2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS)

Public-Use Data File User's Manual

NCES 2018-107
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ies NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
Institute of Education Sciences

This page is intentionally left blank

2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS)

Public-Use Data File User's Manual

March 2018

Michael Jackson
Melissa Diliberti
Jana Kemp
Steven Hummel
American Institutes for Research

Christina Cox
Komba Gbondo-Tugbawa
Dillon Simon
U.S. Census Bureau

Rachel Hansen
Project Officer
National Center for Education Statistics

NCES 2018-107
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ies NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
Institute of Education Sciences

U.S. Department of Education
Betsy DeVos
Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences
Thomas Brock
Commissioner for Education Research
Delegated the Duties of the Director

National Center for Education Statistics
James L. Woodworth
Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high-priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high-quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public. Unless specifically noted, all information contained herein is in the public domain.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to

NCES, IES, U.S. Department of Education
Potomac Center Plaza
550 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20202

March 2018

The NCES Home Page address is http://nces.ed.gov.
The NCES Publications and Products address is http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

This publication is only available online. To download, view, and print the report as a PDF file, go to the NCES Publications and Products address shown above.

This report was prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics under Contract No. ED-IES-12-D-0002 with the American Institutes for Research. Mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Suggested Citation
Jackson, M., Diliberti, M., Kemp, J., Hummel, S., Cox, C., Gbondo-Tugbawa, K., Simon, D., and Hansen, R. (2018). *2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS): Public-Use Data File User's Manual* (NCES 2018-107). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC. Retrieved [date] from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Content Contact
Rachel Hansen
(202) 245-7082
rachel.hansen@ed.gov

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables ..... **vi**

1. Introduction **1**

1.1 Background of the Study 1

1.2 Questionnaire Development 2

1.3 Survey Topics 11

1.3.1 School Practices and Programs 11

1.3.2 Parent and Community Involvement at School 11

1.3.3 School Security Staff 11

1.3.4 School Mental Health Services 12

1.3.5 Staff Training 12

1.3.6 Limitations on Crime Prevention 12

1.3.7 Frequency of Crime and Violence at School 12

1.3.8 Number of Incidents 12

1.3.9 Disciplinary Problems and Actions 13

1.3.10 School Characteristics 13

2. Sample Design and Weighting **15**

2.1 Sampling Frame 15

2.2 Sample Design 15

2.3 Sample Size 16

2.4 Stratification, Sample Selection, and Final Sample 16

2.5 Weighting 20

3. Data Collection Methods and Response Rates **23**

3.1 Data Collection Activities 23

3.2 Interviewer Training 25

3.2.1 Training on Basic Interviewer Skills 25

3.2.2 Training on Questionnaire Follow-up 25

3.2.3 Training on Refusal Conversion 26

3.2.4 Training on Data Retrieval 26

3.3 Data Retrieval 26

3.4 Efforts to Increase Response Rates 27

3.5 Unit Response Rate 28

3.6 Analysis of Unit Nonresponse Bias 30

3.7 Item Response Rates 31
3.8 Analysis of Item Nonresponse Bias 31
3.9 Nonsampling Error 32
4. Data Preparation 33
4.1 Analysis of Disclosure Risk 33
4.2 Editing Specifications 33
4.2.1 Range Specifications 33
4.2.2 Consistency Checks (Logic Edits) 34
4.3 Review and Coding of Text Items 34
4.4 Imputation 35
4.4.1 Imputation Methods 35
4.4.2 Imputation Order 36
4.4.3 Imputation Flags 36
5. Guide to the Public-Use Data File and Codebook 37
5.1 Content and Organization of the Data File 37
5.2 Public-Use Data File 39
5.3 Unique School Identifier 39
5.4 Questionnaire Item Variables 40
5.5 Variables Recoded for Public-Use File to Preserve Confidentiality 40
5.6 Composite Variables 41
5.7 Sampling Frame Variables 45
5.8 Weighting and Variance Estimation Variables 46
5.9 Imputation Flag Variables 46
6. Applying the Weight and Computing Standard Errors 47
6.1 Applying the Weight 47
6.2 Computing Standard Errors 47
7. Data Considerations and Anomalies 51
7.1 Law Enforcement Officers: Items 11 (C0610) Through 18b (C0242) 51
7.2 Number of Incidents: Subitems 26a_1 (C0310) Through 26l_2 (C0364) 51
7.3 Use of Disciplinary Actions: Subitems 34a_1 (C0390) Through 34o_2 (C0456) 51
7.4 Number of Students Involved in Recorded Offenses of Use/Possession of a Firearm/Explosive Device: Subitem 35a_1 (C0458) 51
7.5 Disciplinary Actions Taken: Subitems 35a_1 (C0458) Through 35e_5 (C0506) 52
7.6 Total Removals and Transfers: Subitems 36a (C0518) and 36b (C0520) 52
7.7 Classroom Changes: Item 40 (C0538) 52

7.8 Average Daily Attendance: Item 44 (C0568) 52
7.9 Outliers in Count Variables 53
8. References 55
Appendix A: 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety Questionnaire A-1
Appendix B: List of Variables and Record Layout of the Fixed-Format ASCII File for the Public-Use Data B-1
Appendix C: List of Variables in the Restricted-Use Data File and Not in the Public-Use Data File C-1
Appendix D: 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety Public-Use Codebook D-1
Appendix E: Advance Letter to Principals E-1
Appendix F: Principal Cover Letter F-1
Appendix G: Chief State School Officer Letter G-1
Appendix H: Superintendent Letter H-1
Appendix I: Interviewer Self Study Guide I-1
Appendix J: Reminder and Non-Response Follow-Up Operation Interviewer Self Study Guide J-1
Appendix K: Failed Edit Follow-Up Operation Interviewer Self Study Guide K-1
Appendix L: Reminder E-mails to Principals L-1
Appendix M: Detailed Analysis of Unit Nonresponse Bias M-1
Appendix N: Base-Weighted Item Response Rates N-1
Appendix O: Detailed Analysis of Item Nonresponse Bias O-1
Appendix P: Detailed Editing Procedures, by Item P-1
Appendix Q: Detailed Imputation Procedures, by Item Q-1

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Unweighted and weighted unit response rates, by selected school characteristics: School year 2015–16	19
2.	Characteristics of the SSOCS:2016 final analysis weight (FINALWGT)	21
3.	Schedule of data collection activities: SSOCS:2016	24
4.	Number of public schools, by interview status: SSOCS:2016	29
5.	Created text item for public-use file: SSOCS:2016	34
6.	Summary of weighting and sample variance estimation variables: SSOCS:2000 to SSOCS:2016	48
C-1.	SSOCS:2016 variables in the restricted-use file that were omitted from the public-use file	C-2
M-1.	Comparison of sample and target population, by school characteristics, SSOCS:2016	M-4
M-2.	Response rates by school characteristics: SSOCS:2016	M-6
M-3.	Summary of chi-square test of independence between school characteristics and 76 key survey variables: SSOCS:2016	M-7
M-4.	Summary of frame characteristics for which key survey variable distributions differed significantly: SSOCS:2016	M-7
M-5.	Comparison of respondents and nonrespondents, by school characteristics: SSOCS:2016	M-9
M-6.	Comparison of odds ratios, by school characteristics: SSOCS:2016	M-11
M-7.	Comparison of key estimates for low-propensity quintile and balance of interviewed sample	M-13
M-8.	Nonresponse adjustment cells, weighted and unweighted response rates of cells, and number of respondents: SSOCS:2016	M-17
M-9.	Summary of unit nonresponse bias before and after noninterview adjustment	M-18
M-10.	Effects of nonresponse adjustment on bias reduction in frame characteristics	M-18
N-1.	Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16	N-2
O-1.	Item details for items with response rates less than 85 percent: SSOCS:2016	O-3
O-2.	Comparison of original and extreme imputed value item mean estimates for items with low and high extreme imputed value estimates	O-3
O-3.	Comparison of item respondents and nonrespondents for the variable number of attacks with a weapon (C0326): SSOCS:2016	O-5
O-4.	Comparison of item respondents and nonrespondents for the variable number of attacks without a weapon (C0330): SSOCS:2016	O-7

1. Introduction

The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) is managed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) within the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education. SSOCS collects extensive crime and safety data from principals and administrators of public schools in the United States. Data from this collection can be used to study the relationship between school characteristics and violent and serious violent crimes in U.S. public schools and to examine what school programs, practices, and policies are used by schools in their efforts to reduce or prevent crime. SSOCS has been conducted six times, during the 1999–2000, 2003–04, 2005–06, 2007–08, 2009–10, and 2015–16 school years.

The latest administration of SSOCS, SSOCS:2016, was conducted by NCES, and the data collection was administered by the U.S. Census Bureau. Funding for the survey was supported by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) of the U.S. Department of Justice through its Comprehensive School Safety Initiative, which was developed in response to a 2014 congressional appropriation to conduct research about school safety. Out of a sample composed of 3,553 primary, middle, high, and combined public schools, a total of 2,092 public schools submitted completed questionnaires, for a weighted response rate of 62.9 percent. Data were collected from February 22, 2016, through July 5, 2016.

This manual is designed to assist users of the public-use SSOCS:2016 data file and offers information about the SSOCS:2016 collection, including its purpose, the sample design, data collection methods, and data processing procedures. The manual also contains a copy of the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire instrument (appendix A) as well as information specific to the SSOCS:2016 public-use data file, including a list of variables and the record layout of the fixed-format ASCII file (appendix B). The public-use data file may be obtained at https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs/data_products.asp.

A restricted-use data file is also available. To protect the confidentiality of sampled schools, certain variables included in the restricted-use file are not available in the public-use file. The restricted-use data file, and a corresponding user's manual, may be obtained through a special licensing agreement with NCES. To learn more about obtaining a license, please visit http://nces.ed.gov/statprog/instruct.asp.

1.1 Background of the Study

A safe school environment is necessary for educating our nation's youth. Students who engage in criminal behavior at school or who are victims of crime at school may not meet their potential in the classroom or at home. While school crime has always been a major concern for educators, researchers, and policymakers, it gained national attention in the aftermath of several school shootings that took place in the 1997–98 school year. Although the federal government had collected crime and safety data for several decades, these events highlighted a need for a survey that would build upon prior school crime and safety surveys[1] while meeting an increased demand

[1] The surveys on school crime and safety sponsored by the Department of Education prior to 1999 are the Safe Schools Study, conducted by the National Institute of Education in 1978; the Teacher, Principal, and Public School District Surveys on Safe, Disciplined, and Drug Free Schools, conducted by NCES through the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) in 1991; and the Principal/School Disciplinarian Survey on School Violence conducted by NCES through FRSS in 1997.

for quality and timely data pertaining to the condition of education in the United States. The SSOCS program was established by NCES in response to this need, specifically, to address safety in and around American public schools.

SSOCS is the only recurring federal survey that collects detailed information on school crime and safety from the school's perspective. SSOCS has been designed to meet the congressional mandate for NCES to provide statistics on the frequency of school violence, the nature of the school environment, and the characteristics of school violence prevention programs. Such national data are critical, given the tendency to focus on anecdotal evidence of crimes without knowing the true frequency of problems in schools. Accurate information is necessary for policymakers to make informed decisions about school policy and to demonstrate to the public a proactive approach to school safety. SSOCS data help the policy and program offices at the U.S. Department of Education design grant programs intended to address school safety, violence prevention, and school climate. Additionally, the national estimates of school crime and safety that SSOCS provides assist NCES and NIJ in fulfilling the goal of the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative, which is to improve the safety of our nation's schools and students through rigorous research that produces practical knowledge.[2]

1.2 Questionnaire Development

Since its introduction during the 1999–2000 school year, the SSOCS questionnaire has evolved over each subsequent data collection. At various times in the history of SSOCS, the survey items have been examined both for the quality of their content and of the data collected and, when necessary, the questionnaire has been adjusted. However, to the extent possible, much of the questionnaire content remains unchanged between survey administrations in order to maintain consistent benchmarks over time. The SSOCS:2016 questionnaire is the result of extensive research and development on emerging issues of school crime and items preserved from previous SSOCS data collections.

The original SSOCS questionnaire, used in the 2000 data collection, was developed in consultation with a technical review panel (TRP)[3] consisting of some of the nation's top experts on school crime and school programs relating to crime and safety. Revisions to the 2004 questionnaire were based on an analysis of responses to the 2000 questionnaire, a review of current literature in the field, feedback from a TRP and invested government agencies, and the results of extensive pretesting. The questionnaires used in 2006 and 2008 were essentially the same as the 2004 questionnaire. The questionnaire used in 2010 was similar to that used in 2008, but it incorporated minor revisions based on feedback from several SSOCS data users and school crime and safety experts.[4]

Revisions to the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire were based on several sources of information, including an analysis of responses to the SSOCS:2010 questionnaire, a review of current literature in the field, feedback from a TRP and invested government agencies, the results of

[2] For more information about the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative, see https://nij.gov/topics/crime/school-crime/pages/school-safety-initiative.aspx.
[3] The TRP consisted of researchers on school crime, educators, policymakers, and representatives of relevant education-related organizations.
[4] For further information on the development of the SSOCS instrument over previous survey iterations, please refer to the 1999–2000, 2003–04, 2005–06, 2007–08, and 2009–10 SSOCS user's manuals, which can be found at http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs/. A complete archive of SSOCS questionnaires, data, and publications, as well as answers to frequently asked questions, can also be found at this website.

extensive cognitive testing, and NIJ's interest in collecting data on school security personnel and school mental health services. While the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire included topics covered in prior years, some individual items were modified and new content was added. A copy of the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire can be found in appendix A. Differences between the 2010 and 2016 questionnaires are detailed below.

Changes to definitions between SSOCS:2010 and SSOCS:2016

This section outlines the changes made to definitions between the 2010 and 2016 survey administrations. First, several definitions were added to the 2016 questionnaire to clarify terms used in new survey items. Second, definitions were added to clarify four terms contained in the 2010 questionnaire (as well as in the 2016 questionnaire), but that had not been formally defined: bullying, cyberbullying, gender identity, and sexual orientation. Finally, minor modifications were made to three definitions, and one definition was removed.

Definitions added to SSOCS:2016

- **Active shooter** – A formal definition was added to the survey using language from the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Education's emergency recommendations. Active shooter is defined as "*an individual actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a confined and populated area; in most cases, active shooters use firearm(s) and there is no pattern or method to their selection of victims.*"
- **Bullying** – A formal definition was added to the survey using language from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Bullying is defined as "*any unwanted aggressive behavior(s) by another youth or group of youths who are not siblings or current dating partners that involves an observed or perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated.*"
- **Cyberbullying** – The definition for cyberbullying was removed from the stem of item 33 and relocated to the definitions page since multiple survey items now include this term. Cyberbullying is defined as "*when willful and repeated harm is inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, or other electronic devices.*"
- **Diagnostic assessment** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new section on school mental health services. Diagnostic assessment is defined as "*an evaluation conducted by a medical or mental health professional that identifies whether an individual has one or more medical and/or mental health diagnoses. This is in contrast to an educational assessment, which does not focus on clarifying a student's diagnosis*."
- **Evacuation** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new survey item on the types of drills used for emergency procedures. Evacuation is defined as "*a procedure that requires all students and staff to leave the building. While evacuating to the school's field makes sense for a fire drill that only lasts a few minutes, it may not be an appropriate location for a longer period of time. The evacuation plan should encompass relocation procedures and include backup buildings to serve as emergency shelters, such as nearby community centers, religious institutions, businesses, or other schools. Evacuation also includes 'reverse evacuation,' a procedure for schools to return students to the building quickly if an incident occurs while students are outside.*"

- **Gender identity –** A formal definition was added to the survey to clarify the term used in both new and existing survey items. Gender identity "*means one's inner sense of one's own gender, which may or may not match the sex assigned at birth. Different people choose to express their gender identity differently. For some, gender may be expressed through, for example, dress, grooming, mannerisms, speech patterns, and social interactions. Gender expression usually ranges between masculine and feminine, and some transgender people express their gender consistent with how they identify internally, rather than in accordance with the sex they were assigned at birth.*"
- **Lockdown** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new survey item on the types of drills used for emergency procedures. Lockdown is defined as "*a procedure that involves occupants of a school building being directed to remain confined to a room or area within a building with specific procedures to follow. A lockdown may be used when a crisis occurs outside of the school and an evacuation would be dangerous. A lockdown may also be called for when there is a crisis inside and movement within the school will put students in jeopardy. All exterior doors are locked and students and staff stay in their classrooms.*"
- **Mental health disorder** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new section on school mental health services. Mental health disorders are defined as "*collectively, all diagnosable mental disorders or health conditions that are characterized by alterations in thinking, mood, or behavior (or some combination thereof) associated with distress and/or impaired functioning.*"
- **Mental health professional** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new section on school mental health services. The definition aligns with the definition used in the School Health Policies and Practices Survey (SHPPS), which is administered by the CDC. Mental health professionals are defined as "*mental health services are provided by several different professions, each of which has its own training and areas of expertise. The types of professionals who may provide mental health services include psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric/mental health nurse practitioners, psychiatric/mental health nurses, clinical social workers, and professional counselors.*"
- **Restorative circle** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new item on student involvement in restorative circles. A restorative circle is defined as "*a formal mediation process led by a facilitator that brings affected parties of a problem together to explore what happened, reflect on their roles, find a solution, and ultimately restore harmony to individual relationships and the larger community.*"
- **Sexual orientation** – A formal definition was added to the survey to clarify the term used in both new and existing survey items. Sexual orientation "*means one's emotional or physical attraction to the same and/or opposite sex.*"
- **Shelter-in-place** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new survey item on the types of drills used for emergency procedures. Shelter-in-place is defined as "*a procedure similar to a lockdown in that the occupants are to remain on the premises; however, shelter-in-place is designed to use a facility and its indoor atmosphere to temporarily separate people from a hazardous outdoor environment. Everyone would be brought indoors and building personnel would close all windows and doors and shut down the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system*

(HVAC). This would create a neutral pressure in the building, meaning the contaminated air would not be drawn into the building."

- **Threat assessment team** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of two new survey items that ask about formal groups whose purpose is to identify students who might be a potential risk for violent behavior. A threat assessment team is defined as "*a formalized group of persons who meet on a regular basis with the common purpose of identifying, assessing, and managing students who may pose a threat of targeted violence in schools.*"
- **Treatment** – A formal definition was added to the survey in accordance with the addition of a new section on school mental health services. Treatment is defined as "*a clinical service addressed at lessening or eliminating the symptoms of a disorder. In mental health, this may include psychotherapy, medication treatment, and/or counseling.*"

SSOCS:2016 definitions modified from SSOCS:2010

- **Hate crime** – The definition for hate crime was revised to align with the Federal Bureau of Investigation's definition and to specifically identify gender identity as a bias. For SSOCS:2016, a hate crime is defined as "*a committed criminal offense that is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias(es) against a race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, or gender identity; also known as bias crime*."
- **Rape** – The definition of rape has been modified to specify that rape includes sodomy and to instruct respondents to report attempted rapes as rapes. Rape is defined as "*forced sexual intercourse (vaginal, anal, or oral penetration). This includes sodomy and penetration with a foreign object. Both male and female students can be victims of rape.*"
- **Sexual assault** – An editorial change was made to revise "sexual battery" to "sexual assault" and the definition was updated to mirror the terminology used by the Office on Violence Against Women, within the U.S. Department of Justice, in its key elements. Sexual assault is defined as "*an incident that includes threatened rape, fondling, indecent liberties, or child molestation. Both male and female students can be victims of sexual assault. Classification of these incidents should take into consideration the age and developmentally appropriate behavior of the offender(s).*"

SSOCS:2010 definitions not included in SSOCS:2016

- **Cult or extremist group** – This definition was removed because the SSOCS:2010 item that included this term (item 20i) is not included in the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire.

Changes to items between SSOCS:2010 and SSOCS:2016

This section details the item additions, modifications, and deletions made between the 2010 and 2016 survey administrations.[5] In addition, throughout the questionnaire, the school year has been updated to reflect the 2015–16 school year.

[5] SSOCS variables are identified by source codes. The source code is "C0" followed by the 3-digit number next to the item on the questionnaire. For example, the first row of item 1 (item 1a) is variable C0110. The source code numbers do not change from one administration to the next, even though the item number might change on the survey instrument.

Items added to SSOCS:2016

- **Item 1f.** Equip classrooms with locks so that doors can be locked from the inside (C0121)
- **Item 1p**. Have "panic button(s)" or silent alarm(s) that directly connect to law enforcement in the event of an incident (C0139)

- **Item 2h**. Post-crisis reunification of students with their families (C0157)

- **Item 3**. During the 2015–16 school year, has your school drilled students on the use of the following emergency procedures?
  - **Item 3a**. Evacuation (C0163)
  - **Item 3b**. Lockdown (C0165)
  - **Item 3c**. Shelter-in-place (C0167)

- **Item 4i**. Student involvement in restorative circles (e.g., "peace circles," "talking circles," "conflict circles") (C0179)
- **Item 4j**. Social emotional learning (SEL) training for students (e.g., social skills, anger management, mindfulness) (C0183)

- **Item 5**. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school have a threat assessment team or any other formal group of persons to identify students who might be a potential risk for violent or harmful behavior (toward themselves or others)? (C0600)

- **Item 6**. During the 2015–16 school year, how often did your school's threat assessment team formally meet? (C0602)

- **Item 7**. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school have any recognized student groups with the following purposes?
  - **Item 7a**. Acceptance of sexual orientation and gender identity of students (e.g., Gay-Straight Alliance) (C0604)
  - **Item 7b**. Acceptance of students with disabilities (e.g., Best Buddies) (C0606)
  - **Item 7c**. Acceptance of cultural diversity (e.g., Cultural Awareness Club) (C0608)

- **Item 13d**. Wear a body camera (C0626)

- **Item 14a**. Motor vehicle traffic control (C0628)
- **Item 14i**. Recording or reporting discipline problems to school authorities (C0644)
- **Item 14j**. Providing information to school authorities about the legal definitions of behavior for recording or reporting purposes (e.g., defining assault for school authorities) (C0646)

- **Item 15**. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school have a sworn law enforcement officer (including School Resource Officers) present for all instructional hours every day that school was in session? (C0648)

- **Item 16**. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school or school district have any formalized policies or written documents (e.g., Memorandum of Use, Memorandum of Agreement) that outlined the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school? (C0650)

- **Item 17**. Did these formalized policies or written documents include language defining the role of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school in the following areas?
    - **Item 17a**. Student discipline (C0652)
    - **Item 17b**. Use of physical restraints (e.g., handcuffs, Tasers, Mace, pepper spray, or other physical or chemical restraints) (C0654)
    - **Item 17c**. Use of firearms (C0656)
    - **Item 17d**. Making arrests on school grounds (C0658)
    - **Item 17e**. Reporting of criminal offenses to a law enforcement agency (C0660)

- **Item 20**. During the 2015–16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed mental health professional?
    - **Item 20a_1**. Diagnostic assessment for mental health disorders at school by a mental health professional employed by the school or district (C0662)
    - **Item 20a_2**. Diagnostic assessment for mental health disorders at school by a mental health professional other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district (C0664)
    - **Item 20a_3**. Diagnostic assessment for mental health disorders outside of school by a mental health professional other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district (C0666)
    - **Item 20b_1**. Treatment for mental health disorders at school by a mental health professional employed by the school or district (C0668)
    - **Item 20b_2**. Treatment for mental health disorders at school by a mental health professional other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district (C0670)
    - **Item 20b_3**. Treatment for mental health disorders outside of school by a mental health professional other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district (C0672)

- **Item 21**. During the 2015–16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students?
    - **Item 21a**. Inadequate access to licensed mental health professionals (C0674)
    - **Item 21b**. Inadequate funding (C0676)
    - **Item 21c**. Potential legal issues for school or district (e.g., malpractice, insufficient supervision) (C0678)
    - **Item 21d**. Lack of parental support in addressing their children's mental health disorders (C0680)
    - **Item 21e**. Lack of community support for providing mental health services to students in your school (C0682)

- **Item 21f**. Written or unwritten policies regarding the school's requirement to pay for the diagnostic assessment or treatment of students (C0684)
- **Item 21g**. Reluctance to label students with mental health disorders to avoid stigmatizing the child (C0686)

- **Item 22c**. Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to cyberbullying (C0265)
- **Item 22d**. Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to bullying other than cyberbullying (C0267)
- **Item 22h**. Training in intervention and referral strategies for students displaying signs of mental health disorders (e.g., depression, mood disorders, ADHD) (C0271)
- **Item 22i**. Training in recognizing physical, social, and verbal bullying behaviors (C0273)

- **Item 27**. Please record the number of arrests that occurred at your school during the 2015–16 school year. Please include all arrests that occurred at school, regardless of whether a student or non-student was arrested. (C0688)

- **Item 29**. To the best of your knowledge, were any of these hate crimes motivated by the offender's bias against the following characteristics?
  - **Item 29a**. Race or color (C0692)
  - **Item 29b**. National origin or ethnicity (C0694)
  - **Item 29c**. Gender (C0696)
  - **Item 29d**. Religion (C0698)
  - **Item 29e**. Disability (C0700)
  - **Item 29f**. Sexual orientation (C0702)
  - **Item 29g**. Gender identity (C0704)

SSOCS:2016 items modified from SSOCS:2010

- **Item 1a**. Require visitors to sign or check in **and** wear badges (C0110)
  - The phrase "**and** wear badges" was added to this item.
- **Item 1d**. Require metal detector checks on students every day (C0116)
  - The phrase "pass through" was removed from this item.
- **Item 1x**. Limit access to social networking websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram) from school computers (C0151)
  - The examples were updated to replace outdated social networking sites.

