails, which increased the number of forms and variables per form being requested.