- **Item 2**. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? (C0155, C0158, C0162, C0166, C0170, C0169, C0173, and C0157)
  - The stem of this item was revised to ask only about written plans to address crisis scenarios. Information on emergency drills is now captured in item 3.
- **Item 2a**. Active shooter (C0155)
  - This item was changed from "shootings" to "active shooter."

- **Item 4a**. Prevention curriculum, instruction, or training for students (e.g., conflict resolution, anti-bullying, dating violence prevention) (C0174)
    - "Conflict resolution," "anti-bullying," and "dating violence prevention" were added as examples in a parenthetical notation.
- **Item 4b**. Behavioral or behavior modification intervention for students (including the use of positive reinforcements) (C0176)
    - A parenthetical notation now specifies that behavioral or behavior modification intervention for students can include positive reinforcements.
- **Item 4g**. Student involvement in peer mediation (C0175)
    - SSOCS:2010 item 3g was split into two separate items. This item now separately identifies what percentage of schools use peer mediation as a form of addressing student conflict.
- **Item 4h**. Student court to address student conduct problems or minor offenses (C0177)
    - SSOCS:2010 item 3g was split into two separate items. This item now separately identifies what percentage of schools use student court as a form of addressing student conflict.

- **Item 11**. During the 2015–16 school year, did you have any sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) present at your school at least once a week? (C0610)
    - This item has been modified to no longer collect data on security guards and security personnel; the revised item asks only about the presence of sworn law enforcement officers. Information on security guards/personnel is now collected separately in item 19.

- **Item 12**. Were sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) used at least once a week in or around your school at the following times? (C0612, C0614, C0616, and C0618)
    - This item has been modified to no longer collect data on security guards and security personnel; the revised item asks only about the presence of sworn law enforcement officers. Information on security guards/personnel is now collected separately in item 19.

- **Item 13**. Did any of the sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at your school routinely…? (C0620, C0622, C0624, and C0626)
    - This item has been modified to no longer collect data on security guards and security personnel; the revised item asks only about the activities of sworn law enforcement officers. Information on security guards/personnel is now collected separately in item 19.

- **Item 14**. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school? (C0628, C0630, C0632, C0634, C0636, C0638, C0640, C0642, C0644, and C0646)
    - This item has been modified to no longer collect data on security guards and security personnel; the revised item asks only about the activities of sworn law

enforcement officers. Information on security guards/personnel is now collected separately in item 19.

- **Item 18**. How many of the following were present in your school at least once a week? (C0236, C0238, C0240, and C0242)
    - This item was modified to separate information on full-time and part-time sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) from information on other security guards or security personnel; this item asks only about the number of sworn law enforcement officers present at school. Information on security guards/personnel is now collected separately in item 19.

- **Item 19**. Aside from School Resource Officers or other sworn law enforcement officers, how many additional security guards or security personnel were present in your school at least once a week? (C0232 and C0234)
    - This item was modified to separate information on full-time and part-time security guards or security personnel from information on sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers); this item asks only about the number of security guards/personnel present at school. Information on sworn law enforcement officers is now collected separately in item 18.

- **Item 26b**. Sexual assault other than rape (include threatened rape) (C0314 and C0316)
    - An editorial change was made to update "sexual battery" to "sexual assault."

- **Item 28**. During the 2015–16 school year, how many hate crimes occurred at your school? (C0690)
    - This item was modified to ask only about the number of hate crimes and to remove "gang-related crimes" and "gang-related hate crimes."

- **Item 32d**. Student harassment of other students based on sexual orientation (C0381)
    - SSOCS:2010 item 20d was split into two separate items. This item now separately identifies harassment based on sexual orientation from harassment based on gender identity.
- **Item 32e**. Student harassment of other students based on gender identity (C0383)
    - SSOCS:2010 item 20d was split into two separate items. This item now separately identifies harassment based on gender identity from harassment based on sexual orientation.

- **Item 33**. To the best of your knowledge, thinking about problems that can occur anywhere (both at your school and away from school), how often do the following occur? (C0389, C0391, and C0393)
    - The definition for cyberbullying was removed from the stem of this item and relocated to the definitions page, since multiple survey items now include this term.

SSOCS:2010 items not included in SSOCS:2016

- **SSOCS:2010 Item 1k**. Require drug testing for any other students (C0132)

- **SSOCS:2010 Item 2g**. The U.S. national threat level is changed to Red (Severe Risk of Terrorist Attack) by the Department of Homeland Security (C0171)

- **SSOCS:2010 Item 20i**. Cult or extremist group activities (C0388)

1.3 Survey Topics

1.3.1 School Practices and Programs

The first section of the SSOCS:2016 instrument, "School Practices and Programs," addresses current school practices and programs that may relate to crime and discipline. Respondents are asked about numerous practices through which schools attempt to prevent and reduce violence as well as whether procedures are in place in the event of a myriad of potential on-campus crises. The section also asks about various violence prevention programs, student groups to promote inclusion, and the presence of a threat assessment team to identify students who might be a potential risk for violent behavior. These items present a foundation from which policymakers and researchers can begin to understand environments in which crime occurs.

1.3.2 Parent and Community Involvement at School

The second section, "Parent and Community Involvement at School," collects information about schools' efforts to involve parents in maintaining school discipline and in responding to students' problem behaviors. In addition, this section addresses the level of parent or guardian participation in school-related activities and whether community groups and related organizations—including juvenile justice agencies, social service agencies, and religious organizations—are involved in schools' efforts to promote safe schools.

1.3.3 School Security Staff

The third section, "School Security Staff," collects information focusing on the presence and roles of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) in schools. The questions in this section collect data that can be used to examine the relationship between the presence of these officers and reports of school crime. Respondents are asked whether sworn law enforcement officers were present at various times throughout the school day and after school hours, whether they were armed, and whether they participated in various activities, such as mentoring students or training teachers in school safety. This section also asks whether schools have formalized policies or written documents that govern the actions of these sworn law enforcement officers and, if so, what topics these documents cover. Respondents are asked to report the number of full-time and part-time sworn law enforcement officers as well as the number of full-time and part-time additional security personnel who are not sworn law enforcement officers.

1.3.4 School Mental Health Services

The fourth section, "School Mental Health Services," asks respondents about mental health services, funded by the school or district, that are available to students who attend their school. Specifically, respondents are asked about both diagnostic assessment and treatment services for mental health disorders, whether these services are available to students at school or away from school and if they are provided by mental health professionals employed by the school or school district. Respondents are also asked for their perceptions of the factors that might limit their school's efforts to provide mental health services to students.

1.3.5 Staff Training

The fifth section, "Staff Training," asks respondents about training provided by the school or school district for classroom teachers or aides. Topics addressed include classroom management; schoolwide discipline policies and practices related to violence, bullying, cyberbullying, and alcohol and/or drug use; safety procedures; recognizing signs of potentially violent students, bullying behaviors, and illegal substance abuse; and intervention strategies for students suspected of having mental health disorders. This section also asks respondents about training for positive behavioral intervention strategies and training in crisis prevention and intervention.

1.3.6 Limitations on Crime Prevention

The sixth section, "Limitations on Crime Prevention," asks respondents whether their efforts to reduce or prevent crime have been constrained by any factors related to teachers, parents, students, or administrative policies. Such limitations include inadequate teacher training or lack of teacher support for school policies; the likelihood of complaints from parents; fear of student retaliation; and federal, state, or district policies on discipline and safety.

1.3.7 Frequency of Crime and Violence at School

The seventh section, "Frequency of Crime and Violence at School," focuses on the incidence of homicides and shootings that occur at school. Fortunately, incidents of this type are rare; therefore, estimates based on these measures are not always reported in SSOCS publications.

1.3.8 Number of Incidents

The eighth section, "Number of Incidents," asks respondents to report counts of a variety of recorded incidents at their schools. It is important to note that this section refers to specific incidents, not the number of victims or offenders, and respondents are asked to include recorded incidents committed by both students and nonstudents. In addition to being asked to report the number of recorded incidents, respondents are asked to report the number of recorded incidents reported to the police. The incidents in this section include rape; sexual assault; robbery (with or without a weapon); physical attack and threats of physical attack (with or without a weapon); theft; possession of various weapons; distribution, possession, or use of alcohol or illegal drugs; inappropriate distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs; and vandalism. Separate questions ask about the number of arrests and the number of unplanned disruptions, such as

death or bomb threats. Respondents are also asked to report the number of hate crimes that occurred at school as well as their perception of the biases that motivated these crimes.

1.3.9 Disciplinary Problems and Actions

The ninth section, "Disciplinary Problems and Actions," asks about the degree to which schools face disciplinary problems, as well as, what actions they take in response to some offenses. School administrators are asked about the use of various disciplinary actions, such as removals from school, transfers, and out-of-school suspensions, and whether the actions were used during the 2015–16 school year. Since research has shown that a school's inability to control minor infractions may be indicative of a crime-prone school environment (Miller 2004), the data provided by this section will be helpful in assessing the impact of schools' control of lesser violations and will provide another measure of the disciplinary measures used in U.S. schools.

1.3.10 School Characteristics

The 10th section, "School Characteristics: 2015–16 School Year," asks respondents about features of the school and characteristics of the student body. Features of the school for which data are collected include the schools' total enrollment; the number of daily classroom changes; the level of crime in the areas where students live and where the school is located; the number of student transfers after the start of the school year; average daily attendance; and the type of school (e.g., regular public, charter, magnet). To collect data on the characteristics of the student body, respondents are asked to report the percentage of students who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch; are of limited English proficiency (LEP); are in special education; are male; are below the 15th percentile on standardized tests; are likely to go to college after high school; and consider academic achievement to be very important.

This page is intentionally left blank

2. Sample Design and Weighting

2.1 Sampling Frame

The sampling frame for the 2016 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2016) was constructed from a modified version of the 2015–16 National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) Universe File. The NTPS Universe File was created from the 2013–14 Common Core of Data (CCD) Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe File. The CCD is an annual NCES collection of fiscal and nonfiscal data on all public schools, public school districts, and state education agencies in the United States. CCD data are supplied by state education agency officials and include information that describes schools and school districts, including

- contact information for the school (i.e., location address, phone number, website address)
- school characteristics (i.e., grades offered, school type, locale)
- student characteristics (i.e., counts of students by race/ethnicity, free or reduced-price lunch)

Certain types of schools are excluded from the NTPS Universe File in order to create the SSOCS sampling frame, including

- schools in the U.S. outlying areas[6] and Puerto Rico
- Department of Defense schools
- recently closed schools
- Bureau of Indian Education schools
- special education schools
- vocational schools
- alternative schools
- virtual schools
- ungraded schools
- schools with a highest grade of kindergarten or lower

Regular schools, charter schools, and schools that have partial or total magnet programs are included in the frame. The size of the SSOCS:2016 universe was approximately 84,000 schools.

2.2 Sample Design

The same general sample design previously used for SSOCS:2000, SSOCS:2004, SSOCS:2006, SSOCS:2008, and SSOCS:2010 was adopted for the selection of schools in SSOCS:2016. As in the prior collections, the objective of the SSOCS:2016 sample design was twofold: to obtain overall cross-sectional and subgroup estimates of important indicators of school crime and safety and to develop precise estimates of change in various characteristics relating to crime between SSOCS administrations. To attain these objectives, a stratified sample of 3,553 regular public schools was drawn for SSOCS:2016. For sample allocation and sample selection purposes, strata were defined by crossing school level, locale, and enrollment size (more information provided in section 2.4). These three explicit stratification variables have been shown to be related to school crime (Chen and Weikart 2008; Langbein and Bess 2002; Miller 2004). In addition, region; the percentage of White, non-Hispanic enrollment; state; and school district were used as implicit

[6] The U.S. outlying areas include American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

stratification variables by sorting schools on these variables within each stratum before selecting the sample.

2.3 Sample Size

The initial goal of SSOCS:2016 was to collect data from at least 2,550 schools. One possible method of allocating schools to the different sampling strata would have been to allocate them proportionally to the U.S. public school population. However, while the majority of U.S. public schools are primary schools, the majority of school violence is reported in middle and high schools. Therefore, a larger proportion of the desired completed interviews of 2,550 schools was allocated to middle and high schools. The desired number of completed interviews was allocated to the four school levels[7] as follows: 640 primary schools, 895 middle schools, 915 high schools, and 100 combined schools. The resulting sample allocation, described in section 2.4, by school level was: 849 primary schools, 1,230 middle schools, 1,347 high schools, and 127 combined schools. The total sample size was 3,553 schools. Schools in SSOCS:2000, SSOCS:2004, SSOCS:2006, SSOCS:2008, and SSOCS:2010 were allocated to instructional levels in a similar manner.

2.4 Stratification, Sample Selection, and Final Sample

"Stratification" refers to the process of subdividing, or grouping, the frame into mutually exclusive subsets called strata, from which samples are selected. Stratification has two main goals: (1) to ensure that selected subgroups of interest are adequately represented in the sample for analysis purposes; and (2) to improve sampling precision by permitting a more optimal allocation of the sample to the strata. For a fixed sample size, the optimum allocation (i.e., the allocation that produces the smallest sampling error) is a function of the number of schools in the stratum and the underlying within-stratum variance of the statistic of interest.

As indicated earlier, the same variables and categories used in SSOCS:2000, SSOCS:2004, SSOCS:2006, SSOCS:2008, and SSOCS:2010 were used to stratify the SSOCS:2016 population of schools, namely, school level, locale, and enrollment size. SSOCS:2008, SSOCS:2010, and SSOCS:2016 differed from previous administrations of SSOCS in that the definition of locale was derived from the 12-level place-based code currently assigned in the CCD rather than the 8-level metro-based code obtained from the CCD in previous administrations. Within each school level, the sample of schools was allocated among 16 strata formed by the cross-classification of enrollment size[8] and locale.[9] This allocation was proportional to the sum of the square roots of the total student enrollment of each school in that stratum. The sum of the square roots was used as the "measure of size" (MOS) in order to obtain a reasonable sample of lower enrollment schools while at the same time giving a higher probability of selection to higher enrollment schools. The MOS was calculated by first finding the square root of each school's enrollment and then aggregating over the schools in the stratum.

[7] The four school levels are based on the lowest and highest grades offered by the school. Primary schools have lowest grade within Pre-K through 3 and highest grade within 1 through 8. Middle schools have both their lowest and highest grades within 4 through 9. High schools have their lowest grade within 9 through 12 and their highest grade within 10 through 12. Combined schools have either (a) their lowest grade within Pre-K through 8 and their highest grade within 10 through 12 or (b) their lowest grade within Pre-K through 3 and their highest grade is 9.
[8] The four categories of enrollment size are 1–299 students, 300–499 students, 500–999 students, and 1,000 students or more.
[9] The four categories of locale are city, suburb, town, and rural.

The formula is given as

$$MOS(h) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_h} \sqrt{E_{hi}}$$

where E_{hi} is the enrollment of school *i* in stratum *h* and N_h is the total number of schools in stratum *h*.

The total measure of size for an instructional level—MOS_{TOT}—was found by summing the MOS_h values for the 16 strata at that instructional level. The ratio MOS_h / MOS_{TOT} determined the number of schools allocated to that stratum. For example, the MOS for the stratum of suburban primary schools with 500–999 students was 221,228, and the total across all 16 strata within the primary school level was 1,047,133. The ratio of this stratum to the overall school level is 221,228/1,047,133 = 0.21127. Therefore, roughly 21.1 percent of the desired 640 primary school interviews were allocated to this stratum (specifically, 640 x 0.21127 = 135.21), or 135 schools.

The effective sample sizes (completed interviews) for each of the strata were then inflated to account for nonresponse by dividing the target stratum sample size by the expected stratum response rate; this inflated count was the sample size for the stratum.

For example, the effective sample size for suburban primary schools with 500–999 students was calculated above as 135 schools. Based on prior experience,[10] the response rate for this stratum was expected to be 77.3 percent, so the number of schools to be sampled from this stratum was increased to 175 (135/0.773 = 174.64). Sample sizes were inflated by an additional 1.5 percent to account for out-of-scope schools, for a total of 178 schools in this stratum.

Once the final sample sizes were determined for each of the 64 strata,[11] the schools within each stratum were sorted by the percentage of White, non-Hispanic enrollment,[12] region,[13] state, and school district (which has a similar effect as stratification), and a sample of 3,553 schools was selected using a systematic design, with a constant sampling rate in each stratum. Within each stratum, a systematic simple random sample was drawn. The sampling interval *k* was calculated as the ratio of the number of schools in the frame to the nonresponse-adjusted sample size. A random start *r* was selected between 0 and *k* for the stratum, and schools *r, r* + *k*, *r* + 2*k*, *r* + 3*k*,

[10] Typically, the previous administration's response rates were used to inflate the initial sample size in each stratum, but the SSOCS:2010 response rates were unusually high. As a result, for SSOCS:2016, the averages of the response rates from SSOCS:2008 and SSOCS:2010 were used to inflate the sample sizes. In strata where the average response rate was higher than the SSOCS:2010 rate, the SSOCS:2010 rate was used to inflate the initial sample. In addition, to account for schools that might have been sampled for the 2015–16 National Teacher and Principal Survey (NTPS) and SSOCS:2016 in the same year, sample sizes for high schools and large schools (i.e., with more than 1,000 students) were inflated by 2.59 and 2.60 percent, respectively. These inflation factors were based on an analysis of response rates for schools that were sampled in both the 2007–08 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), the predecessor to the NTPS, and SSOCS:2008. The results from this analysis found that the response rates for high schools and large schools decreased by 2.59 and 2.60 percent, respectively, for schools that were sampled in both surveys. For other school levels and enrollment sizes, there was no decrease in response rate due to being sampled in both SASS and SSOCS in the same year, so an inflation factor is not used.

[11] The 64 strata are formed by the cross-classification of enrollment size and locale in each of the four school-level categories.

[12] "Percent White enrollment" refers to the variable PERCWHT, which represents the percentage of White, non-Hispanic students enrolled in the school. For the remainder of this report, this variable is referred to as "percent White enrollment."

[13] "Region" refers to the variable CENREGN, which represents Census regions. For the remainder of this report, this variable is referred to as "region." The four categories are Northeast, Midwest, South, and West.

etc., were selected (rounding up to the nearest whole number). Continuing the example of suburban primary schools with 500–999 students, there were 8,618 schools of this type in the frame. Because 178 schools were needed from this stratum, the sampling interval *k* was 48.42 (8,618/178 = 48.42). A random start was then chosen between 0 and 48.42 to select the first school, and 48.42 was successively added to the random start to select each of the remaining 177 schools in the sample (rounding up each time to get the number of the school in the sorted list).

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the initial selected sample of 3,553 schools (which yielded 2,092 responding schools, 1,442 nonresponding schools, and 19 ineligible schools). Some categories of schools were more likely than others to respond; in particular, lower enrollment schools, schools in rural areas, and schools with a high percentage of White student enrollment were more likely to respond (see appendix tables M-2, M-5, and M-6 for statistical comparisons of response rates by school characteristics; respondents and nonrespondents; and odds ratios, by school characteristics, respectively).

Table 1. Unweighted and weighted unit response rates, by selected school characteristics: School year 2015–16

School characteristic	Initial sample	Completed survey[1]	Non-respondents[2]	Ineligible[3]	Unweighted response rate (percent)[4]	Weighted response rate (percent)[5]
Total	3,553	2,092	1,442	19	59.2	62.9
Level[6]						
Primary	849	516	325	8	61.4	63.6
Middle	1,230	719	508	3	58.6	60.4
High school	1,347	774	567	6	57.7	60.2
Combined	127	83	42	2	66.4	69.7
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	349	234	107	8	68.6	73.0
300–499	702	426	273	3	60.9	62.3
500–999	1,384	831	546	7	60.3	60.2
1,000 or more	1,118	601	516	1	53.8	53.8
Locale						
City	1,083	558	517	8	51.9	52.2
Suburb	1,362	781	576	5	57.6	60.7
Town	428	295	130	3	69.4	68.6
Rural	680	458	219	3	67.7	73.9
Percent White, non-Hispanic enrollment						
More than 95 percent	147	108	39	0	73.5	74.1
More than 80 to 95 percent	801	543	255	3	68.0	71.5
More than 50 to 80 percent	1,025	606	414	5	59.4	63.0
50 percent or less	1,580	835	734	11	53.2	56.2
Region						
Northeast	602	338	262	2	56.3	61.6
Midwest	788	501	283	4	63.9	66.3
South	1,346	765	575	6	57.1	61.6
West	817	488	322	7	60.2	62.5

[1] For a survey to be considered complete in SSOCS:2016, answers were required for at least 162 of the 296 total subitems eligible for recontact (i.e., all subitems in the questionnaire except those associated with the introductory items). Of the 296 total subitems, 92 were categorized as critical and respondents were required to provide answers for at least 75. Responses provided to the critical subitems counted toward the total 162 subitem responses needed for a survey to be considered complete. Items 26 and 35 (whose subitems were all categorized as critical) had additional completion criteria; respondents had to provide responses for at least 18 of the 30 subitems within item 26 and at least 6 of the 25 subitems within item 35. Questionnaires that did not meet established completion criteria were considered incomplete and are excluded from the SSOCS:2016 data file.

[2] Nonrespondents include schools whose districts denied permission to NCES and those eligible schools that either did not respond or that responded but did not answer the minimum number of items required for the survey to be considered complete.

[3] Ineligible schools include those that had closed, merged with another school at a new location, changed from a regular public school to an alternative school, or are not a school: "not a school" generally refers to a school record for an organization that does not provide any classroom instruction (e.g., an office overseeing a certain type of program or offering only tutoring services).

[4] The unweighted response rate is calculated as the following ratio: completed cases / (total sample - known ineligibles).

[5] The weighted response rate is calculated by applying the inverse of the probability of selection (including the sampling adjustment factor) to the calculation of the unweighted response rate.

[6] Primary schools are defined as schools in which the lowest grade is not higher than grade 3 and the highest grade is not higher than grade 8. Middle schools are defined as schools in which the lowest grade is not lower than grade 4 and the highest grade is not higher than grade 9. High schools are defined as schools in which the lowest grade is not lower than grade 9 and the highest grade is not higher than grade 12. Combined schools include all other combinations of grades, including K–12 schools.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2016).

2.5 Weighting

Sample weights allow inferences to be made about the population from which the sample units were drawn. Due to the complex nature of the SSOCS:2016 sample design, weights are necessary to obtain population-based estimates, to minimize bias arising from differences between responding and nonresponding schools, and to calibrate the data to known population characteristics in a way that reduces sampling error. The procedures used to create the SSOCS:2016 sampling weights are described below.

Each school was assigned an initial (base) weight equal to the ratio of the number of schools available in the sampling frame in the school's stratum to the number of schools sampled from the school's stratum.[14] In other words, a school's base weight was equal to the inverse of the sampling rate within its stratum. Due to nonresponse, the responding schools did not necessarily constitute a random sample from the schools in the stratum. In order to reduce the potential bias due to nonresponse, weighting classes were determined by using the statistical algorithm CHAID (chi-square automatic interaction detection) to partition the sample such that schools within a weighting class were homogeneous with respect to their probability of responding. The CHAID analysis identified the following variables as being predictive of response

- school locale
- number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) teachers
- school level
- Census region
- percent White, non-Hispanic enrollment
- school enrollment size
- student-to-teacher FTE staff ratio
- percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch

When the number of responding schools in a weighting class was below a minimum threshold, the class was combined with another to avoid the possibility of disproportionately large weights. Variables that are predictive of response are likely to be sources of nonresponse bias. These variables were therefore used to define the weighting adjustment cells.The base weights were adjusted so that the weighted distribution of the responding schools was similar to the initial distribution of the total sample based on the predictor variables listed above. This was implemented by multiplying the base weight by the inverse of the weighted response rate within the adjustment cell.

The nonresponse-adjusted weights were then poststratified to calibrate the sample to the known population totals from the initial sampling frame. A pair of two-dimensional margins were set up for the poststratification: (1) school level and school enrollment size, and (2) school level and locale. An iterative process known as a raking ratio adjustment brought the sum of the weights into agreement with known control totals.

Poststratification works well when the population not covered by the survey is similar to the covered population within each poststratum. Thus, for poststratification to be effective, the variables that define the poststrata must be correlated with the variables of interest, they must be

[14] The base weight was adjusted for a small number of schools to correct the probability of selection based on information learned during data collection. For example, if two schools had merged, the new school would have had twice the probability of selection.

well measured in the survey, and control totals must be available for the population as a whole. All three requirements were satisfied by the aforementioned poststratification margins.[15]

The final analysis weight on the data file is named FINALWGT. Characteristics of FINALWGT are presented in table 2 below. The file also includes 50 replicate weights (REPFWT1 through REPFWT50) for use in variance estimate. For information on how to apply the weights in statistical analysis, refer to chapter 6.

Table 2. Characteristics of the SSOCS:2016 final analysis weight (FINALWGT)

Weight	Number of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Skewness	Kurtosis	Sum
FINALWGT	2,092	40.0	36.4	9.7	200.8	1.3	3.9	83,592

[15] School level, school enrollment, and locale have been shown to be correlated with crime (Chen and Weikart 2008; Langbein and Bess 2002; Miller 2004).

This page is intentionally left blank

3. Data Collection Methods and Response Rates

Chapter 3 begins with an examination of the data collection activities that were conducted on behalf of SSOCS:2016. Other topics examined are interviewer training, data retrieval, efforts to increase response rates, and unit and item response rates and nonresponse bias analyses.

3.1 Data Collection Activities

SSOCS:2016 was conducted as a mail survey with telephone follow-up. A detailed list and schedule of the SSOCS:2016 data collection activities can be found in table 3 and are described below.

Data collection activities began about 4 months prior to the initial mailout of the questionnaire, when the Census Bureau began working with the school districts of sampled schools that required district approval (also known as "Special Districts") to participate in the survey.[16] Approximately 1 week prior to the initial questionnaire mailout, an advance letter was sent to the principals of sampled schools, along with a brochure providing additional information about the survey. Letters were also mailed to chief state school officers (CSSOs) and district superintendents prior to the initial questionnaire mailout to inform them that schools within their states and districts, respectively, had been selected for SSOCS:2016 (see appendixes G and H for a copy of the CSSO and district superintendent cover letters, respectively). The letters were not designed to ask for permission for the schools' participation in the survey, but rather as a vehicle to enhance participation.

Questionnaires were sent via FedEx[17] directly to the principals of the sampled schools along with a cover letter describing the importance of the survey, a promotional SSOCS pen, and a preaddressed, postage-paid return envelope. Schools located within Special Districts in which approval was granted also received inserts informing the principals that their districts had approved their participation in SSOCS. Please see appendixes E and F for a copy of the advance and cover letters, respectively, sent to principals and appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire.

The reminder telephone operation, which was composed of two phases, began three weeks after the initial mailout. Phase 1 consisted of a follow-up call with the principal or school contact to determine the status of the questionnaire. In phase 2, which began approximately 2 weeks after the close of phase 1 reminder operations, a follow-up call to principals or school contacts was repeated for schools that had still not returned a questionnaire. The 2-week break between the two phases of the reminder operation was to allow time to send replacement questionnaires to schools that did not receive them or had misplaced them and to give principals time to complete and return the questionnaire. During the reminder operation, the interviewer could complete the SSOCS questionnaire over the phone at the respondent's request. Questionnaires were resent via FedEx to schools that had not received them or that had not been reached in either reminder operation.

[16] The total SSOCS:2016 sample consisted of 3,553 public schools. The "special district approval" work yielded refusals for 90 schools in various districts prior to the initial mailout; the districts of 21 additional schools refused after the initial mailout. It was determined prior to the initial mailout that 2 sampled schools were out-of-scope.

[17] The majority of the questionnaires were sent via FedEx; however, 41 questionnaires were sent via USPS Priority Mail because a physical address was not available for the school.

The nonresponse follow-up operation began a little over 2 weeks after the reminder operations ended. During this 4-week operation, interviewers collected data over the telephone and by fax submission. Follow-up activities, in which the U.S. Census Bureau contacted respondents in order to complete the remaining questionnaires, ended on June 15, 2016. There were 41 requests for replacement questionnaires during the nonresponse follow-up operation. Replacement questionnaires were sent via FedEx on a flow basis.

Table 3. Schedule of data collection activities: SSOCS:2016

Activity	Description	Date
LEA contacts	Census began contacting school districts of sampled schools that require prior district approval to participate in surveys.	September 30, 2015–January 20, 2016
E-mail look-up operation	The National Processing Center (NPC) gathered principal e-mail addresses of sampled schools in order to make direct contact with sampled schools via e-mail.	December 7, 2015–January 20, 2016
Mail advance letter to principals of sampled schools	Advance letters describing the survey were mailed to principals of sampled schools.	February 18, 2016
Mail advance letter to chief state school officers and superintendents	Letters were sent to superintendents and chief state school officers to inform them that schools within their districts or states were selected for SSOCS:2016.	February 18, 2016
Advance e-mail to principals	Principals were alerted to expect the questionnaire within the next week.	February 22, 2016
Questionnaire mailout	SSOCS:2016 questionnaire was sent by FedEx to the school principal/administrator of sampled schools.	February 22, 2016
Follow-up e-mail to principals and other appropriate school staff	Principals or other staff of sampled schools were contacted by e-mail to encourage them to complete the questionnaire.	March 9, 2016
Re-mail to schools that requested a replacement questionnaire	Requests accepted via e-mail and phone calls (incoming and outgoing). Replacement questionnaires sent on flow basis by FedEx.	March 7–June 10, 2016
Reminder operation phase 1	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted to verify that the questionnaire was received and to remind them to complete it as soon as possible. Data were collected over the phone, if requested.	March 14–April 1, 2016
E-mail reminder	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted by e-mail to encourage them to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.	March 23, 2016
Thank you e-mail to responding schools	Sampled schools that returned a completed questionnaire were sent a thank you e-mail.	April 6, 2016
E-mail reminder	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted by e-mail to encourage them to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.	April 6, 2016
Second mailout	Questionnaires were re-mailed to sampled schools that were reached during phase 1 of the reminder operation but had not returned a completed questionnaire.	April 18–20, 2016
Reminder operation phase 2	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted to verify that the questionnaire was received and to remind them to complete it as soon as possible. Data were collected over the phone, if requested.	April 18–22, 2016
E-mail reminder	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted by e-mail to encourage them to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.	April 27, 2016
Nonresponse follow-up operation	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted to attempt to complete the questionnaire over the phone or by fax submission.	May 9–June 10, 2016
Third mailout	Questionnaires were re-mailed to sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire.	May 16, 2016
E-mail reminder	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted by e-mail to encourage them to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.	May 25, 2016

Activity	Description	Date
E-mail reminder	Sampled schools that had not returned a completed questionnaire were contacted by e-mail to encourage them to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.	June 13, 2016
Data retrieval operation	For cases in which critical subitems were left blank or responses were illogical, respondents were contacted to resolve issues related to the missing data.	May 5–June 15, 2016
Keyed data	The last day that keyed data were accepted	July 5, 2016

3.2 Interviewer Training

Interviewers working on SSOCS:2016 were employees of the U.S. Census Bureau's Jeffersonville Contact Center in Jeffersonville, Indiana. All interviewers were required to receive 10 hours of computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) training—on topics such as what makes a good interviewer, how to interview, voice, and diction—before attending survey-specific training sessions.

Interviewer training on the content and data collection procedures of SSOCS:2016 was conducted from February through May of 2016. Details on the required survey-specific trainings, including the dates and number of participants, are provided below.

3.2.1 Training on Basic Interviewer Skills

A 1-hour self-study training was conducted for 50 interviewers prior to the start of incoming calls on February 16, 2016. Interviewers were given an *Interviewer Self Study Guide* to read at the beginning of the training session. The self-study guide covered all of the information necessary to be successful in making and answering phone calls to and from schools. The guide described the purpose, design, and sample size of the survey and provided an overview of all of the telephone operations. It described the challenges the interviewers might face when collecting data from schools and offered advice on how to work with the office staff. It also explained to interviewers how to encourage participants and how to document the outcome of each phone call. See appendix I for a copy of the *Interviewer Self Study Guide*.

3.2.2 Training on Questionnaire Follow-up

A 5-hour classroom training session for 50 interiewers was conducted on March 8-9, 2016, for the reminder phase 1 follow-up operations. The session included a review of the calling procedures, the frequently asked questions, and the forms relevant for the operation. A large portion of the training session was devoted to completing paired practices using the relevant forms. During the paired practices, interviewers alternated the role of interviewer and respondent in order to become proficient with the paper script and the SSOCS questionnaire. The paper script provided the interviewers with the wording to use to introduce themselves, ask for the appropriate staff member, and inquire about the status of the SSOCS questionnaire.

A 2-hour self study training was conducted for 50 interviewers on April 16, 2016, for the reminder phase 2 follow-up operation, and a 4-hour classroom training session was conducted for 30 interviewers on May 2, 2016, for the non-response follow-up operation. Interviewers were given a *Reminder and Non-Response Follow-Up Operation Interviewer Self Study Guide* prior to phase 2 of the reminder operation and the nonresponse follow-up operation as well as brief

training memos that highlighted key points of the specific operation about to be conducted. See appendix J for a copy of this guide.

3.2.3 Training on Refusal Conversion

All interviewers working on SSOCS:2016 were trained in both refusal aversion and conversion. The training distinguished between aversion and conversion and described keys to success, including strong communication skills, project knowledge, knowledge of the case history, and the ability to think on one's feet. Interviewers were instructed to respond to the issues the respondent raised, to remember that the respondent is always right, and to know when the interview is over. They were urged to be persuasive as well as calm and understanding, to probe for the reason the respondent was refusing, to be prepared to listen, and to use active listening techniques. They were also asked to vary their tone of voice, to use the resources available to them (e.g., frequently asked questions), and to leave good comments for the next interviewer working on the case. First-refusal cases were referred to experienced interviewers for a refusal conversion attempt.

3.2.4 Training on Data Retrieval

Training on data retrieval was conducted on May 2, 2016. This 5-hour training session, which was attended by 30 interviewers, was similar to the training for the other telephone operations in that it included a self-study guide and paired practice exercises. However, the data retrieval training included more time for paired practice than the other training sessions due to the complex nature of the task.

The data retrieval form included a list of items for follow-up, and their respective page numbers, ordered by importance to the survey so that the most critical items were completed first in case the respondent could not complete the interview. Since one of the criteria for flagging an item was the ratio of an item's value to the school's enrollment, some items flagged for follow-up due to extreme values would no longer require follow-up if the new enrollment value caused the ratio to fall within an acceptable range. The following instruction was included for these cases: "If the new enrollment exceeds 1000 then do not ask items from q26 and q35 that are range violations." Items that were range violations had the term "range violation" in parentheses next to the page and item number. See appendix K for a copy of the *Failed Edit Follow-Up Operation Interviewer Self Study Guide*.

3.3 Data Retrieval

The data were passed through an initial editing program that searched for inconsistencies in the data; blanked or flagged inconsistencies, where necessary; and imputed blank items based on responses to other items in the questionnaire. Next, a program was used to assess whether a questionnaire could be considered complete. To reduce unit nonresponse, if a returned survey did not meet the minimum completion criteria, the school was recontacted for data retrieval. A school was recontacted if any of the following criteria were met:

- three or more rapes were reported in subitem 26a;
- less than 55 percent of the total subitems eligible for recontact were filled in (at least 162 of the 296 total subitems needed to be complete);
- less than 60 percent of question 26 subitems were filled in (at least 18 of the 30 subitems needed to be complete);
- less than 24 percent of question 35 subitems for columns 1 through 5 were filled in (at least 6 of the 25 subitems needed to be complete);
- less than 80 percent of the critical subitems were filled in (at least 75 of the 92 critical subitems needed to be complete); or
- there were five or more soft-range violations.

The critical items in SSOCS:2016 were questions 11, 12, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, and 45. Soft-range violations occurred if an answer was unusually high or low, given the school's enrollment.

In the 2015–16 SSOCS, 379 partially complete questionnaires were received by mail, of which 362 were successfully resolved and 17 did not meet the criteria to be considered a completed interview. An additional 12 cases that were finished over the telephone with survey respondents did not meet the criteria for a completed interview. Telephone interviews were not eligible for data retrieval because an interviewer had already attempted to complete the questionnaire with the respondent.

3.4 Efforts to Increase Response Rates

Several steps were taken to maximize survey response rates during data collection. All questionnaires were sent via FedEx (with the exception of cases where a physical address was not available, in which case USPS was used) to ensure their prompt receipt and to give the survey a greater sense of importance to the respondents. A preaddressed, postage-paid reply envelope was included in the mailing for respondents to use when returning their completed questionnaire. In addition, a toll-free number and an e-mail address were provided for respondents to contact with inquiries regarding the survey.

Multiple follow-up contacts were made via telephone and e-mail throughout the data collection period to encourage and promote participation, as were targeted reminder mailings. Between scheduled mailouts, interviewers called nonrespondents to ensure that the questionnaire had been received and to follow up on its status. The questionnaire was resent via FedEx to schools indicating they had not received it and needed a new questionnaire and to schools that had not yet responded and were not reached during the reminder operations. After several rounds of telephone reminders to complete the questionnaire, interviewers contacted nonrespondents by telephone to attempt to complete the questionnaire over the phone or via fax submission.

Several unique e-mail messages from the NCES project director were used as prompts and reminders (see appendix L for a copy of the reminder e-mails). The first e-mail message, sent to school principals on February 22, 2016, was used to alert them that the SSOCS questionnaire would be delivered within the next week. Several reminder e-mails containing statistics from the prior SSOCS collection were sent to school principals and other appropriate school staff members throughout the collection period.

The advance mailing included a brochure that provided details about the issues addressed in the study, the importance of the data, and information regarding the SSOCS website. The initial questionnaire mailout to schools also contained informational materials about SSOCS and a promotional SSOCS pen. All correspondence to schools was personalized with the principal's name if it was available on the school's or district's website.

Refusal conversion efforts were used to obtain responses from schools that had initially declined to complete the questionnaire. Refusals coded by interviewers as "firm" were reviewed by supervisors to determine whether another attempt should be made. A case was coded as a final refusal if interviewers received two refusals from any school contact (e.g., a secretary or assistant principal) during the reminder and nonresponse follow-up operations. If a school district refused, schools within that district were coded as final refusals as well.

3.5 Unit Response Rate

A unit response rate is, at its most basic level, the ratio of surveys completed by eligible respondents to the total count of eligible respondents respondents using the base weights (i.e., prior to nonresponse adjustments). Unit response rates are traditionally reported because they reflect the potential effects of nonsampling error and indicate whether portions of the population are underrepresented due to nonresponse. In order to calculate any of these measures, it is first necessary to know the disposition (outcome) of each sampled case. In some surveys, this calculation can be rather complicated because it is difficult to distinguish eligible and ineligible units. For school surveys, however, the U.S. Department of Education updates its list of known schools on a fairly regular basis, so estimating eligibility among sampled cases is relatively straightforward.

SSOCS:2016 used three measures to evaluate response: the completion rate, the unweighted unit response rate, and the overall weighted[18] unit response rate. Table 4 shows the dispositions of the 3,553 cases selected for participation in SSOCS:2016.

[18] The weighted response rate is calculated by applying the inverse of the probability of selection (including the sampling adjustment factor) to the calculation of the unweighted response rate.

Table 4. Number of public schools, by interview status: SSOCS:2016

Interview status	Number of public schools
Total sample	3,553
Schools whose districts refused on their behalf	111
Completed survey returned[1]	2,092
Partially completed survey returned	36
Ineligible schools[2]	19
Other nonresponding schools	1,295

[1] For a survey to be considered complete in SSOCS:2016, answers were required for at least 162 of the 296 total subitems eligible for recontact (i.e., all subitems in the questionnaire except those associated with the introductory items). Of the 296 total subitems, 92 were categorized as critical and respondents were required to provide answers for at least 75. Responses provided to the critical subitems counted toward the total 162 subitem responses needed for a survey to be considered complete. Items 26 and 35 (whose subitems were all categorized as critical) had additional completion criteria; respondents had to provide responses for at least 18 of the 30 subitems within item 26 and at least 6 of the 25 subitems within item 35. Questionnaires that did not meet established completion criteria were considered incomplete and are excluded from the SSOCS:2016 data file.
[2] Ineligible schools include those that had closed, merged with another school at a new location, changed from a regular public school to an alternative school, or are not a school: "not a school" generally refers to a school record for an organization that does not provide any classroom instruction (e.g., an office overseeing a certain type of program or offering only tutoring services).
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2016).

The completion rate is defined as the number of completed surveys (C) divided by the total sample size (T):

$$C / T = 2{,}092 / 3{,}553 = 58.9 \text{ percent.}$$

While this figure represents the quality of the SSOCS:2016 data collection operations, it does not necessarily represent the quality of the data. To determine this, all schools selected for the study must be considered. A conservative measure, the unweighted response rate, divides the number of completed surveys (C) by the total initial sample size (T), subtracting known ineligible schools from the denominator (I).

For SSOCS:2016, this calculation yields an unweighted unit response rate of

$$C / (T - I) = 2{,}092 / (3{,}553 - 19) = 59.2 \text{ percent.}$$

While unweighted unit response rates generally measure the proportion of the sample that produced usable information for analysis, weighted unit response rates can be used to estimate the proportion of the survey population covered by the units that responded. These two rates can differ if certain subpopulations are sampled with different selection probabilities, such as in SSOCS:2016. The weighted unit response rate is calculated by applying the base sampling weights and substituting the result in the equation above.

For SSOCS:2016, the weighted response rate was calculated by dividing the weighted number of completed surveys (C_w) by the weighted total initial sample size (T_w), subtracting the weighted number of known ineligible schools from the denominator (I_w).

$$C_w / (T_w - I_w) = 52{,}639.64 / (84{,}452 - 829.9742) = 62.9 \text{ percent.}$$

Weighted and unweighted unit response rates by selected school characteristics are shown in table 1 in chapter 2.[19] The overall weighted unit response rate was 62.9 percent.

3.6 Analysis of Unit Nonresponse Bias

The existence of nonresponding schools has the potential to introduce bias into survey estimates, depending on the magnitude of the nonresponse and whether differences exist between responding and nonresponding schools in characteristics related to the estimates of interest. Because NCES Statistical Standard 4-4 requires analysis of nonresponse bias for any survey stage with a base-weighted unit response rate less than 85 percent, a nonresponse bias analysis was conducted to evaluate the extent of this bias in SSOCS:2016, since the base-weighted unit response rate was 62.9 percent (U.S. Department of Education 2012).

The unit nonresponse bias analysis compared the sample and target population, respondents and nonrespondents, and relative response probability across frame variable categories to identify potential sources of bias. The frame variables used in the unit nonresponse bias analysis were school locale; number of FTE teachers; school level; region; percentage of White, non-Hispanic enrollment; enrollment size; student-to-teacher ratio; and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. These variables are available for all U.S. public schools from the CCD and thus were known for all schools sampled for SSOCS:2016, regardless of whether they responded. For such characteristics, bias can be measured directly. Based on these characteristics, the analysis found that there were significant differences between responding and nonresponding schools. For example, schools with an enrollment of 1,000 students or more, city schools, and schools in which less than 50 percent of students are White, non-Hispanic were significantly underrepresented among respondents, relative to their share of the target population.

To provide a fuller picture of the risk of bias in key estimates, correlations between the frame characteristics and survey variables were analyzed, and key estimates were compared between the lowest propensity respondents (i.e. schools with characteristics resembling those of nonrespondents) and other respondents. The frame characteristics (which are known for both respondents and nonrespondents) were found to be correlated with a number of survey variables (which are known only for respondents). This implies that the observed bias in frame characteristics, if not adjusted for, would likely lead to bias in key SSOCS:2016 estimates.

A CHAID analysis was conducted to inform the selection of weighting classes to be used to produce nonresponse-adjusted weights. Based on the CHAID analysis, the base weights were adjusted for potential nonresponse bias in school level; locale; enrollment size; percentage of White, non-Hispanic enrollment; region; percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch; pupil-teacher ratio; and number of FTE teaching staff. After the nonresponse-adjusted weights were applied, no significant bias remained in any of these characteristics. Because these characteristics are known to be correlated with survey variables, it suggests that the weighting adjustments incorporated into the SSOCS:2016 weights help to mitigate nonresponse bias in key estimates.

[19] Although it is possible that some nonresponding schools (i.e., schools whose districts denied permission to NCES and those schools that either did not respond or did not submit a complete survey) were also ineligible, the calculation of the unweighted and weighted response rates assumed that all nonresponding schools were eligible. This is the most conservative approach to calculating the response rates.

However, some estimates may be subject to nonresponse bias that is not related to the observable characteristics used to create nonresponse-adjusted weights. This type of bias would not be removed by weighting adjustments. Therefore, data users are cautioned that, because survey variables are not observed for nonrespondents, the exact amount of nonresponse bias remaining in key estimates cannot be known with certainty and is likely to vary between estimates. See appendix M for detailed information on the SSOCS:2016 unit-level nonresponse bias analysis.

3.7 Item Response Rates

Just as principals sometimes chose not to respond to the SSOCS:2016 survey request, those that did respond did not always answer all of the survey items. Unweighted item response rates are calculated by dividing the number of sampled schools responding to an item by the number of schools to which the item was applicable. Weighted item response rates are calculated in the same way, but with each school weighted by the inverse of its probability of selection. Weighted[20] item-level response rates in SSOCS:2016 were generally high, ranging from 82 to 100 percent. The mean item response rate for SSOCS:2016 was about 98 percent. Of the 273 subitems in the SSOCS questionnaire (i.e., all of the subitems except those associated with the 23 introductory items), most (248) had response rates greater than 95 percent, 23 had response rates between 85 and 95 percent, and 2 had response rates below 85 percent. The two subitems with response rates below 85 percent are

- C0326–Number of recorded incidents of physical attacks or fights with a weapon (weighted response rate of 84 percent)
- C0330–Number of recorded incidents of physical attacks or fights without a weapon (weighted response rate of 82 percent)

A detailed list of base-weighted item response rates for SSOCS:2016 questionnaire items is available in appendix N.

3.8 Analysis of Item Nonresponse Bias

NCES Statistical Standard 4-4 requires an analysis of item nonresponse bias for any item with a base-weighted item response rate less than 85 percent. Therefore, an item-level bias analysis was performed to determine the susceptibility of subitems C0326 and C0330 to bias. The magnitude of item nonresponse bias for a particular item is determined by several factors, including the level of item response, differences between item respondents and item nonrespondents in the characteristic being measured by the item, and the distribution of item responses across categories of auxiliary variables.

Two methods were used to analyze the potential for item nonresponse bias in C0326 and C0330. First, extreme "low" and extreme "high" values were imposed on nonrespondents to determine the resulting change in the estimate. For both subitems, the extreme assumptions led to significant changes in the estimated mean, suggesting that the items are susceptible to bias if there are large differences between item nonrespondents and nonrespondents.

[20] Base weights (which are equal to the inverse of each school's probability of selection) were used to calculate item response rates.

Second, an analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which schools that did not answer each item differed from schools that did answer the item. Specifically, the distributions of two survey subitems and eight sampling frame variables were compared between respondents and nonrespondents to subitems C0326 and C0330. The two survey subitems—C0560 (perceived level of crime in students' neighborhood) and C0562 (perceived level of crime in the school's neighborhood)— both had weighted item response rates above 99 percent and are likely to be correlated with responses to critical items. The eight sampling frame variables used in the analysis were school locale; number of FTE teachers; school level; region; percentage of White, non-Hispanic enrollment; enrollment size; student-to-teacher ratio; and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Results of the analyses indicated that the potential for bias was not enough to warrant the exclusion of C0326 and C0330 from the data file. More detailed information on the item nonresponse analyses, including the specific comparisons that were significant in the tests outlined above, is available in appendix O.

Even though these items were demonstrated to have little potential for nonresponse bias, they were omitted from the public-use file to protect schools from disclosure risks. They are available in the restricted-use file. However, several of the composite variables included in the public-use file were constructed using these variables.

3.9 Nonsampling Error

"Nonsampling error" is the term used to describe variations in the estimates that may be caused by population coverage limitations and data collection, processing, and reporting procedures. The sources of nonsampling errors are typically problems such as unit and item nonresponse, the differences in respondents' interpretations of the meaning of survey questions, response differences related to the particular month or time of the year when the survey was conducted, the tendency for respondents to give socially desirable responses, and mistakes in data preparation.

In general, it is difficult to identify and estimate either the amount of nonsampling error or the bias caused by this error. For SSOCS, efforts were made to prevent such errors from occurring and to compensate for them, where possible. For instance, during the survey design phase, cognitive testing of the new and revised questionnaire items was conducted with public school principals or the person most knowledgeable about school crime and policies to provide a safe environment in their school. Cognitive testing provided the opportunity to check for consistency of interpretation of questions and definitions as well as to eliminate ambiguous items. The questionnaire items were also extensively reviewed by NCES, a technical review panel consisting of some of the nation's top experts on school crime, and the National Institute of Justice, a partner federal agency who contributed funding for SSOCS:2016. In addition, extensive editing of the questionnaire responses was conducted to check the data for accuracy and consistency. Cases with missing or inconsistent items were recontacted by telephone to resolve problems. Data entered for all surveys, received by mail or telephone, were extensively reviewed to identify anomalies and verify that data were entered correctly.

4. Data Preparation

4.1 Analysis of Disclosure Risk

Central to the mission of NCES is a commitment to protecting the identity of respondents to its various data collections. Thus, the SSOCS:2016 response data have been subjected to an extensive disclosure risk analysis and modified based on the results of that analysis to prevent positive identification of individual schools. Tests on the modified data were performed to ensure that the data remain accurate and useful. The penalty for unlawful disclosure of any individually identifiable information is a fine of not more than $250,000 (under 18 U.S.C. 3559 and 3571), or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

4.2 Editing Specifications

As questionnaires were returned to Census, they were sent to data keying staff, who used a data capture program to enter the responses. As the data were captured, they were reformatted into ASCII files and sent weekly to Census Bureau analysts in Suitland, Maryland, for data review. The data were then run through a series of editing programs. As described in section 3.3, computer programs were used to determine whether a returned questionnaire could be considered complete. Additional editing programs subsequently checked the data for consistency, valid data value ranges, and skip patterns. Detailed information on editing procedures is provided in appendix P.

4.2.1 Range Specifications

The frequencies for all survey items were reviewed to ensure that recorded values were acceptable. For the categorical variables, these values were predetermined by precoded response options available on the questionnaire. For numeric variables, the initial data were reviewed to determine whether the ranges met hard and soft boundary criteria for acceptable responses. Ranges from the SSOCS:2010 data were used as a basis of comparison. Out-of-range responses were flagged, and the value was verified if the school was contacted again during data retrieval. If the respondent was not contacted again during data retrieval, the out-of-range value was deleted and a new value was imputed.

Range checks included both soft- and hard-range edits. A soft range is one that represents the reasonable expected range of values, but does not include all possible values. For critical items,[21] responses outside the soft range were confirmed with the respondent during data retrieval phone calls. If a respondent could not be reached, or if the item was not a critical item, the response was accepted as is. Hard ranges are those that have a finite set of parameters for an item. For example, a respondent may have given a date of February 1, 2016, as the date he or she completed the questionnaire. This value is out of range because the questionnaire was not mailed to the respondent until February 22, 2016. Similarly, on questions 38 and 39, responses greater than 100 percent were not accepted. For critical items with responses outside a hard range, respondents were called so that the question could be asked again; if a respondent insisted that a

[21] The critical items in SSOCS:2016 were questions 11, 12, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44 and 45.

response was correct, or if the respondent could not be reached, the response was not accepted. If the item was not a critical item, a response outside a hard range was not accepted.

4.2.2 Consistency Checks (Logic Edits)

Cross-tabulations were reviewed to check that logical relationships were maintained across items. For example, column 1 in item 26 asks for the total number of various incidents of crimes, and column 2 asks for the number of crimes reported to police. Logically, column 1 should be equal to or greater than column 2. If an illogical relationship was found between two numeric items, a response was deleted during editing and later imputed.[22]

Illogical relationships can also exist between two categorical items. For example, in item 34, column 1 asks whether the school allows the use of disciplinary actions and column 2 asks whether the school has used these disciplinary actions during the school year. Logically, if column 2 was answered "yes," column 1 should be answered "yes" as well. In this case, the data were "backward cleaned," and if the column 1 response was "no," it was logically edited to a "yes" response. A detailed list of consistency checks and rectification procedures is provided in appendix P. All inconsistencies were flagged, reviewed, and rectified.

4.3 Review and Coding of Text Items

There are two "other – please specify" text subitems in the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire: respondent title (C0015) and item 43(5) (other type of school, C0565). For these subitems, a respondent is asked to record an original response if the supplied response options do not capture his or her experiences. The provided responses were reviewed to determine whether they could be coded into one of the response options supplied on the questionnaire (i.e., back-coded), and those responses that could not be were reviewed to determine which were used frequently.

The SSOCS:2016 questionnaire contained two items regarding the respondent's title/position: C0014 asked whether the respondent was a principal, vice-principal/disciplinarian, or "Other," and C0015 allowed a text response if "Other" was selected. In the restricted-use file, seven new response categories were added to C0015, which became C0015_R because of this addition. C0015_R is not included in the public-use file because of concerns about disclosure risk. The public-use file contains a new recoded variable, C0014_R, which combines the most common responses for variables C0014 and C0015_R. These new responses are shown in table 5.

Table 5. Created text item for public-use file: SSOCS:2016

Created text item	Response categories
Title/Position (C0014_R)	(1) Principal
	(2) Vice principal or disciplinarian
	(3) Security staff
	(4) Other school-level staff
	(5) Superintendent or district staff

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2016).

[22] If a school required data retrieval, these inconsistencies were addressed during the data retrieval process.

The SSOCS:2016 questionnaire contained two items regarding school type. Item C0564 asked whether the school was a regular public school, a charter school, a school with a magnet program for part of the school, exclusively a magnet school, or "Other," and C0565 allowed a text response if "Other" was selected. Open-ended responses to C0565 were either back-coded as response options to item C0564 or, if it was determined that the responses could not readily be grouped into categories, left in the "Other" category. C0565 was omitted from the public-use file.

4.4 Imputation

Files containing missing data can be problematic because, depending on how the missing data are treated, the analysis of incomplete datasets may cause different users to arrive at different conclusions. Missing data may also create bias in the survey estimates, because certain groups of respondents may be more likely than others to leave some survey items unanswered. When completed SSOCS:2016 surveys contained some level of item nonresponse after the conclusion of the data retrieval phase,[23] imputation procedures were used to create values for all questionnaire items with missing information.

Appendix N presents the base-weighted response rate for each survey item eligible for recontact, after data editing and cleaning, and the type of imputation used for each item. Appendix N includes response rates for survey items which are included in the public-use file as well as those that are included in the restricted-use file but have been removed from the public-use file. For each questionnaire item in the data file, there is an accompanying imputation flag variable to indicate the imputation method used. For details regarding imputation flags, refer to section 5.9 below.

The base-weighted item response rates for SSOCS:2016 were generally high. After data cleaning and editing, the base-weighted item response rates of the 273 questionnaire items reviewed ranged from 82 to 100 percent. The mean weighted item response rate was about 98 percent, which is relatively high for a mailed self-administered questionnaire. In fact, the majority of items (99 percent) had weighted response rates of more than 85 percent.

4.4.1 Imputation Methods

The imputation methods used in SSOCS:2016 were tailored to the nature of each survey item. Three methods were used: aggregate proportions, hot deck, and clerical. Each method is described briefly below. A detailed discussion of SSOCS imputation methods can be found in appendix Q.

Aggregate proportions. Many of the items in SSOCS:2016 were counts of incidents or disciplinary actions. These counts are likely to be related to other school characteristics such as enrollment. The imputation methods used for such items were designed to maintain these relationships. Namely, rather than imputing counts from a single donor or a mean count from a group of donors, proportions were imputed using two methods. For most items, the imputed

[23] The initial editing program was run again after data retrieval. If a survey still did not met the criteria for completion—55 percent of all subitems in the questionnaire (162 out of 296 total), including a minimum of 80 percent of the 92 critical subitems (75 out of 92 total), 60 percent of item 26 subitems (18 out of 30 total), and 24 percent of item 35 subitems in columns 1 through 5 (6 out of 25 total)—the survey was considered incomplete and its data were not included in the final dataset.

proportions were derived from a single donor within an imputation class, as the donor's ratio of the item in question to another count (typically school enrollment).

However, for a select number of items, ratios were calculated by using the sums of the items across multiple donors in the imputation class with the identical instructional level and enrollment size category as the recipient.[24] Regardless of how the donors were selected, the donor proportion was assigned to recipient schools in that imputation class, and the proportion was multiplied by a known value for the recipient school, such as the number of students. Unlike mean imputation, this method maintains variability. Since the proportion is based on multiple donors, the result is also more stable than if it had been based on a single donor. By using more stable, aggregate proportions, imputation of outlier values is also minimized.

Hot deck. For categorical variables and several continuous variables, hot deck imputation was used. Hot deck imputation is a method for handling missing data in which each missing value is replaced with an observed response from a "similar" unit. A donor is chosen by observing responses from a similar unit, and a series of missing items is imputed directly from those items in the donor record.

Clerical. In some instances, missing data were available from the CCD frame. For example, sampling frame data were used to impute values for schools missing student enrollment data (item 37). Frame data were also available for school type (item 43), the percentage of male student enrollment (item 38d), and the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (item 38a). In other instances, research was done on school administrative records to estimate logical values for missing data.

4.4.2 Imputation Order

The interrelationships between the items in the SSOCS survey necessitated that a specific imputation order be followed. Because item 37 (student enrollment) is used in imputation for other variables, it was the first item to be imputed. Because item 35 is closely linked to several survey items, including items 26, 34, 36, and 45, the components of this item were imputed next. After the imputation of the item 35 matrix was complete, items 26 and 34 were imputed. This imputation sequence was chosen because some item 34 values and some item 26 values are limited by the item 35 values. After these four items were imputed, items 36 and 45 were imputed. Similarly, this imputation sequence was chosen because the item 36 values are limited by the item 35 values, and the item 45 values are limited by the item 36 values. The remaining questionnaire items were then imputed.

4.4.3 Imputation Flags

The imputation flags indicate the imputation method used: aggregate proportions, hot deck, or clerical. The codes used for the imputation flags are described in section 5.9.

[24] All subitems in questions 36a and 36b used this approach.

5. Guide to the Public-Use Data File and Codebook

5.1 Content and Organization of the Data File

The SSOCS:2016 data file contains data from all 2,092 completed questionnaires. The contents of the data file are presented in the following order: the unique school identifier (SCHID); questionnaire item variables, including categorized versions of the open-ended response variables; the composite (created) variables, including the nesting variable (STRATA); the sampling frame variables; the final sampling weight (FINALWGT); the jackknife replicate weights; and the imputation flags. Each of these sets of variables is described in sections 5.3 through 5.9 below.

The public-use materials available for download include a SAS data file (pu_ssocs16.sas7bdat); a SAS format library (pu_ssocs16_format.sas7bcat); a fixed-format ASCII (text) file (pu_ssocs16_ASCII.txt); a program to read the fixed-format file into SAS (pu_ssocs16_SAS_setup.sas); and this public-use data file user's manual in Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) (2018-107.pdf). Appendix B in this report contains the list of variables and the record layout of the fixed-format ASCII public-use data file. Appendix D in this report contains the public-use data file codebook.

NCES no longer provides SSOCS public-use data in Stata or SPSS format. To convert the provided data for use in Stata or SPSS, users may use file conversion software such as Stat/Transfer or DBMS/Copy. Users with access to SAS may do the following to convert to Stata or SPSS:

Converting From SAS to Stata

Use **proc export** to convert the SAS file into a comma-delimited file (.csv). In Stata, use the **import delimited** command to read in the .csv file. For example, if the SSOCS SAS file was saved in the C:\ directory, use the following code in SAS:

```
libname in "c:\";
proc export data=in.pu_ssocs16_sas outfile="c:\pu_ssocs16_stata.csv"
dbms=csv replace;
run;
```

In Stata, then use the following code to read in the .csv file, convert it to a Stata file, and save it in the C:\ directory:

```
cd c:\
import delimited using pu_ssocs16_stata.csv, varnames(1) clear
save pu_ssocs16_stata.dta, replace
```

Alternatively, use **proc export** to convert the SAS file into an .xpt file. In Stata, then use the **import sasxport** command to read in the .xpt file. For example, if the SSOCS SAS file was saved in the C:\ directory, use the following code in SAS:

```
libname out XPORT "c:\pu_ssocs16_sas.xpt";
```

```
data out.pu_ssocs16_stata;
  set "c:\pu_ssocs16_sas";
run;
```

In Stata, then use the following code to read in the .xpt file, convert it to a Stata file, and save it in the C:\ directory:

```
cd c:\
import sasxport pu_ssocs16_stata, clear
compress
save pu_ssocs16_stata.dta, replace
```

For additional information, see http://stats.idre.ucla.edu/other/mult-pkg/faq/how-do-i-convert-among-sas-stata-and-spss-files/.

Converting From SAS to SPSS

In SPSS, use the **get sas data** command to open the SAS data file in SPSS. For example, if the SSOCS SAS file was saved in the C:\ directory, use the following code in SPSS:

```
GET
  SAS DATA='c:\pu_ssocs16.sas7bdat'.
DATASET NAME DataSet1 WINDOW=FRONT.
```

To save as an SPSS file in the C:\ directory, use the following code in SPSS:

```
SAVE OUTFILE="C:\pu_ssocs16.sav".
```

For additional information, see https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/other/mult-pkg/faq/how-do-i-use-a-sas-data-file-in-spss/.

Reading into R

The **foreign** package contains functions that will allow users to import data files from SAS (.xpt format only), Stata, and SPSS. To download the foreign package from the CRAN website from within R, click on "Packages" and then "Install package(s) from CRAN." Alternatively, the following syntax will allow users to download the package and view the package functions:

```
>library(foreign)
>library(help=foreign)
```

Here are syntax examples of importing a Stata, SPSS, and .xpt SSOCS:16 file into R:

```
>pu_ssocs16_r <- read.dta("c:\pu_ssocs16_stata.dta")

>pu_ssocs16_r <- read.spss("c:\pu_ssocs16_spss.sav")

>pu_ssocs16_r <- read.xport("c:\pu_ssocs16_sas.xpt")
```

A file that has previously been saved as a CSV file can be read into R using the read.csv() function in base R, an example of which follows:

```
>pu_ssocs16_r <- read.csv("c:\pu_ssocs16.csv",stringsAsFactors=FALSE)
```

Finally, the **haven** package allows SAS datasets to be imported directly into R through the read_sas() function, without first converting to a different format. An example of this function is as follows:

```
>pu_ssocs16_r <- read.sas("c:\pu_ssocs16_sas.sas7bdat")
```

The save() function allows users to save the data from the original format into the R data format:

```
> save(pu_ssocs16_r, file = "pu_ssocs16_r.RData")
```

5.2 Public-Use Data File

This manual is designed to assist users of the public-use SSOCS:2016 data file. The public-use data file can be found at http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs/data_products.asp. Data on school crime can be considered sensitive, and in order to encourage complete and honest responses, participating schools were promised confidentiality. To protect the confidentiality of sampled schools, the following several steps were taken to prepare a public-use data file:

- The variables used for sampling were omitted or included only as categorical variables in order to lessen the amount of identifying information provided about each school.
- Some data collected in the questionnaire were omitted or modified; for example, by being converted to categorical variables or by being replaced by composite variables that contained summary information. This is especially true for the continuous variables (such as the incident counts) because of their potential capacity to uniquely identify a school.
- Some data were perturbed in ways that would not affect their overall distribution but so that the data no longer directly corresponded to the respondents' original data.
- The data file was examined using disclosure analysis procedures in order to identify any threats to confidentiality.
- Some variables were removed from the data file to reduce the risk of disclosure.

This process resulted in the public-use data file. Though the public-use file was designed to meet the needs of most users, some users may desire the more specific data that were removed in the public-use file. Please see appendix C for a list of variables that can be found in the restricted-use file that are not included in the public-use file. These data can be obtained by requesting the restricted-use file from NCES; however, the perturbations that were made to the data were applied consistently to both the public-use and restricted-use files. To learn more about getting a license, please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/licenses.asp.

5.3 Unique School Identifier

The sample file was sorted by control number, and the school case IDs were assigned sequentially. There were 3,553 ID numbers assigned, one for each sampled school. This

identifier is called SCHID. SCHID is created specifically for the SSOCS data file and, while it is included for the 2,092 respondent cases that appear in the public-use file, it cannot be used to link schools to any other files.

5.4 Questionnaire Item Variables

The questionnaire, shown in appendix A, has 47 items and 273 subitems, not counting the introductory items. In the data file and accompanying codebook, these items are listed in the order in which they appear in the questionnaire; within items, subitems are listed in source code order. Response values for question item variables are indicated in the questionnaire. A value of "-1" indicates that the item was legitimately skipped.

SSOCS variables are identified by source codes rather than by item numbers. The source code is "C0" followed by the 3-digit number next to the item in the questionnaire. For example, the first subitem of item 1 is variable C0110.

Variables that have been recoded to preserve confidentiality are denoted with an "_R" following the variable source code. For example, a small number of schools reported having an arrest that occurred at school in item C0688. Therefore, the responses for this item were collapsed into four categories (None, 1–5, 6–10, or 11 or more) to prevent individual schools from being identified. The variable was renamed to C0688_R to reflect this revision. See section 5.5 below for more information regarding items that were recoded for the public-use file to preserve confidentiality in SSOCS:2016.

There are two open-ended text questions in the questionnaire—respondent job title and other school type—and both were examined to identify common responses. When a write-in response appeared frequently, it was given a new code. The remaining responses were left in an "other" category." See section 4.3 for more information regarding the coding of text items in SSOCS:2016.

5.5 Variables Recoded for Public-Use File to Preserve Confidentiality

On the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire, schools were asked to report the number of arrests (C0688) and the number of hate crimes (C0690) that occurred at school. Due to the small number of schools reporting these incidents, including an incident count in the public-use file would present a disclosure risk. Therefore, these two variables were recoded for inclusion in the public-use file so that variables could be made available to users while simultaneously preserving the confidentiality of the respondents.

The arrest variable was recoded from a continuous variable to a categorical variable. For the revised variable (C0688_R), the number of arrests reported by each school was sorted into one of the following categories: None, 1–5, 6–10, or 11 or more.

The hate crime variable was recoded from a continuous variable to a binary variable, with "Yes" and "No" as the possible response options. For the revised variable (C0690_R), schools that reported at least one hate crime were coded as "1" while schools that reported no hate crimes were coded as "2."

5.6 Composite Variables

Composite variables were created and are included in the SSOCS data file to simplify analysis for users and make it easier for analysts to replicate others' results. A list of the composite variables included in the public-use file is presented below with an explanation of how they were derived.

CRISIS16 – Number of types of crises covered in written plans
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of schools' advance planning for crisis situations.
General explanation: Number of "yes" responses to item 2.
SAS code:

```
CRISIS16 = 0;
if C0155 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
if C0157 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
if C0158 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
if C0162 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
if C0166 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
if C0169 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
if C0170 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
if C0173 in (1) then CRISIS16 = CRISIS16 + 1;
```

DISALC16 – Total number of disciplinary actions recorded for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the total number of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol.
General explanation: Sum of responses in columns 2–5 of item 35d.
SAS code: DISALC16 = sum(C0490, C0492, C0494, C0496);

DISATT16 – Total number of disciplinary actions recorded for physical attacks or fights
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the total number of disciplinary actions for physical attacks or fights.
General explanation: Sum of responses in columns 2–5 of item 35e.
SAS code: DISATT16 = sum(C0500, C0502, C0504, C0506);

DISDRUG16 – Total number of disciplinary actions recorded for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the total number of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs.
General explanation: Sum of responses in columns 2–5 of item 35c.
SAS code: DISDRUG16 = sum(C0480, C0482, C0484, C0486);

DISFIRE16 – Total number of disciplinary actions recorded for use or possession of a firearm or explosive device
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the total number of disciplinary actions for use or possession of a firearm or explosive device.
General explanation: Sum of responses in columns 2–5 of item 35a.

SAS code: DISFIRE16 = sum(C0460, C0462, C0464, C0466);

DISRUPT – Total number of disruptions
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the total number of disruptions.
General explanation: Sum of responses in items 30 and 31.
SAS code: DISRUPT = sum(C0370, C0372);

DISTOT16 – Total number of disciplinary actions recorded
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the total number of disciplinary actions used by school officials in response to school crime and violence.
General explanation: Sum of responses in columns 2–5 of item 35.
SAS code:

DISTOT16 = sum(C0460, C0462, C0464, C0466, C0470, C0472, C0474, C0476, C0480, C0482, C0484, C0486, C0490, C0492, C0494, C0496, C0500, C0502, C0504, C0506);

DISWEAP16 – Total number of disciplinary actions recorded for use or possession of a weapon other than a firearm or explosive device
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the total number of disciplinary actions for use or possession of a weapon other than a firearm or explosive device.
General explanation: Sum of responses in columns 2–5 of item 35b.
SAS code: DISWEAP16 = sum(C0470, C0472, C0474, C0476);

INCID16 – Total number of incidents recorded
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of recorded incidents.
General explanation: Sum of responses in column 1 of item 26.
SAS code:

INCID16 = sum(C0310, C0314, C0318, C0322, C0326, C0330, C0334, C0338, C0342, C0346, C0350, C0354, C0355, C0358, C0362);

INCPOL16 – Total number of incidents reported to police
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of incidents reported to police or other law enforcement.
General explanation: Sum of responses in column 2 of item 26.
SAS code:

INCPOL16 = sum(C0312, C0316, C0320, C0324, C0328, C0332, C0336, C0340, C0344, C0348, C0352, C0356, C0357, C0360, C0364);

OTHACT16 – Total number of other disciplinary actions for specified offenses
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of other disciplinary actions used.
General explanation: Sum of items 35a–e, column 5.
SAS code: OTHACT16 = sum(C0466, C0476, C0486, C0496, C0506);

OUTSUS16 – Total number of out-of-school suspensions
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days, but less than the remainder of the school year.
General explanation: Sum of items 35a–e, column 4.

SAS code: OUTSUS16 = sum(C0464, C0474, C0484, C0494, C0504);

PROBWK16 – Number of types of disciplinary problems that occur daily or at least once a week
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the extent to which problems occur at school regularly.
General explanation: Provides a school-level count of disciplinary problems listed in items 32a–i as happening "daily" or "at least once a week."
SAS code:

```
PROBWK16=0;
    if C0374 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0376 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0378 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0380 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0381 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0382 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0383 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0384 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
    if C0386 in (1,2) then PROBWK16=PROBWK16 + 1;
```

REMOVL16 – Total number of removals with no continuing school services for specified offenses
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year.
General explanation: Sum of items 35a–e, column 2.
SAS code: REMOVL16 = sum(C0460, C0470, C0480, C0490, C0500);

SEC_FT16 – Total number of full-time security guards, SROs, and other sworn law enforcement officers
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of full-time security guards, School Resource Officers, and other sworn law enforcement officers present at school
General explanation: Sum of items 18ai, 18bi, and 19i. If a school had no security staff (as answered in question 11), then the total was set to zero.
Note. Schools that reported that they had no security staff (as answered in question 11) were coded as -1 for questions 18ai and 18bi to stay consistent with the legitimate skip coding.
SAS code: SEC_FT16 = sum(C0232, C0236, C0240); if C0610=2 then SEC_FT16=0;

SEC_PT16 – Total number of part-time security guards, SROs, and other sworn law enforcement officers
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of part-time security guards, School Resource Officers, and other sworn law enforcement officers present at school.
General explanation: Sum of items 18aii, 18bii, and 19ii. If a school had no security staff (as answered in question 11), then the total was set to zero.
Note. Schools that reported that they had no security staff (as answered in question 11) were coded as -1 for questions 18ai and 18bi to stay consistent with the legitimate skip coding.
SAS code:

SEC_PT16 = sum(C0234, C0238, C0242); if C0610=2 then SEC_PT16=0;

STRATA – Collapsed sampling stratum (nesting variable)
Purpose: To identify the sampling stratum for Taylor series variance estimation (described in section 6.2).
General explanation: Sampling stratum defined by concatenating school level, enrollment size category, and four-level locale, and then collapsing small strata as needed.
SAS code:

```
STRATA = FR_LVEL || FR_SIZE || FR_URBAN;
if STRATA in ("143","144") then STRATA = "144";
if STRATA in ("411","412") then STRATA = "412";
if STRATA in ("413","414") then STRATA = "414";
if STRATA in ("443","444") then STRATA = "444";
```

STUOFF16 – Total number of students involved in recorded offenses (regardless of disciplinary action)
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of students involved in specified recorded offenses.
General explanation: Sum of responses in column 1 of item 35.
SAS code: STUOFF16 = sum(C0458, C0468, C0478, C0488, C0498);

SVINC16 – Total number of serious violent incidents recorded
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of serious violent incidents recorded.
General explanation: Sum of item 26, column 1, rows a, b, c_i, c_ii, d_i, and e_i.
SAS code: SVINC16 = sum(C0310, C0314, C0318, C0322, C0326, C0334);

SVPOL16 – Total number of serious violent incidents reported to police
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of serious violent incidents reported to police.
General explanation: Sum of item 26, column 2, rows a, b, c_i, c_ii, d_i, and e_i.
SAS code: SVPOL16 = sum(C0312, C0316, C0320, C0324, C0328, C0336);

TRANSF16 – Total number of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses.
General explanation: Sum of items 35a–e, column 3.
SAS code: TRANSF16 = sum(C0462, C0472, C0482, C0492, C0502);

VIOINC16 – Total number of violent incidents recorded
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of violent incidents recorded.
General explanation: Sum of item 26, column 1, rows a, b, c_i, c_ii, d_i, d_ii, e_i, and e_ii.
SAS code: VIOINC16 = sum(C0310, C0314, C0318, C0322, C0326, C0330, C0334, C0338);

VIOPOL16 – Total number of violent incidents reported to police
Purpose: To provide a summary measure of the number of violent crimes reported to police.
General explanation: Sum of item 26, column 2, rows a, b, c_i, c_ii, d_i, d_ii, e_i, and e_ii.

SAS code: VIOPOL16 = sum(C0312, C0316, C0320, C0324, C0328, C0332, C0336, C0340);

5.7 Sampling Frame Variables

A number of variables from the 2013–14 Common Core of Data (CCD) sampling frame are included in the public-use data file, including variables used for stratification purposes. These variables were taken from the 2013–14 CCD school-level data file and provide key statistics about the schools sampled in SSOCS:2016. With the exception of the percentage of White enrollment (categorical), each sampling frame variable in the public-use file begins with the prefix "FR_" (to denote that it is a sampling frame variable) and has a variable label indicating that the variable was taken from the CCD school-level file. For example, "FR_SIZE" is described in the file as "School size categories – taken from the 13–14 CCD (School)." The frame variables listed in the SSOCS:2016 data file are described below in the order in which they appear in the codebook.

FR_LVEL

This is a SSOCS-created variable based on school grades offered as reported in the 2013–14 CCD school data file. This variable has four categories indicating the span of grades offered. 1 = primary, 2 = middle, 3 = high school, and 4 = combined. (Categorical)
FR_LVEL can be created based on the variables FR_HIGD and FR_LOGD (listed in appendix C) as described above, as follows:
SAS code:

```
if (FR_HIGD <= 8 & FR_LOGD <= 3) then FR_LVEL = 1;
else if (FR_HIGD <= 9 & FR_LOGD >= 4) then FR_LVEL = 2;
else if (FR_HIGD <= 12 & FR_LOGD >= 9) then FR_LVEL = 3;
else if (FR_HIGD = 9 & FR_LOGD = 9) then FR_LVEL = 2;
else FR_LVEL =4;
```

FR_SIZE

This is a SSOCS-created variable of school size categories. This variable collapses the number of students into four categories: 1 = less than 300, 2 = 300–499, 3 = 500–999, and 4 = 1,000 or more students. (Categorical)
FR_SIZE can be created based on the variable FR_NOST (listed in appendix C) as described above, as follows:
SAS code:

```
if FR_NOST < 300 then FR_SIZE=1;
else if 300 <= FR_NOST <= 499 then FR_SIZE=2;
else if 500 <= FR_NOST <= 999 then FR_SIZE=3;
else if FR_NOST >= 1000 then FR_SIZE = 4;
```

FR_URBAN

This is a SSOCS-created variable that collapses the 12-level locale variable into four categories: city (FR_LOC12 = 11, 12, or 13), suburb (FR_LOC12 = 21, 22, or 23), town (FR_LOC12 = 31, 32, or 33), and rural (FR_LOC12 = 41, 42, or 43).
FR_URBAN can be created based on the variable FR_LOC12 (listed in appendix C) as described above, as follows:
SAS code:

```
if FR_LOC12 in (11,12, 13) then FR_URBAN=1;
else if FR _LOC12 in (21, 22, 23) then FR_URBAN =2;
else if FR _LOC12 in (31, 32, 33) then FR_URBAN =3;
else if FR _LOC12 in (41, 42, 43) then FR_URBAN =4;
```

PERCWHT — This is a SSOCS-created variable representing percent White enrollment as reported in the 2013–14 CCD school data file. This variable has four categories: 1 = more than 95 percent, 2 = more than 80 to 95 percent, 3 = more than 50 to 80 percent, and 4 = 50 percent or less. (Categorical) PERCWHT can be created based on the variable FR_PERWT (listed in appendix C), as follows:

SAS code:

```
if FR_PERWT gt 95 then PERCWHT=1;
else if 80 < FR_PERWT <= 95 then PERCWHT = 2;
else if 50 < FR_PERWT <= 80 then PERCWHT =3;
else PERCWHT =4;
```

5.8 Weighting and Variance Estimation Variables

The final weight, "FINALWGT," is needed to produce national estimates from the variables listed in the file. The final weight precedes the 50 jackknife replicate weights (REPFWT1 to REPFWT50). Also included in the data file are the variables "STRATA" and "SCHID," which are the STRATA and primary sampling unit (PSU) variables needed for the nesting statement when producing Taylor series approximations in statistical analysis software. For a more detailed discussion of replicate weights and Taylor series approximations, see section 6.2.

5.9 Imputation Flag Variables

With the exception of the introductory items and open-ended text items, each questionnaire item in the data file has an imputation flag, which indicates whether any imputation was required. The naming convention appends the prefix "I" to the questionnaire variable. For example, row A of item 1 would have an imputation flag named IC0110. The flag values represent the type of imputation method used and are as follows:

0 = Value not imputed.
7 = Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor).
8 = Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases.
9 = Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data.

A detailed discussion of SSOCS imputation methods can be found in appendix Q.

6. Applying the Weight and Computing Standard Errors

6.1 Applying the Weight

SSOCS data are intended to represent U.S. public schools nationwide rather than only the schools that responded to the SSOCS survey; therefore, most analyses should be done with the weighted SSOCS data. The final SSOCS analysis weight on the SSOCS data file is called FINALWGT. See section 6.2 for example code that incorporates the final weight.

6.2 Computing Standard Errors

Estimates derived from a probability sample are subject to sampling error because only a small fraction of the target population has been surveyed. In surveys with complex sampling designs, such as SSOCS, estimates of standard errors that assume simple random sampling typically underestimate the variability in the point estimates. Two commonly used methods for estimating sampling errors that account for complex sampling designs are (1) replication and (2) the Taylor series linearization procedure (TSP).

Replication involves splitting the entire sample into a set of groups based on the actual sample design of the survey. The survey estimates can then be computed for each of the replicates by creating replicate weights that mimic the actual sample design and estimation procedures used in the full sample. The variation in the estimates computed from the replicate weights can then be used to estimate the sampling errors of the estimates for the full sample.

A total of 50 replicates were defined for SSOCS:2016. The specific replication procedure used for SSOCS:2016 was the jackknife method, which involved dividing the sample into 50 subsamples (replicates) for the computation of the replicate weights. Replicate weights were created for each of the 50 replicates using the same estimation procedures that were used for the full sample. These replicate weights are included in the SSOCS:2016 data file as REPFWT1 through REPFWT50 and can be used to calculate sampling errors in a number of software packages specializing in complex sample designs. The formula for the jackknife standard error of an estimate is

$$sse(\hat{\theta}) = \sqrt{\frac{49}{50} * \sum_{r=1}^{50} (\hat{\theta}_r - \hat{\theta})^2}$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ is the estimate computed using the final analysis weight (FINALWGT) and $\hat{\theta}_r$ is the estimate computed using the *r*th replicate weight (REPFWT*r*).

Another valid approach to the estimation of sampling errors for complex sample design is to use TSP. Under TSP, sampling is assumed to be with replacement within each stratum to avoid estimating the variance at all stages of sampling, and the variance computation involves only the totals of PSUs within each stratum. Therefore, it is important to specify the PSU (i.e., the school) identified by the unique school variable and the stratum to which the PSU belongs for computing the variance.

The SSOCS:2016 data file includes variables to obtain weighted estimates and to calculate standard errors using TSP. Table 6 gives a summary of weighting and sample variance estimation variables for data files from each administration of SSOCS. Data users should be aware that the use of different approximation methods or software packages in the calculation of standard errors may result in slightly different standard errors. Standard errors computed using the replication method and TSP are nearly always very similar, but not identical.

The statistical programs that allow for the calculation of standard errors using both jackknife replication and TSP are SUDAAN,[25] Stata,[26] SAS (versions 9.2 and above),[27] and the survey package in R.[28] An additional program that offers the replication method is WesVar.[29] Additional programs that offer TSP are SAS (version 8 or above), SPSS,[30] and AM.[31]

Sample code is provided below for calculating standard errors for means using the jackknife replication method in SAS-callable SUDAAN, SAS (version 9.2 and above), Stata, and the survey package in R. Sample code is also provided for calculating standard errors for means using TSP in SAS, Stata, SUDAAN, the SPSS Complex Samples module, and the survey package in R.

Table 6. Summary of weighting and sample variance estimation variables: SSOCS:2000 to SSOCS:2016

	Replication method: WesVar, SUDAAN, Stata, SAS (version 9.2 and above), R (survey package)			**Taylor series procedure: SUDAAN, Stata, SAS (version 8 and above), SPSS Complex Samples module, AM, R (survey package)**			
SSOCS data file	**Full sample weight**	**Respondent ID**	**Replicate weights**	**Jackknife method**	**Sample design**	**Nesting variables**	**DEFF (Design effect)**
1999–2000 SSOCS	FWT	WESID	FWT1-FWT50	JK1	WR	STR_SOCS; WESID	1.4
2003–2004 SSOCS	FINALWGT	ABTID	REPWGT1-REPWGT50	JK1	WR	STRATA64; ABTID	1.4
2005–2006 SSOCS	FINALWGT	SCHID	REPWGT1-REPWGT50	JK1	WR	STRATA; SCHID	1.5
2007–2008 SSOCS	FINALWGT	SCHID	REPWGT1-REPWGT50	JK1	WR	STRATA; SCHID	1.6
2009–2010 SSOCS	FINALWGT	SCHID	REPWGT1-REPWGT50	JK1	WR	STRATA; SCHID	1.6
2015–2016 SSOCS	FINALWGT	SCHID	REPFWT1-REPFWT50	JK1	WR	STRATA; SCHID	1.6

[25] See http://www.rti.org/sudaan for more information about SUDAAN.
[26] See http://www.stata.com for more information about Stata.
[27] See http://www.sas.com for more information about SAS.
[28] See https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/survey/survey.pdf for more information about the R survey package.
[29] To calculate standard errors using jackknife replication weights in WesVar, see *A User's Guide to WesVarPC* (Brick et al. 1997).
[30] See http://www.spss.com for more information about SPSS.
[31] See http://am.air.org for more information about AM.

The following code for SAS-callable SUDAAN, SAS (version 9.2 and above), Stata, and the survey package in R will produce standard errors for a mean using the jackknife replication method:

SAS-callable SUDAAN

```
proc descript design=jackknife DEFT4 filetype=sas ;
  weight FINALWGT ;
  jackwgts REPFWT1-REPFWT50/adjjack=0.98 ;
  var VARNAME ;
run ;
```

SAS 9.2

```
proc surveymeans varmethod=jackknife;
var VARNAME;
weight FINALWGT;
REPWEIGHTS REPFWT1-- REPFWT 50/JKCOEFS=0.98;
run;
```

Stata

```
svyset [pw=finalwgt], jkrw(repfwt1-repfwt50, multiplier (.98))
svy: mean varname
```

Survey package in R

```
mydesign<-svrepdesign(data=ssocs,
repweights=subset(ssocs,select=REPFWT1:REPFWT50), weights=~finalwgt,
type="JK1", mse=TRUE, combined.weights=TRUE, scale=49/50)
svymean(x=ssocs$varname, design=mydesign)
```

The following code will produce standard errors for a mean using TSP:

SAS

```
proc surveymeans;
 stratum STRATA ;
 cluster SCHID ;
 weight FINALWGT ;
 var VARNAME ;
run ;
```

Stata

```
svyset schid [pweight=finalwgt], strata (strata)
svy: mean varname
```

SAS-callable SUDAAN

```
proc descript filetype=sas design=wr DEFT2 ;
 nest STRATA SCHID;
 weight FINALWGT ;
```

```
 var VARNAME ;
run ;
```

SPSS[32]

Step One:

```
CSPLAN ANALYSIS
 /PLAN FILE='C:\SSOCS.CSAPLAN'
 /PLANVARS ANALYSISWEIGHT=FINALWGT
 /DESIGN  STRATA=STRATA  CLUSTER=SCHID
 /ESTIMATOR TYPE=WR.
```

Step Two:

```
CSDESCRIPTIVES
 /PLAN FILE='C:\SSOCS.CSAPLAN'
 /SUMMARY VARIABLES=VARNAME
 /MEAN
 /STATISTICS SE
 /MISSING SCOPE=ANALYSIS CLASSMISSING=EXCLUDE.
```

Survey package in R

```
mydesign<-svydesign(data=ssocs, id=~schid, strata=~strata, weights=~finalwgt,
nest=TRUE)
svymean(x=ssocs$varname, design=mydesign)
```

[32] Unlike the other statistical programs, a two-step method is required when using the SPSS Complex Samples module. The first step sets up the complex sample analysis plan (generating a CSPLAN file), while the second step uses this plan to generate an estimate. For the example provided, the file is called SSOCS.csaplan and is saved to the C:\ drive.

7. Data Considerations and Anomalies

This section discusses some of the anomalies and considerations that analysts should take into account when using the SSOCS:2016 data. In addition, it describes some of the data problems and the logical imputation edits that were implemented in the SSOCS:2016 data file.

Note that many of the specific variables discussed below have been removed from the SSOCS:2016 public-use file. However, several of the composite variables included in the public-use file were constructed using these variables, and they reflect the anomalies identified below.

7.1 Law Enforcement Officers: Items 11 (C0610) Through 18b (C0242)

In item 11, respondents are asked whether their schools have any sworn law enforcement officers. Respondents who answer "no" are then skipped to item 19. In some cases, however, respondents who answered "no" proceeded to answer positively to items 12, 13, 14, 15, or 18, which ask for descriptions of the security personnel. In these cases, the "no" response in item 11 was logically edited to a "yes" response.

7.2 Number of Incidents: Subitems 26a_1 (C0310) Through 26l_2 (C0364)

In item 26, respondents are asked to record the overall number of specific incidents that occurred at their school during the 2015–16 school year—for example, rape, robbery, physical attack, or theft—and then the number of those incidents that were reported to police. Logically, the number reported to police should not exceed the total number of incidents. If more incidents were reported to police than were recorded as having occurred, the overall number of incidents recorded was deleted and a revised count was later imputed. To protect respondents' confidentiality, the detailed responses were omitted from the public-use file and replaced by summary measures.

7.3 Use of Disciplinary Actions: Subitems 34a_1 (C0390) Through 34o_2 (C0456)

In item 34, respondents are asked to report whether various disciplinary actions are allowed in their school. If a respondent reports that a specific disciplinary action is allowed, he or she is then asked whether the action was used during the 2015–16 school year. Logically, a disciplinary action must be allowed in order for it to be used during the school year. Some respondents reported "no" to the question of whether the action was allowed, but "yes" to the question of use. In these circumstances, the "no" response to whether the action was allowed was logically edited to a "yes" response.

7.4 Number of Students Involved in Recorded Offenses of Use/Possession of a Firearm/Explosive Device: Subitem 35a_1 (C0458)

In item 35a_1, respondents are asked to report the total number of students involved in recorded offenses of use or possession of a firearm/explosive device. In the event that the value of C0458 is missing but there are valid values for each type of disciplinary action for this offense (C0460–C0466), the number of students (C0458) is edited to be equal to the sum of disciplinary actions

taken for that offense. When applied to the SSOCS:2016 data file, this edit resulted in the largest values of C0458 in the data file. Specifically, about 21 percent of these edited values constitute the highest values of the distribution of this variable (about the highest 0.1 percent of the distribution). Because the values of disciplinary actions recorded were not the result of editing or imputation, the edited values of C0458 were left as is in the SSOCS:2016 data file. Data users may want to top-code responses to this item at 10 or eliminate them from analysis when using this variable. This item was omitted from the public-use file to protect respondents' confidentiality.

7.5 Disciplinary Actions Taken: Subitems 35a_1 (C0458) Through 35e_5 (C0506)

In item 35, respondents are asked to report the total number of students in their school who committed various offenses (column 1) and to provide counts of various disciplinary actions taken in response to those offenses (columns 2–5). In some cases, respondents provided a response of zero in the "total students" column, leaving the remaining columns blank (or a mixture of zeros and blanks). In these cases, missing data were recoded to values of zero during the data-editing process. To protect respondents' confidentiality, the detailed responses were omitted from the public-use file and replaced by summary measures.

7.6 Total Removals and Transfers: Subitems 36a (C0518) and 36b (C0520)

In item 36, respondents are asked to report the total number of removals and transfers from their school for disciplinary reasons. Logically, these counts should be equal to or greater than the total number of removals and transfers reported in item 35, column 2, "Removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year," and column 3, "Transfers to specialized schools," for the specified offenses. In cases where the item 35 counts for the removal and transfer columns exceeded their respective subparts in item 36, the item 36 count was deleted and imputed.

7.7 Classroom Changes: Item 40 (C0538)

In item 40, schools are asked to report the average number of classroom changes most students make during a typical day. Some respondents may have interpreted this question to mean the number of classroom changes that occur throughout the school in a typical day, regardless of whether most students make all of those changes; therefore, some responses were quite high. These abnormally high responses were blanked, and a new value was imputed.

7.8 Average Daily Attendance: Item 44 (C0568)

In item 44, schools were asked to report the average daily attendance (percentage of students present). Some respondents may have interpreted this question to mean the percentage of students absent rather than present; therefore, some responses were quite low. These abnormally low responses were left in the data file; however, data users may want to code these responses in a different manner or eliminate them from analysis when using this variable.

7.9 Outliers in Count Variables

For some items that required schools to enter a count of incidents, students, or disciplinary actions, a small number of schools entered values that, while technically permissible under the SSOCS:2016 range and consistency rules, were unusually high. Specifically:

- In item 28 (C0690), one school reported 50 hate crimes. The next highest entry for this item was 22.
- In column 5 of item 35c (C0486), one school reported 300 "Other disciplinary actions" for distribution, possession, and use of illegal drugs. The next highest entry for this item was 100.
- In some parts of item 35 (C0458-C0506), a handful of schools reported that the number of disciplinary actions for a particular offense (columns 2 through 5) substantially exceeded the number of students involved in that offense (column 1). While it is theoretically possible for a student to be disciplined more than once for the same type of offense, the size of the discrepancies for these cases raised concerns during data review.
- In item 36a (C0518), one school reported that 94 students were removed without continuing services for disciplinary reasons. The next highest entry for this item was 44.
- Two schools reported in item 45b (C0572) that the number of transfers out of the school exceeded 90 percent of the enrollment reported in item 37 (C0522).

For all of these schools, the questionnaires were manually rechecked to verify that the unusual values were actually entered by the respondent and were not the result of a keying error. Because all of the outlier values noted above were confirmed to have been actually entered by the respondents, and did not violate prespecified range or consistency rules, they were left in the data file. However, when using count variables in analyses, data users may want to consider top-coding the counts or eliminating outlier cases from the analysis, as appropriate.

This page is intentionally left blank

8. References

Brick, M., Broene, P., James, P., and Severynse, J. (1997). A User's Guide to WesVarPC. Westat, Inc. Rockville, MD.

Chen, C., and Weikart, L.A. (2008). Student background, school climate, school disorder, and student achievement: An empirical study of New York City's middle schools. *Journal of School Violence*, *7*(4): 3–20.

Langbein, L., and Bess, R. (2002). Sports in schools: Source of amity or antipathy? *Social Science Quarterly, 83*(2): 436–54.

Miller, A.K. (2004). *Violence in U.S. Public Schools: 2000 School Survey on Crime and Safety* (NCES 2004-314R). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Statistics Canada. (2009). *2009 Statistics Canada Quality Guidelines, 5th edition*. Retrieved May 12, 2017, from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/12-539-x/12-539-x2009001-eng.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). NCES Statistical Standards (NCES 2014-097). Retrieved May 12, 2017 from http://nces.ed.gov/statprog/2012/.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A: 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety Questionnaire

OMB No. 1850-0761: Approval Expires 08/31/2018

Conducted by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Collected by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

SCHOOL SURVEY ON CRIME AND SAFETY

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE
2015–16 SCHOOL YEAR

This survey is designed to be completed by the principal or the person most knowledgeable about school crime and policies to provide a safe environment at your school.

School Survey On Crime & Safety

(Please correct any errors in name, address, and ZIP Code.)

THIS SURVEY HAS BEEN ENDORSED BY:

American Association of School Administrators
American Federation of Teachers
American School Counselors Association
Association for Middle Level Education
Association of American Educators
Council of Chief State School Officers
Education Northwest
National Association of State Boards of Education
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Association of School Resource Officers
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National PTA
National School Safety Center
School Safety Advocacy Council
UCLA Center for Mental Health in the Schools
National Association of School Psychologists
School Social Work Association of America

NOTICE

Your answers may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law [Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA 2002) 20 U.S.C., § 9573]. Reports of the findings from the survey will not identify participating districts, schools, or staff. Individual responses will be combined with those from other participants to produce summary statistics and reports.

PLEASE RESPOND BY:

FORM **SSOCS-1**
(12-2-2015)

110106

DEFINITIONS

The following words are bolded and marked by an asterisk (*) wherever they appear in the questionnaire. Please use these definitions as you respond.

Active shooter – an individual actively engaged in killing or attempting to kill people in a confined and populated area; in most cases, active shooters use firearm(s) and there is no pattern or method to their selection of victims.

At school/at your school – activities happening in school buildings, on school grounds, on school buses, and at places that hold school-sponsored events or activities. Unless otherwise specified, this refers to normal school hours or to times when school activities/events were in session.

Bullying – any unwanted aggressive behavior(s) by another youth or group of youths who are not siblings or current dating partners that involves an observed or perceived power imbalance and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated.

Cyberbullying – occurs when willful and repeated harm is inflicted through the use of computers, cell phones, or other electronic devices.

Diagnostic assessment – an evaluation conducted by a medical or mental health professional that identifies whether an individual has one or more medical and/or mental health diagnoses. This is in contrast to an educational assessment, which does not focus on clarifying a student's diagnosis.

Evacuation – a procedure that requires all students and staff to leave the building. While evacuating to the school's field makes sense for a fire drill that only lasts a few minutes, it may not be an appropriate location for a longer period of time. The evacuation plan should encompass relocation procedures and include backup buildings to serve as emergency shelters, such as nearby community centers, religious institutions, businesses, or other schools. Evacuation also includes "reverse evacuation," a procedure for schools to return students to the building quickly if an incident occurs while students are outside.

Firearm/explosive device – any weapon that is designed to (or may readily be converted to) expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. This includes guns, bombs, grenades, mines, rockets, missiles, pipe bombs, or similar devices designed to explode and capable of causing bodily harm or property damage.

Gang – an ongoing loosely organized association of three or more persons, whether formal or informal, that has a common name, signs, symbols, or colors, whose members engage, either individually or collectively, in violent or other forms of illegal behavior.

Gender identity – means one's inner sense of one's own gender, which may or may not match the sex assigned at birth. Different people choose to express their gender identity differently. For some, gender may be expressed through, for example, dress, grooming, mannerisms, speech patterns, and social interactions. Gender expression usually ranges between masculine and feminine, and some transgender people express their gender consistent with how they identify internally, rather than in accordance with the sex they were assigned at birth.

Hate crime – A committed criminal offense that is motivated, in whole or in part, by the offender's bias(es) against a race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, gender, or gender identity; also known as bias crime.

Lockdown – a procedure that involves occupants of a school building being directed to remain confined to a room or area within a building with specific procedures to follow. A lockdown may be used when a crisis occurs outside of the school and an evacuation would be dangerous. A lockdown may also be called for when there is a crisis inside and movement within the school will put students in jeopardy. All exterior doors are locked and students and staff stay in their classrooms.

Mental health disorders – collectively, all diagnosable mental disorders or health conditions that are characterized by alterations in thinking, mood, or behavior (or some combination thereof) associated with distress and/or impaired functioning.

Mental health professionals – mental health services are provided by several different professions, each of which has its own training and areas of expertise. The types of professionals who may provide mental health services include psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric/mental health nurse practitioners, psychiatric/mental health nurses, clinical social workers, and professional counselors.

Physical attack or fight – an actual and intentional touching or striking of another person against his or her will, or the intentional causing of bodily harm to an individual.

Rape – forced sexual intercourse (vaginal, anal, or oral penetration). This includes sodomy and penetration with a foreign object. Both male and female students can be victims of rape. [Counts of attempted rape should be added to counts of rapes in your reporting of item 26a.]

DEFINITIONS – *Continued*

The following words are bolded and marked by an asterisk (*) wherever they appear in the questionnaire. Please use these definitions as you respond.

Restorative circle – a formal mediation process led by a facilitator that brings affected parties of a problem together to explore what happened, reflect on their roles, find a solution, and ultimately restore harmony to individual relationships and the larger community.

Robbery (taking things by force) – the taking or attempting to take anything of value that is owned by another person or organization, under confrontational circumstances by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear. A key difference between robbery and theft/larceny is that robbery involves a threat or assault.

Sexual assault – an incident that includes threatened rape, fondling, indecent liberties, or child molestation. Both male and female students can be victims of sexual assault. Classification of these incidents should take into consideration the age and developmentally appropriate behavior of the offender(s).

Sexual harassment – conduct that is unwelcome, sexual in nature, and denies or limits a student's ability to participate in or benefit from a school's education program. The conduct can be carried out by school employees, other students, and non-employee third parties. Both male and female students can be victims of sexual harassment, and the harasser and the victim can be of the same sex. The conduct can be verbal, nonverbal, or physical.

Sexual orientation – means one's emotional or physical attraction to the same and/or opposite sex.

Shelter-in-place – a procedure similar to a lockdown in that the occupants are to remain on the premises; however, shelter-in-place is designed to use a facility and its indoor atmosphere to temporarily separate people from a hazardous outdoor environment. Everyone would be brought indoors and building personnel would close all windows and doors and shut down the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system (HVAC). This would create a neutral pressure in the building, meaning the contaminated air would not be drawn into the building.

Special education student – a child with a disability, defined as mental retardation, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance, orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities, who needs special education and related services and receives these under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Specialized school – a school that is specifically for students who were referred for disciplinary reasons, although the school may also have students who were referred for other reasons. The school may be at the same location as your school.

Theft/larceny (taking things worth over $10 without personal confrontation) – the unlawful taking of another person's property without personal confrontation, threat, violence, or bodily harm. This includes pocket picking, stealing a purse or backpack (if left unattended or no force was used to take it from owner), theft from a building, theft from a motor vehicle or of motor vehicle parts or accessories, theft of a bicycle, theft from a vending machine, and all other types of thefts.

Threat assessment team – a formalized group of persons who meet on a regular basis with the common purpose of identifying, assessing, and managing students who may pose a threat of targeted violence in schools.

Treatment – a clinical service addressed at lessening or eliminating the symptoms of a disorder. In mental health, this may include psychotherapy, medication treatment, and/or counseling.

Vandalism – the willful damage or destruction of school property, including bombing, arson, graffiti, and other acts that cause property damage. This includes damage caused by computer hacking.

Violence – actual, attempted, or threatened fight or assault.

Weapon – any instrument or object used with the intent to threaten, injure, or kill. This includes look-alikes if they are used to threaten others.

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS:

- For most questions, please mark the box that best reflects your school's circumstances. Please mark your response with an "X".
- Some questions ask for counts or percents of items. Please place an "X" in the None box, rather than leaving the item blank, if the number of such items at your school is zero.
- It is not necessary to consult any records for items 9 and 39. Please provide estimates for these questions.
- Definitions are available for many terms on pages 2 and 3. Defined terms are bolded and marked with an asterisk (*) throughout the survey.
- Some questions refer to the 2015–16 school year. Please report for the school year to date.
- Please have this questionnaire filled out by the person most knowledgeable about school crime and policies to provide a safe environment.
- Please keep a copy of the completed questionnaire for your records.

WHERE SHOULD I RETURN MY COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE?

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope or mail it to:

U.S. Census Bureau
ATTN: DCB/PCSPU, Building 60A
1201 E. 10th Street
Jeffersonville IN 47132-0001

If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at: 1-888-595-1332 or at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this voluntary information collection is 1850-0761. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 52 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate, suggestions for improving this collection, or comments or concerns about the contents or the status of your individual submission of this questionnaire, please write directly to: School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), National Center for Education Statistics, 550 12th Street, S.W., #4012, Washington, DC 20202.

Please provide the following information:

Name of person completing form

010

Telephone number
Area code Number

012 ___ — ___ — ____

Title/position
Check one response.

014
1 Principal
2 Vice-principal or disciplinarian
3 Other – *Please specify*

015

Number of years at this school

016

Best days and times to reach you (in case we have further questions)

018

E-mail address

020

Is the correct grade range for this school?

022
1 Yes → *GO TO Question 1 on page 6.*
2 No → Which of the following grades are offered in this school?

Check all that apply.

024 1 Prekindergarten
026 1 Kindergarten
028 1 1st
030 1 2nd
032 1 3rd
034 1 4th
036 1 5th
038 1 6th
040 1 7th
042 1 8th
044 1 9th
046 1 10th
048 1 11th
050 1 12th
052 1 Ungraded

GO TO QUESTION 1 ON PAGE 6.

School Practices and Programs

1. During the 2015–16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following?
   - If your school changed its practices during the school year, please answer regarding your most recent practice.
   - Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	Require visitors to sign or check in **and** wear badges	110	1	2
b.	Control access to school buildings during school hours (e.g., locked or monitored doors)	112	1	2
c.	Control access to school grounds during school hours (e.g., locked or monitored gates)	114	1	2
d.	Require metal detector checks on students every day	116	1	2
e.	Perform one or more random metal detector checks on students	120	1	2
f.	Equip classrooms with locks so that doors can be locked from the inside	121	1	2
g.	Close the campus for most or all students during lunch	122	1	2
h.	Use one or more random dog sniffs to check for drugs	124	1	2
i.	Perform one or more random sweeps for contraband (e.g., drugs or **weapons***), but not including dog sniffs	126	1	2
j.	Require drug testing for athletes	128	1	2
k.	Require drug testing for students in extra-curricular activities other than athletics	130	1	2
l.	Require students to wear uniforms	134	1	2
m.	Enforce a strict dress code	136	1	2
n.	Provide school lockers to students	138	1	2
o.	Require clear book bags or ban book bags on school grounds	140	1	2
p.	Have “panic button(s)” or silent alarm(s) that directly connect to law enforcement in the event of an incident	139	1	2
q.	Provide an electronic notification system that automatically notifies parents in case of a school-wide emergency	141	1	2
r.	Provide a structured anonymous threat reporting system (e.g., online submission, telephone hotline, or written submission via drop box)	143	1	2
s.	Require students to wear badges or picture IDs	142	1	2
t.	Require faculty and staff to wear badges or picture IDs	144	1	2
u.	Use one or more security cameras to monitor the school	146	1	2
v.	Provide telephones in most classrooms	148	1	2
w.	Provide two-way radios to any staff	150	1	2
x.	Limit access to social networking websites (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram) from school computers	151	1	2
y.	Prohibit use of cell phones and text messaging devices during school hours	153	1	2

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

2. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios?

			YES	NO
a.	**Active shooter***	155	1	2
b.	Natural disasters (e.g., earthquakes or tornadoes)	158	1	2
c.	Hostages	162	1	2
d.	Bomb threats or incidents	166	1	2
e.	Chemical, biological, or radiological threats or incidents (e.g., release of mustard gas, anthrax, smallpox, or radioactive materials)	170	1	2
f.	Suicide threat or incident	169	1	2
g.	Pandemic flu	173	1	2
h.	Post-crisis reunification of students with their families	157	1	2

3. During the 2015–16 school year, has your school drilled students on the use of the following emergency procedures?

- Please respond to each of these according to the definitions provided on pages 2 and 3.

			YES	NO
a.	**Evacuation***	163	1	2
b.	**Lockdown***	165	1	2
c.	**Shelter-in-place***	167	1	2

4. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce **violence*** that included the following components for students?

- If a program has multiple components, answer "Yes" for each that applies.
- Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	Prevention curriculum, instruction, or training for students (e.g., conflict resolution, anti-**bullying***, dating **violence*** prevention)	174	1	2
b.	Behavioral or behavior modification intervention for students (including the use of positive reinforcements)	176	1	2
c.	Counseling, social work, psychological, or therapeutic activity for students	178	1	2
d.	Individual attention/mentoring/tutoring/coaching of students by students	180	1	2
e.	Individual attention/mentoring/tutoring/coaching of students by adults	181	1	2
f.	Recreational, enrichment, or leisure activities for students	182	1	2
g.	Student involvement in peer mediation	175	1	2
h.	Student court to address student conduct problems or minor offenses	177	1	2
i.	Student involvement in **restorative circles*** (e.g., "peace circles," "talking circles," "conflict circles")	179	1	2
j.	Social emotional learning (SEL) training for students (e.g., social skills, anger management, mindfulness)	183	1	2
k.	Programs to promote a sense of community/social integration among students	186	1	2

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

5. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school have a **threat assessment team*** or any other formal group of persons to identify students who might be a potential risk for violent or harmful behavior (toward themselves or others)?

600 1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No → *GO TO item 7 below.*

6. During the 2015–16 school year, how often did your school's **threat assessment team*** formally meet?

• Check one response.

602 1 ☐ At least once a week
2 ☐ At least once a month
3 ☐ On occasion
4 ☐ Never

7. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school have any recognized student groups with the following purposes?

• Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	Acceptance of **sexual orientation*** and **gender identity*** of students (e.g., Gay-Straight Alliance)	604	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	Acceptance of students with disabilities (e.g., Best Buddies)	606	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	Acceptance of cultural diversity (e.g., Cultural Awareness Club)	608	1 ☐	2 ☐

Parent and Community Involvement at School

8. Which of the following does your school do to involve or help parents?

• Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	Have a formal process to obtain parental input on policies related to school crime and discipline	190	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	Provide training or technical assistance to parents in dealing with students' problem behavior	192	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	Have a program that involves parents **at school*** helping to maintain school discipline	194	1 ☐	2 ☐

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

9. What is your best estimate of the percentage of students who had at least one parent or guardian participating in the following events during the 2015–16 school year?

Check one response on each line.

		0–25%	26–50%	51–75%	76–100%	School does not offer
a. Open house or back-to-school night	196	1	2	3	4	5
b. Regularly scheduled parent-teacher conferences	198	1	2	3	4	5
c. Special subject-area events (e.g., science fair, concerts)	200	1	2	3	4	5
d. Volunteered **at school*** or served on a committee	202	1	2	3	4	5

10. During the 2015–16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools?

Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

		YES	NO
a. Parent groups	204	1	2
b. Social service agencies	206	1	2
c. Juvenile justice agencies	208	1	2
d. Law enforcement agencies	210	1	2
e. Mental health agencies	212	1	2
f. Civic organizations/service clubs	214	1	2
g. Private corporations/businesses	216	1	2
h. Religious organizations	218	1	2

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

School Security Staff

11. During the 2015–16 school year, did you have any sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) present **at your school*** at least once a week?

- Do not include security guards or other security personnel who are not sworn law enforcement in your response to this item; information on additional security staff is gathered in item 19.

610 1 ☐ Yes

2 ☐ No → *GO TO item 19 on page 12.*

12. Were sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) used at least once a week in or around your school at the following times?

- Do not include security guards or other security personnel who are not sworn law enforcement in your response to this item; information on additional security staff is gathered in item 19.
- Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	At any time during school hours	612	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	While students were arriving or leaving	614	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	At selected school activities (e.g., athletic and social events, open houses, science fairs)	616	1 ☐	2 ☐
d.	When school/school activities were not occurring	618	1 ☐	2 ☐

13. Did any of the sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) **at your school*** routinely:

- Do not include security guards or other security personnel who are not sworn law enforcement in your response to this item; information on additional security staff is gathered in item 19.
- Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	Carry a stun gun (e.g., Taser gun)	620	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	Carry chemical aerosol sprays (e.g., Mace, pepper spray)	622	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	Carry a **firearm***	624	1 ☐	2 ☐
d.	Wear a body camera	626	1 ☐	2 ☐

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

14. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities **at your school***?

- Do not include security guards or other security personnel who are not sworn law enforcement in your response to this item; information on additional security staff is gathered in item 19.
- Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	Motor vehicle traffic control	628	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	Security enforcement and patrol	630	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	Maintaining school discipline	632	1 ☐	2 ☐
d.	Coordinating with local police and emergency team(s)	634	1 ☐	2 ☐
e.	Identifying problems in the school and proactively seeking solutions to those problems	636	1 ☐	2 ☐
f.	Training teachers and staff in school safety or crime prevention	638	1 ☐	2 ☐
g.	Mentoring students	640	1 ☐	2 ☐
h.	Teaching a law-related education course or training students (e.g., drug-related education, criminal law, or crime prevention courses)	642	1 ☐	2 ☐
i.	Recording or reporting discipline problems to school authorities	644	1 ☐	2 ☐
j.	Providing information to school authorities about the legal definitions of behavior for recording or reporting purposes (e.g., defining assault for school authorities)	646	1 ☐	2 ☐

15. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school have a sworn law enforcement officer (including School Resource Officers) present for <u>all instructional hours every day that school was in session</u>?

- Include officers who are used as temporary coverage while regularly assigned officers are performing duties external to the school (such as attending court) or during these officers' personal leave time.
- Check "No" if your school does not have officer coverage while regularly assigned officers are performing duties external to the school (such as attending court) or during these officers' personal leave time.
- Do not include security guards or other security personnel who are not sworn law enforcement in your response to this item; information on additional security staff is gathered in item 19.

648 1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No

16. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school or school district have any formalized policies or written documents (e.g., Memorandum of Use, Memorandum of Agreement) that outlined the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school?

650 1 ☐ Yes → *CONTINUE to item 17 on page 12.*
2 ☐ No → *GO TO item 18 on page 12.*

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

17. Did these formalized policies or written documents include language defining the role of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school in the following areas?

- Check "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" on each line.

			YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
a.	Student discipline	652	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
b.	Use of physical restraints (e.g., handcuffs, Tasers, Mace, pepper spray, or other physical or chemical restraints)	654	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
c.	Use of **firearms***	656	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
d.	Making arrests on school grounds	658	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
e.	Reporting of criminal offenses to a law enforcement agency	660	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐

18. How many of the following were present in your school <u>at least once a week</u>?

- If an officer works full-time across various schools in the district, please count this officer as "part-time" for your school.
- Do not include security guards or other security personnel who are not sworn law enforcement in your response to this item; information on additional security staff is gathered in item 19.
- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

			Number **at your school***
a.	School Resource Officers (Include all career sworn law enforcement officers with arrest authority, who have specialized training and are assigned to work in collaboration with school organizations.)		
	i. Full-time	236	☐☐ 0 ☐ None
	ii. Part-time	238	☐☐ 0 ☐ None
b.	Sworn law enforcement officers who are not School Resource Officers		
	i. Full-time	240	☐☐ 0 ☐ None
	ii. Part-time	242	☐☐ 0 ☐ None

19. Aside from School Resource Officers or other sworn law enforcement officers, how many additional security guards or security personnel were present in your school <u>at least once a week</u>?

- If a security guard or other security personnel works full-time across various schools in the district, please count this person as "part-time" for your school.
- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

			Number **at your school***
	Security guards or security personnel		
	i. Full-time	232	☐☐ 0 ☐ None
	ii. Part-time	234	☐☐ 0 ☐ None

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

School Mental Health Services

20. During the 2015–16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed **mental health professional***?

- Check "Yes" or "No" for each type of service available to students, regardless of whether the service was used this school year.
- Please respond to each of these according to the definitions provided on pages 2 and 3.

	Service was available to students...					
	AT SCHOOL* by a **mental health professional*** employed by the school or district		**AT SCHOOL*** by a **mental health professional*** other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district		OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL by a **mental health professional*** other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. **Diagnostic assessment*** for **mental health disorders***	662 1 ☐	2 ☐	664 1 ☐	2 ☐	666 1 ☐	2 ☐
b. **Treatment*** for **mental health disorders***	668 1 ☐	2 ☐	670 1 ☐	2 ☐	672 1 ☐	2 ☐

21. During the 2015–16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students?

- Check one response on each line.

			Limits in major way	Limits in minor way	Does not limit
a.	Inadequate access to licensed **mental health professionals***	674	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
b.	Inadequate funding	676	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
c.	Potential legal issues for school or district (e.g., malpractice, insufficient supervision)	678	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
d.	Lack of parental support in addressing their children's **mental health disorders***	680	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
e.	Lack of community support for providing mental health services to students in your school	682	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
f.	Written or unwritten policies regarding the school's requirement to pay for the diagnostic assessment or treatment of students	684	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐
g.	Reluctance to label students with **mental health disorders*** to avoid stigmatizing the child	686	1 ☐	2 ☐	3 ☐

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

Staff Training

22. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides?

Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.

			YES	NO
a.	Training in classroom management for teachers	266	1	2
b.	Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to **violence***	268	1	2
c.	Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to **cyberbullying***	265	1	2
d.	Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to **bullying*** other than **cyberbullying***	267	1	2
e.	Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to alcohol and/or drug use	269	1	2
f.	Training in safety procedures (e.g., how to handle emergencies)	270	1	2
g.	Training in recognizing early warning signs of students likely to exhibit violent behavior	272	1	2
h.	Training in intervention and referral strategies for students displaying signs of **mental health disorders*** (e.g., depression, mood disorders, ADHD)	271	1	2
i.	Training in recognizing physical, social, and verbal **bullying*** behaviors	273	1	2
j.	Training in recognizing signs of students using/abusing alcohol and/or drugs	274	1	2
k.	Training in positive behavioral intervention strategies	276	1	2
l.	Training in crisis prevention and intervention	277	1	2

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

Limitations on Crime Prevention

23. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime?

Check one response on each line.

			Limits in major way	Limits in minor way	Does not limit
a.	Lack of or inadequate teacher training in classroom management	280	1	2	3
b.	Lack of or inadequate alternative placement/programs for disruptive students	282	1	2	3
c.	Likelihood of complaints from parents	284	1	2	3
d.	Lack of teacher support for school policies	286	1	2	3
e.	Lack of parental support for school policies	288	1	2	3
f.	Teachers' fear of student retaliation	290	1	2	3
g.	Fear of litigation	292	1	2	3
h.	Inadequate funds	294	1	2	3
i.	Inconsistent application of school policies by faculty or staff	296	1	2	3
j.	Fear of district or state reprisal	298	1	2	3
k.	Federal, state, or district policies on disciplining **special education students***	300	1	2	3
l.	Federal policies on discipline and safety other than those for **special education students***	302	1	2	3
m.	State or district policies on discipline and safety other than those for **special education students***	304	1	2	3

Frequency of Crime and Violence at School

24. During the 2015–16 school year, have any of your school's students, faculty, or staff died as a result of a homicide committed **at your school***?

306 1 Yes
2 No

25. During the 2015–16 school year, has there been at least one incident **at your school*** that involved a shooting (regardless of whether anyone was hurt)? Please include those incidents that occurred **at school***, regardless of whether a student or non-student used the **firearm***.

308 1 Yes
2 No

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

Number of Incidents

26. Please record the number of incidents that occurred **at school*** during the 2015–16 school year for the offenses listed below. (NOTE: The number in column 1 should be greater than or equal to the number in column 2.)

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

Please provide information on:

- The number of incidents, not the number of victims or offenders.
- Recorded incidents, regardless of whether any disciplinary action was taken.
- Recorded incidents, regardless of whether students or non-students were involved.
- Incidents occurring before, during, or after normal school hours.

	Column 1 Total number of recorded incidents	Column 2 Number reported to police or other law enforcement
a. **Rape*** or attempted **rape***	310 0 None	312 0 None
b. **Sexual assault*** other than **rape*** (include threatened **rape***)	314 0 None	316 0 None
c. **Robbery*** (taking things by force)		
i. With a **weapon***	318 0 None	320 0 None
ii. Without a **weapon***	322 0 None	324 0 None
d. **Physical attack or fight***		
i. With a **weapon***	326 0 None	328 0 None
ii. Without a **weapon***	330 0 None	332 0 None
e. Threats of **physical attack***		
i. With a **weapon***	334 0 None	336 0 None
ii. Without a **weapon***	338 0 None	340 0 None
f. **Theft/larceny*** (taking things worth over $10 without personal confrontation)	342 0 None	344 0 None
g. Possession of a **firearm or explosive device***	346 0 None	348 0 None
h. Possession of a knife or sharp object	350 0 None	352 0 None
i. Distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs	354 0 None	356 0 None
j. Inappropriate distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs	355 0 None	357 0 None
k. Distribution, possession, or use of alcohol	358 0 None	360 0 None
l. **Vandalism***	362 0 None	364 0 None

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

27. Please record the number of arrests that occurred at your school during the 2015–16 school year. Please include all arrests that occurred **at school***, regardless of whether a student or non-student was arrested.

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

688 ☐☐☐ Number of arrests

0 ☐ None

28. During the 2015–16 school year, how many **hate crimes*** occurred **at your school***?

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

690 ☐☐☐ Number of **hate crimes***

0 ☐ None → *GO TO item 30 below.*

29. To the best of your knowledge, were any of these **hate crimes*** motivated by the offender's bias against the following characteristics?

- Check "Yes" or "No" on each line.
- If a **hate crime*** was motivated by multiple characteristics, answer "Yes" for each that applies.

			YES	NO
a.	Race or color	692	1 ☐	2 ☐
b.	National origin or ethnicity	694	1 ☐	2 ☐
c.	Gender	696	1 ☐	2 ☐
d.	Religion	698	1 ☐	2 ☐
e.	Disability	700	1 ☐	2 ☐
f.	**Sexual Orientation***	702	1 ☐	2 ☐
g.	**Gender Identity***	704	1 ☐	2 ☐

30. How many times during the 2015–16 school year were activities disrupted by unplanned fire alarms (i.e., false alarms)?

- Do not include fire alarms due to actual emergencies.
- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

370 ☐☐☐ Number of unplanned fire alarms

0 ☐ None

31. Excluding planned and unplanned fire alarms, how many times during the 2015–16 school year were activities disrupted by other actions, such as death threats, bomb threats, or chemical, biological, or radiological threats?

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

372 ☐☐☐ Number of disruptions

0 ☐ None

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

Disciplinary Problems and Actions

32. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur **at your school***?

Check one response on each line.

			Happens daily	Happens at least once a week	Happens at least once a month	Happens on occasion	Never happens
a.	Student racial/ethnic tensions	374	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Student **bullying***	376	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Student **sexual harassment*** of other students	378	1	2	3	4	5
d.	Student harassment of other students based on **sexual orientation***	381	1	2	3	4	5
e.	Student harassment of other students based on **gender identity***	383	1	2	3	4	5
f.	Widespread disorder in classrooms	382	1	2	3	4	5
g.	Student verbal abuse of teachers	380	1	2	3	4	5
h.	Student acts of disrespect for teachers other than verbal abuse	384	1	2	3	4	5
i.	**Gang*** activities	386	1	2	3	4	5

33. To the best of your knowledge, thinking about problems that can occur anywhere (both at your school and away from school), how often do the following occur?

Check one response on each line.

			Happens daily	Happens at least once a week	Happens at least once a month	Happens on occasion	Never happens
a.	**Cyberbullying*** among students who attend your school	389	1	2	3	4	5
b.	School environment is affected by **cyberbullying***	391	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Staff resources are used to deal with **cyberbullying***	393	1	2	3	4	5

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

34. During the 2015–16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year?

	Does your school allow for use of the following?		If "Yes," was the action used this school year?	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Removal with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year	390 1 ☐	2 ☐	392 1 ☐	2 ☐
b. Removal with school-provided tutoring/at-home instruction for at least the remainder of the school year	394 1 ☐	2 ☐	396 1 ☐	2 ☐
c. Transfer to a **specialized school*** for disciplinary reasons	398 1 ☐	2 ☐	400 1 ☐	2 ☐
d. Transfer to another regular school for disciplinary reasons	402 1 ☐	2 ☐	404 1 ☐	2 ☐
e. Out-of-school suspension or removal for less than the remainder of the school year				
i. With no curriculum/services provided	406 1 ☐	2 ☐	408 1 ☐	2 ☐
ii. With curriculum/services provided	410 1 ☐	2 ☐	412 1 ☐	2 ☐
f. In-school suspension for less than the remainder of the school year				
i. With no curriculum/services provided	414 1 ☐	2 ☐	416 1 ☐	2 ☐
ii. With curriculum/services provided	418 1 ☐	2 ☐	420 1 ☐	2 ☐
g. Referral to a school counselor	422 1 ☐	2 ☐	424 1 ☐	2 ☐
h. Assignment to a program (during school hours) designed to reduce disciplinary problems	426 1 ☐	2 ☐	428 1 ☐	2 ☐
i. Assignment to a program (outside of school hours) designed to reduce disciplinary problems	430 1 ☐	2 ☐	432 1 ☐	2 ☐
j. Loss of school bus privileges due to misbehavior	434 1 ☐	2 ☐	436 1 ☐	2 ☐
k. Corporal punishment	438 1 ☐	2 ☐	440 1 ☐	2 ☐
l. Placement on school probation with consequences if another incident occurs	442 1 ☐	2 ☐	444 1 ☐	2 ☐
m. Detention and/or Saturday school	446 1 ☐	2 ☐	448 1 ☐	2 ☐
n. Loss of student privileges	450 1 ☐	2 ☐	452 1 ☐	2 ☐
o. Requirement of participation in community service	454 1 ☐	2 ☐	456 1 ☐	2 ☐

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

35. During the 2015–16 school year, how many students were involved in committing the following offenses, and how many of the following disciplinary actions were taken in response?

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

Please follow these guidelines when determining the number of offenses and disciplinary actions:

- If more than one student was involved in an incident, please count each student separately when providing the number of disciplinary actions.
- If a student was disciplined more than once, please count each offense separately (e.g., a student who was suspended five times would be counted as five suspensions).
- If a student was disciplined in two different ways for a single infraction (e.g., the student was both suspended and referred to counseling), **count only the most severe disciplinary action that was taken.**
- If a student was disciplined in one way for multiple infractions, record the disciplinary action for only the most serious offense.

		Column number				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Total students involved in recorded offenses (regardless of disciplinary action)	Removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year	Transfers to **specialized schools***	Out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days, but less than the remainder of the school year	Other disciplinary action (e.g., suspension for less than 5 days, detention, etc.)
a.	Use/possession of a **firearm/ explosive device***	458 0 None	460 0 None	462 0 None	464 0 None	466 0 None
b.	Use/possession of a **weapon*** other than a **firearm/ explosive device***	468 0 None	470 0 None	472 0 None	474 0 None	476 0 None
c.	Distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs	478 0 None	480 0 None	482 0 None	484 0 None	486 0 None
d.	Distribution, possession, or use of alcohol	488 0 None	490 0 None	492 0 None	494 0 None	496 0 None
e.	**Physical attacks or fights***	498 0 None	500 0 None	502 0 None	504 0 None	506 0 None

36. During the 2015–16 school year, how many of the following occurred?

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

		Total number
a.	Students were removed from your school without continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for disciplinary reasons. (NOTE: This number should be greater than or equal to the sum of entries in item 35, column 2.)	518 0 None
b.	Students were transferred to **specialized schools*** for disciplinary reasons. (NOTE: This number should be greater than or equal to the sum of entries in item 35, column 3.)	520 0 None

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

School Characteristics: 2015–16 School Year

37. As of October 1, 2015, what was your school's total enrollment?

522 ☐☐☐☐☐ Students

38. What percentage of your current students fit the following criteria?

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

		Percent of students
a.	Eligible for free or reduced-price lunch	524 ☐☐☐ % 0 ☐ None
b.	Limited English Proficient (LEP)	526 ☐☐☐ % 0 ☐ None
c.	**Special education students***	528 ☐☐☐ % 0 ☐ None
d.	Male	530 ☐☐☐ % 0 ☐ None

39. What is your best estimate of the percentage of your current students who meet the following criteria?

- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

		Percent of students
a.	Below the 15th percentile on standardized tests	532 ☐☐☐ % 0 ☐ None
b.	Likely to go to college after high school	534 ☐☐☐ % 0 ☐ None
c.	Consider academic achievement to be very important	536 ☐☐☐ % 0 ☐ None

40. How many classroom changes do most students make in a typical day?

- Count going to lunch and then returning to the same or a different classroom as two classroom changes. Do not count morning arrival or afternoon departure.
- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

538 ☐☐ Typical number of classroom changes

0 ☐ None

*Please use the definition on pages 2 and 3.

41. How would you describe the crime level in the area(s) in which your students live?

- Check one response.

560 1 ☐ High level of crime
2 ☐ Moderate level of crime
3 ☐ Low level of crime
4 ☐ Students come from areas with very different levels of crime

42. How would you describe the crime level in the area where your school is located?

- Check one response.

562 1 ☐ High level of crime
2 ☐ Moderate level of crime
3 ☐ Low level of crime

43. Which of the following best describes your school?

- Check one response.

564 1 ☐ Regular public school
2 ☐ Charter school
3 ☐ Has a magnet program for part of the school
4 ☐ Exclusively a magnet school
5 ☐ Other – *Please specify*

565 ☐

44. What is your school's average daily attendance?

Percent of students present
568 ☐☐☐ %
0 ☐ None

45. During the 2015–16 school year, how many students transferred to or from your school after the start of the school year? Please report on the total mobility, not just transfers due to disciplinary actions. (NOTE: This number should be greater than or equal to the number of students who were transferred for disciplinary reasons, as reported in item 36b.)

- If a student transferred more than once in the school year, count each transfer separately.
- If none, please place an "X" in the None box.

a.	Transferred to the school	570 ☐☐☐☐ 0 ☐ None
b.	Transferred from the school	572 ☐☐☐☐ 0 ☐ None

46. Please provide the following dates:

		Month Day
a. Start date for your 2015–16 school year	574	/ /2015
b. End date for your 2015–16 school year	576	/ /2016
c. Date you completed the questionnaire	578	/ /2016

47. How long did it take you to complete this form, not counting interruptions?

- Please record the time in minutes (e.g., 55 minutes, 65 minutes).

580 Minutes

Please return your completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope or mail it to:
U.S. Census Bureau
Attn: DCB/PCSPU, Building 60A
1201 E 10th Street
Jeffersonville, IN 47132-0001

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey. If you have any questions, please contact us, toll–free, at: 1–888–595–1332 or by e-mail at: addp.education.surveys@census.gov

To learn more about this survey and to access reports from earlier collections, see the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) website at:

http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs

Additional data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) on a variety of topics in elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and international education are available from the NCES website at:

http://nces.ed.gov

For additional data collected by various Federal agencies, including the Department of Education, visit the Federal Statistics clearinghouse at:

http://www.fedstats.sites.usa.gov

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix B: List of Variables and Record Layout of the Fixed-Format ASCII File for the Public-Use Data

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
1	SCHID	Unique school identifier	Num	4	1	4
2	C0014_R	Title/position of respondent (recoded)	Num	2	5	6
3	C0016_R	# of years respondent at the school (topcoded)	Num	2	7	8
4	C0110	School practice require visitor check in and badges	Num	1	9	9
5	C0112	Building access controlled locked/monitored doors	Num	1	10	10
6	C0114	Grounds access controlled locked/monitored gates	Num	1	11	11
7	C0116	Students pass through metal detectors	Num	1	12	12
8	C0120	Have random metal detector checks on students	Num	1	13	13
9	C0121	Equip classrooms with locks so that doors are locked from inside	Num	1	14	14
10	C0122	Practice to close campus for lunch	Num	1	15	15
11	C0124	Practice random dog sniffs for drugs	Num	1	16	16
12	C0126	Random sweeps for contraband not including dog sniffs	Num	1	17	17
13	C0128	Require drug testing for athletes	Num	1	18	18
14	C0130	Require drug testing for students in extra-curricular activities	Num	1	19	19
15	C0134	Require students to wear uniforms	Num	1	20	20
16	C0136	Practice to enforce a strict dress code	Num	1	21	21
17	C0138	Provide school lockers to students	Num	1	22	22
18	C0139	Silent alarms directly connected to law enforcement	Num	1	23	23
19	C0140	Require clear book bags or ban book bags	Num	1	24	24
20	C0141	Provide an electronic notification system that automatically notifies parents in case of a school-wide emergency	Num	1	25	25
21	C0142	Require students to wear badge or photo ID	Num	1	26	26
22	C0143	Provide a structured anonymous threat reporting system	Num	1	27	27
23	C0144	Require faculty/staff to wear badge or photo ID	Num	1	28	28
24	C0146	Security camera(s) monitor the school	Num	1	29	29
25	C0148	Provide telephones in most classrooms	Num	1	30	30
26	C0150	Provide two-way radios to any staff	Num	1	31	31
27	C0151	Limit access to social networking sites	Num	1	32	32
28	C0153	Prohibit use of cell phones and text messaging devices	Num	1	33	33
29	C0155	Written plan for active shooter scenario	Num	1	34	34

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
30	C0157	Written plan for post-crisis reunification of students with their families	Num	1	35	35
31	C0158	Written plan for natural disasters	Num	1	36	36
32	C0162	Written plan for hostages	Num	1	37	37
33	C0166	Written plan for bomb threats	Num	1	38	38
34	C0169	Written plan for suicide threat or incident	Num	1	39	39
35	C0170	Written plan for chemical, biological, or radiological threats	Num	1	40	40
36	C0173	Written plan for pandemic flu	Num	1	41	41
37	C0163	Drilled students on plan for evacuation	Num	1	42	42
38	C0165	Drilled students on plan for lockdown	Num	1	43	43
39	C0167	Drilled students on plan for shelter-in-place	Num	1	44	44
40	C0174	Prevention curriculum/instruction/training	Num	1	45	45
41	C0175	Student involvement in peer mediation	Num	1	46	46
42	C0176	Behavioral modification for students	Num	1	47	47
43	C0177	Student court to address student conduct problems or minor offenses	Num	1	48	48
44	C0178	Student counseling/social work	Num	1	49	49
45	C0179	Student involvement in restorative circles	Num	1	50	50
46	C0180	Individual mentoring/tutoring by students	Num	1	51	51
47	C0181	Individual mentoring/tutoring by adults	Num	1	52	52
48	C0182	Recreation/enrichment student activities	Num	1	53	53
49	C0183	Social emotional learning training for students	Num	1	54	54
50	C0186	Promote sense of community/integration	Num	1	55	55
51	C0600	Have a threat assessment team	Num	1	56	56
52	C0602	Threat assessment team formal meetings	Num	2	57	58
53	C0604	LGBTQ acceptance group	Num	1	59	59
54	C0606	Disability acceptance group	Num	1	60	60
55	C0608	Cultural diversity acceptance group	Num	1	61	61
56	C0190	Formal process to obtain parental input	Num	1	62	62
57	C0192	Provide training/assistance to parents	Num	1	63	63
58	C0194	Program involves parents at school	Num	1	64	64
59	C0196	Parent participates in open house or back to school night	Num	1	65	65
60	C0198	Parent participates in parent-teacher conference	Num	1	66	66
61	C0200	Parent participates in subject-area events	Num	1	67	67
62	C0202	Parent volunteers at school	Num	1	68	68
62	C0204	Community involvement - parent groups	Num	1	69	69
64	C0206	Community involvement - social services	Num	1	70	70
65	C0208	Community involvement - juvenile justice	Num	1	71	71
66	C0210	Community involvement - law enforcement	Num	1	72	72

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
67	C0212	Community involvement - mental health	Num	1	73	73
68	C0214	Community involvement - civic organizations	Num	1	74	74
69	C0216	Community involvement - business	Num	1	75	75
70	C0218	Community involvement - religious organizations	Num	1	76	76
71	C0610	Sworn law enforcement officers at school	Num	1	77	77
72	C0612	Sworn law enforcement officers present during school	Num	2	78	79
73	C0614	Sworn law enforcement officers while students arriving or leaving	Num	2	80	81
74	C0616	Sworn law enforcement officers present at school activities	Num	2	82	83
75	C0618	Sworn law enforcement officers present at other times	Num	2	84	85
76	C0620	Sworn law enforcement officers with stun gun	Num	2	86	87
77	C0622	Sworn law enforcement officers with chemical sprays	Num	2	88	89
78	C0624	Sworn law enforcement officers with firearms	Num	2	90	91
79	C0626	Sworn law enforcement officers wear a body camera	Num	2	92	93
80	C0628	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in traffic control	Num	2	94	95
81	C0630	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in patrol	Num	2	96	97
82	C0632	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in discipline	Num	2	98	99
83	C0634	Sworn law enforcement officers participate with emergency personnel	Num	2	100	101
84	C0636	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in solving school problems	Num	2	102	103
85	C0638	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in prevention training	Num	2	104	105
86	C0640	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in student mentoring	Num	2	106	107
87	C0642	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in teaching law-related courses	Num	2	108	109
88	C0644	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in recording or reporting discipline problems	Num	2	110	111
89	C0646	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in providing legal definitions	Num	2	112	113
90	C0648	Sworn law enforcement officer present for all instructional hours	Num	2	114	115
91	C0650	Formalized policies for sworn law enforcement officers	Num	2	116	117

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
92	C0652	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include student discipline	Num	2	118	119
93	C0654	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include use of restraints	Num	2	120	121
94	C0656	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include use of firearms	Num	2	122	123
95	C0658	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include making arrests	Num	2	124	125
96	C0660	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include reporting of offenses	Num	2	126	127
97	C0662	Diagnostic assessment at school by school-employed mental health professional	Num	1	128	128
98	C0664	Diagnostic assessment at school by school-funded mental health professional	Num	1	129	129
99	C0666	Diagnostic assessment outside of school by school-funded mental health professional	Num	1	130	130
100	C0668	Treatment at school by school-employed mental health professional	Num	1	131	131
101	C0670	Treatment at school by school-funded mental health professional	Num	1	132	132
102	C0672	Treatment outside of school by school-funded mental health professional	Num	1	133	133
103	C0674	Inadequate access to professionals limits mental health efforts	Num	1	134	134
104	C0676	Inadequate funding limits mental health efforts	Num	1	135	135
105	C0678	Potential legal issues limit mental health efforts	Num	1	136	136
106	C0680	Lack of parental support limits mental health efforts	Num	1	137	137
107	C0682	Lack of community support limits mental health efforts	Num	1	138	138
108	C0684	Payment policies limit mental health efforts	Num	1	139	139
109	C0686	Reluctance to label students limits mental health efforts	Num	1	140	140
110	C0265	Teacher training - discipline policies related to cyberbullying	Num	1	141	141
111	C0266	Teacher training - classroom management	Num	1	142	142
112	C0267	Teacher training - discipline policies related to bullying	Num	1	143	143
113	C0268	Teacher training - discipline policies related to violence	Num	1	144	144
114	C0269	Teacher training - alcohol or drug discipline policy	Num	1	145	145
115	C0270	Teacher training - safety procedures	Num	1	146	146
116	C0271	Teacher training - intervention and referral strategies	Num	1	147	147

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
117	C0272	Teacher training - early warning signs for violent behavior	Num	1	148	148
118	C0273	Teacher training - recognize bullying behavior	Num	1	149	149
119	C0274	Teacher training - student alcohol/drug abuse	Num	1	150	150
120	C0276	Teacher training - positive behavioral intervention	Num	1	151	151
121	C0277	Teacher training - crisis prevention and intervention	Num	1	152	152
122	C0280	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of teacher training	Num	1	153	153
123	C0282	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of alternative placement	Num	1	154	154
124	C0284	Efforts limited by parental complaints	Num	1	155	155
125	C0286	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of teacher support	Num	1	156	156
126	C0288	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of parent support	Num	1	157	157
127	C0290	Efforts limited by fear of student retaliation	Num	1	158	158
128	C0292	Efforts limited by fear of litigation	Num	1	159	159
129	C0294	Efforts limited by inadequate funds	Num	1	160	160
130	C0296	Efforts limited by inconsistent application of policies	Num	1	161	161
131	C0298	Efforts limited by fear of district or state reprisal	Num	1	162	162
132	C0300	Efforts limited by fed policies/special ed	Num	1	163	163
133	C0302	Efforts limited by other federal policies-not special ed	Num	1	164	164
134	C0304	Efforts limited by other state/district policies-not special ed	Num	1	165	165
135	C0306	Any school deaths from homicides	Num	1	166	166
136	C0308	School shooting incidents	Num	1	167	167
137	C0688_R	Number of arrests at school	Num	1	168	168
138	C0690_R	Any hate crimes	Num	1	169	169
139	C0374	How often student racial/ethnic tensions	Num	1	170	170
140	C0376	How often student bullying occurs	Num	1	171	171
141	C0378	How often student sexual harassment of students	Num	1	172	172
142	C0380	How often student verbal abuse of teachers	Num	1	173	173
143	C0381	How often student harassment based on sexual orientation	Num	1	174	174

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
144	C0382	How often widespread disorder in classrooms	Num	1	175	175
145	C0383	How often student harassment based on gender identity	Num	1	176	176
146	C0384	How often student acts of disrespect for teachers-not verbal abuse	Num	1	177	177
147	C0386	How often student gang activities	Num	1	178	178
148	C0389	How often cyberbullying among students	Num	1	179	179
149	C0391	How often school environment affected by cyberbullying	Num	1	180	180
150	C0393	How often staff resources used to deal with cyberbullying	Num	1	181	181
151	C0390	Removal with no services available	Num	1	182	182
152	C0392	Removal with no services available - action used	Num	2	183	184
153	C0394	Removal with tutoring/at-home instruction available	Num	1	185	185
154	C0396	Removal with tutoring/at-home instruction available - action used	Num	2	186	187
155	C0398	Transfer to specialized school available	Num	1	188	188
156	C0400	Transfer to specialized school available - action used	Num	2	189	190
157	C0402	Transfer to regular school available	Num	1	191	191
158	C0404	Transfer to regular school available - action used	Num	2	192	193
159	C0406	Outside suspension/no services available	Num	1	194	194
160	C0408	Outside suspension/no services available - action used	Num	2	195	196
161	C0410	Outside suspension with services available	Num	1	197	197
162	C0412	Outside suspension with services available - action used	Num	2	198	199
163	C0414	In-school suspension/no services available	Num	1	200	200
164	C0416	In-school suspension/no services available - action used	Num	2	201	202
165	C0418	In-school suspension with services available	Num	1	203	203
166	C0420	In-school suspension with services available - action used	Num	2	204	205
167	C0422	Referral to school counselor available	Num	1	206	206
168	C0424	Referral to school counselor available - action used	Num	2	207	208
169	C0426	In-school disciplinary plan available	Num	1	209	209

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
170	C0428	In-school disciplinary plan available - action used	Num	2	210	211
171	C0430	Outside school disciplinary plan available	Num	1	212	212
172	C0432	Outside school disciplinary plan available - action used	Num	2	213	214
173	C0434	Loss of bus privileges for misbehavior available	Num	1	215	215
174	C0436	Loss of bus privileges for misbehavior available - action used	Num	2	216	217
175	C0438	Corporal punishment available	Num	1	218	218
176	C0440	Corporal punishment available - action used	Num	2	219	220
177	C0442	School probation available	Num	1	221	221
178	C0444	School probation available - action used	Num	2	222	223
179	C0446	Detention/Saturday school available	Num	1	224	224
180	C0448	Detention/Saturday school available - action used	Num	2	225	226
181	C0450	Loss of student privileges available	Num	1	227	227
182	C0452	Loss of student privileges available - action used	Num	2	228	229
183	C0454	Require community service available	Num	1	230	230
184	C0456	Require community service available - action used	Num	2	231	232
185	C0518	# of removals with no service - total	Num	2	233	234
186	C0520	# of transfers to specialized schools - total	Num	3	235	237
187	C0526	Percent students limited English proficient	Num	3	238	240
188	C0528	Percent special education students	Num	2	241	242
189	C0532	Percent students below 15th percentile standardized tests	Num	3	243	245
190	C0534	Percent students likely to go to college	Num	3	246	248
191	C0536	Percent students academic achievement important	Num	3	249	251
192	C0538	Typical number of classroom changes	Num	2	252	253
193	C0560	Crime where students live	Num	1	254	254
194	C0562	Crime where school located	Num	1	255	255
195	C0568	Average percent daily attendance	Num	3	256	258
196	C0570	# of students transferred to school	Num	4	259	262
197	C0572	# of students transferred from school	Num	3	263	265
198	C0578	Date questionnaire completed MMDDYYYY	Char	8	266	273
199	C0578_DD	Day questionnaire completed	Num	2	274	275
200	C0578_MM	Month questionnaire completed	Num	2	276	277
201	C0578_YY	Year questionnaire completed	Num	4	278	281
202	C0580	Number of minutes to complete questionnaire	Num	3	282	284

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
203	CRISIS16	# of types of crises covered in written plans	Num	1	285	285
204	DISTOT16	Total number of disciplinary actions recorded	Num	4	286	289
205	INCID16	Total number of incidents recorded	Num	3	290	292
206	INCPOL16	Total number of incidents reported to police	Num	3	293	295
207	OTHACT16	Total 'other actions' for specified offenses	Num	3	296	298
208	OUTSUS16	Total out-of-school suspensions > 5 days but < the remainder of school for specified offenses	Num	3	299	301
209	PROBWK16	# of types of problems that occur at least once a week	Num	1	302	302
210	REMOVL16	Total removals with no continuing school services for specified offenses	Num	2	303	304
211	STRATA	Collapsed STRATUM code	Num	3	305	307
212	STUOFF16	Total students involved in specified offenses	Num	3	308	310
213	SVINC16	Total number of serious violent incidents recorded	Num	2	311	312
214	SVPOL16	Total number of serious violent incidents reported to police	Num	2	313	314
215	TRANSF16	Total transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses	Num	3	315	317
216	VIOINC16	Total number of violent incidents recorded	Num	3	318	320
217	VIOPOL16	Total number of violent incidents reported to police	Num	3	321	323
218	DISFIRE16	Total # of disciplinary actions for firearm use/possession	Num	2	324	325
219	DISDRUG16	Total # of disciplinary actions for distribution/possession/use-illegal drugs	Num	3	326	328
220	DISWEAP16	Total # of disciplinary actions for weapon use	Num	2	329	330
221	DISRUPT	Total number of disruptions	Num	2	331	332
222	DISATT16	Total # of disciplinary actions for attacks/fights	Num	4	333	336
223	DISALC16	Total # of disciplinary actions for distribution/possession/use-alcohol	Num	2	337	338
224	SEC_FT16	Total # of full-time security guards, SROs, or sworn law enforcement officers	Num	2	339	340
225	SEC_PT16	Total # of part-time security guards, SROs, or sworn law enforcement officers	Num	2	341	342
226	FR_URBAN	Urbanicity - Based on Urban-centric location of school	Num	1	343	343
227	FR_LVEL	Grade Level of school	Char	1	344	344

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
228	FR_SIZE	Size of school	Num	1	345	345
229	PERCWHT	Percent non-Hispanic White enrollment-categorical	Char	1	346	346
230	FINALWGT	Final weight for the sample	Num	16	347	362
231	REPFWT1	Jackknife replicate 1	Num	16	363	378
232	REPFWT2	Jackknife replicate 2	Num	16	379	394
233	REPFWT3	Jackknife replicate 3	Num	16	395	410
234	REPFWT4	Jackknife replicate 4	Num	16	411	426
235	REPFWT5	Jackknife replicate 5	Num	16	427	442
236	REPFWT6	Jackknife replicate 6	Num	16	443	458
237	REPFWT7	Jackknife replicate 7	Num	16	459	474
238	REPFWT8	Jackknife replicate 8	Num	16	475	490
239	REPFWT9	Jackknife replicate 9	Num	16	491	506
240	REPFWT10	Jackknife replicate 10	Num	16	507	522
241	REPFWT11	Jackknife replicate 11	Num	16	523	538
242	REPFWT12	Jackknife replicate 12	Num	16	539	554
243	REPFWT13	Jackknife replicate 13	Num	16	555	570
244	REPFWT14	Jackknife replicate 14	Num	16	571	586
245	REPFWT15	Jackknife replicate 15	Num	16	587	602
246	REPFWT16	Jackknife replicate 16	Num	16	603	618
247	REPFWT17	Jackknife replicate 17	Num	16	619	634
248	REPFWT18	Jackknife replicate 18	Num	16	635	650
249	REPFWT19	Jackknife replicate 19	Num	16	651	666
250	REPFWT20	Jackknife replicate 20	Num	16	667	682
251	REPFWT21	Jackknife replicate 21	Num	16	683	698
252	REPFWT22	Jackknife replicate 22	Num	16	699	714
253	REPFWT23	Jackknife replicate 23	Num	16	715	730
254	REPFWT24	Jackknife replicate 24	Num	16	731	746
255	REPFWT25	Jackknife replicate 25	Num	16	747	762
256	REPFWT26	Jackknife replicate 26	Num	16	763	778
257	REPFWT27	Jackknife replicate 27	Num	16	779	794
258	REPFWT28	Jackknife replicate 28	Num	16	795	810
259	REPFWT29	Jackknife replicate 29	Num	16	811	826
260	REPFWT30	Jackknife replicate 30	Num	16	827	842
261	REPFWT31	Jackknife replicate 31	Num	16	843	858
262	REPFWT32	Jackknife replicate 32	Num	16	859	874
263	REPFWT33	Jackknife replicate 33	Num	16	875	890
264	REPFWT34	Jackknife replicate 34	Num	16	891	906
265	REPFWT35	Jackknife replicate 35	Num	16	907	922
266	REPFWT36	Jackknife replicate 36	Num	16	923	938
267	REPFWT37	Jackknife replicate 37	Num	16	939	954

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
268	REPFWT38	Jackknife replicate 38	Num	16	955	970
269	REPFWT39	Jackknife replicate 39	Num	16	971	986
270	REPFWT40	Jackknife replicate 40	Num	16	987	1002
271	REPFWT41	Jackknife replicate 41	Num	16	1003	1018
272	REPFWT42	Jackknife replicate 42	Num	16	1019	1034
273	REPFWT43	Jackknife replicate 43	Num	16	1035	1050
274	REPFWT44	Jackknife replicate 44	Num	16	1051	1066
275	REPFWT45	Jackknife replicate 45	Num	16	1067	1082
276	REPFWT46	Jackknife replicate 46	Num	16	1083	1098
277	REPFWT47	Jackknife replicate 47	Num	16	1099	1114
278	REPFWT48	Jackknife replicate 48	Num	16	1115	1130
279	REPFWT49	Jackknife replicate 49	Num	16	1131	1146
280	REPFWT50	Jackknife replicate 50	Num	16	1147	1162
281	IC0110	Imputation Flag for C0110	Num	1	1163	1163
282	IC0112	Imputation Flag for C0112	Num	1	1164	1164
283	IC0114	Imputation Flag for C0114	Num	1	1165	1165
284	IC0116	Imputation Flag for C0116	Num	1	1166	1166
285	IC0120	Imputation Flag for C0120	Num	1	1167	1167
286	IC0121	Imputation Flag for C0121	Num	1	1168	1168
287	IC0122	Imputation Flag for C0122	Num	1	1169	1169
288	IC0124	Imputation Flag for C0124	Num	1	1170	1170
289	IC0126	Imputation Flag for C0126	Num	1	1171	1171
290	IC0128	Imputation Flag for C0128	Num	1	1172	1172
291	IC0130	Imputation Flag for C0130	Num	1	1173	1173
292	IC0134	Imputation Flag for C0134	Num	1	1174	1174
293	IC0136	Imputation Flag for C0136	Num	1	1175	1175
294	IC0138	Imputation Flag for C0138	Num	1	1176	1176
295	IC0139	Imputation Flag for C0139	Num	1	1177	1177
296	IC0140	Imputation Flag for C0140	Num	1	1178	1178
297	IC0141	Imputation Flag for C0141	Num	1	1179	1179
298	IC0142	Imputation Flag for C0142	Num	1	1180	1180
299	IC0143	Imputation Flag for C0143	Num	1	1181	1181
300	IC0144	Imputation Flag for C0144	Num	1	1182	1182
301	IC0146	Imputation Flag for C0146	Num	1	1183	1183
302	IC0148	Imputation Flag for C0148	Num	1	1184	1184
303	IC0150	Imputation Flag for C0150	Num	1	1185	1185
304	IC0151	Imputation Flag for C0151	Num	1	1186	1186
305	IC0153	Imputation Flag for C0153	Num	1	1187	1187
306	IC0155	Imputation Flag for C0155	Num	1	1188	1188
307	IC0157	Imputation Flag for C0157	Num	1	1189	1189
308	IC0158	Imputation Flag for C0158	Num	1	1190	1190

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
309	IC0162	Imputation Flag for C0162	Num	1	1191	1191
310	IC0166	Imputation Flag for C0166	Num	1	1192	1192
311	IC0169	Imputation Flag for C0169	Num	1	1193	1193
312	IC0170	Imputation Flag for C0170	Num	1	1194	1194
313	IC0173	Imputation Flag for C0173	Num	1	1195	1195
314	IC0163	Imputation Flag for C0163	Num	1	1196	1196
315	IC0165	Imputation Flag for C0165	Num	1	1197	1197
316	IC0167	Imputation Flag for C0167	Num	1	1198	1198
317	IC0174	Imputation Flag for C0174	Num	1	1199	1199
318	IC0175	Imputation Flag for C0175	Num	1	1200	1200
319	IC0176	Imputation Flag for C0176	Num	1	1201	1201
320	IC0177	Imputation Flag for C0177	Num	1	1202	1202
321	IC0178	Imputation Flag for C0178	Num	1	1203	1203
322	IC0179	Imputation Flag for C0179	Num	1	1204	1204
323	IC0180	Imputation Flag for C0180	Num	1	1205	1205
324	IC0181	Imputation Flag for C0181	Num	1	1206	1206
325	IC0182	Imputation Flag for C0182	Num	1	1207	1207
326	IC0183	Imputation Flag for C0183	Num	1	1208	1208
327	IC0186	Imputation Flag for C0186	Num	1	1209	1209
328	IC0600	Imputation Flag for C0600	Num	1	1210	1210
329	IC0602	Imputation Flag for C0602	Num	1	1211	1211
330	IC0604	Imputation Flag for C0604	Num	1	1212	1212
331	IC0606	Imputation Flag for C0606	Num	1	1213	1213
332	IC0608	Imputation Flag for C0608	Num	1	1214	1214
333	IC0190	Imputation Flag for C0190	Num	1	1215	1215
334	IC0192	Imputation Flag for C0192	Num	1	1216	1216
335	IC0194	Imputation Flag for C0194	Num	1	1217	1217
336	IC0196	Imputation Flag for C0196	Num	1	1218	1218
337	IC0198	Imputation Flag for C0198	Num	1	1219	1219
338	IC0200	Imputation Flag for C0200	Num	1	1220	1220
339	IC0202	Imputation Flag for C0202	Num	1	1221	1221
340	IC0204	Imputation Flag for C0204	Num	1	1222	1222
341	IC0206	Imputation Flag for C0206	Num	1	1223	1223
342	IC0208	Imputation Flag for C0208	Num	1	1224	1224
343	IC0210	Imputation Flag for C0210	Num	1	1225	1225
344	IC0212	Imputation Flag for C0212	Num	1	1226	1226
345	IC0214	Imputation Flag for C0214	Num	1	1227	1227
346	IC0216	Imputation Flag for C0216	Num	1	1228	1228
347	IC0218	Imputation Flag for C0218	Num	1	1229	1229
348	IC0610	Imputation Flag for C0610	Num	1	1230	1230
349	IC0612	Imputation Flag for C0612	Num	1	1231	1231
350	IC0614	Imputation Flag for C0614	Num	1	1232	1232

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
351	IC0616	Imputation Flag for C0616	Num	1	1233	1233
352	IC0618	Imputation Flag for C0618	Num	1	1234	1234
353	IC0620	Imputation Flag for C0620	Num	1	1235	1235
354	IC0622	Imputation Flag for C0622	Num	1	1236	1236
355	IC0624	Imputation Flag for C0624	Num	1	1237	1237
356	IC0626	Imputation Flag for C0626	Num	1	1238	1238
357	IC0628	Imputation Flag for C0628	Num	1	1239	1239
358	IC0630	Imputation Flag for C0630	Num	1	1240	1240
359	IC0632	Imputation Flag for C0632	Num	1	1241	1241
360	IC0634	Imputation Flag for C0634	Num	1	1242	1242
361	IC0636	Imputation Flag for C0636	Num	1	1243	1243
362	IC0638	Imputation Flag for C0638	Num	1	1244	1244
363	IC0640	Imputation Flag for C0640	Num	1	1245	1245
364	IC0642	Imputation Flag for C0642	Num	1	1246	1246
365	IC0644	Imputation Flag for C0644	Num	1	1247	1247
366	IC0646	Imputation Flag for C0646	Num	1	1248	1248
367	IC0648	Imputation Flag for C0648	Num	1	1249	1249
368	IC0650	Imputation Flag for C0650	Num	1	1250	1250
369	IC0652	Imputation Flag for C0652	Num	1	1251	1251
370	IC0654	Imputation Flag for C0654	Num	1	1252	1252
371	IC0656	Imputation Flag for C0656	Num	1	1253	1253
372	IC0658	Imputation Flag for C0658	Num	1	1254	1254
373	IC0660	Imputation Flag for C0660	Num	1	1255	1255
374	IC0662	Imputation Flag for C0662	Num	1	1256	1256
375	IC0664	Imputation Flag for C0664	Num	1	1257	1257
376	IC0666	Imputation Flag for C0666	Num	1	1258	1258
377	IC0668	Imputation Flag for C0668	Num	1	1259	1259
378	IC0670	Imputation Flag for C0670	Num	1	1260	1260
379	IC0672	Imputation Flag for C0672	Num	1	1261	1261
380	IC0674	Imputation Flag for C0674	Num	1	1262	1262
381	IC0676	Imputation Flag for C0676	Num	1	1263	1263
382	IC0678	Imputation Flag for C0678	Num	1	1264	1264
383	IC0680	Imputation Flag for C0680	Num	1	1265	1265
384	IC0682	Imputation Flag for C0682	Num	1	1266	1266
385	IC0684	Imputation Flag for C0684	Num	1	1267	1267
386	IC0686	Imputation Flag for C0686	Num	1	1268	1268
387	IC0265	Imputation Flag for C0265	Num	1	1269	1269
388	IC0266	Imputation Flag for C0266	Num	1	1270	1270
389	IC0267	Imputation Flag for C0267	Num	1	1271	1271
390	IC0268	Imputation Flag for C0268	Num	1	1272	1272
391	IC0269	Imputation Flag for C0269	Num	1	1273	1273
392	IC0270	Imputation Flag for C0270	Num	1	1274	1274

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
393	IC0271	Imputation Flag for C0271	Num	1	1275	1275
394	IC0272	Imputation Flag for C0272	Num	1	1276	1276
395	IC0273	Imputation Flag for C0273	Num	1	1277	1277
396	IC0274	Imputation Flag for C0274	Num	1	1278	1278
397	IC0276	Imputation Flag for C0276	Num	1	1279	1279
398	IC0277	Imputation Flag for C0277	Num	1	1280	1280
399	IC0280	Imputation Flag for C0280	Num	1	1281	1281
400	IC0282	Imputation Flag for C0282	Num	1	1282	1282
401	IC0284	Imputation Flag for C0284	Num	1	1283	1283
402	IC0286	Imputation Flag for C0286	Num	1	1284	1284
403	IC0288	Imputation Flag for C0288	Num	1	1285	1285
404	IC0290	Imputation Flag for C0290	Num	1	1286	1286
405	IC0292	Imputation Flag for C0292	Num	1	1287	1287
406	IC0294	Imputation Flag for C0294	Num	1	1288	1288
407	IC0296	Imputation Flag for C0296	Num	1	1289	1289
408	IC0298	Imputation Flag for C0298	Num	1	1290	1290
409	IC0300	Imputation Flag for C0300	Num	1	1291	1291
410	IC0302	Imputation Flag for C0302	Num	1	1292	1292
411	IC0304	Imputation Flag for C0304	Num	1	1293	1293
412	IC0306	Imputation Flag for C0306	Num	1	1294	1294
413	IC0308	Imputation Flag for C0308	Num	1	1295	1295
414	IC0688	Imputation Flag for C0688	Num	1	1296	1296
415	IC0690	Imputation Flag for C0690	Num	1	1297	1297
416	IC0374	Imputation Flag for C0374	Num	1	1298	1298
417	IC0376	Imputation Flag for C0376	Num	1	1299	1299
418	IC0378	Imputation Flag for C0378	Num	1	1300	1300
419	IC0380	Imputation Flag for C0380	Num	1	1301	1301
420	IC0381	Imputation Flag for C0381	Num	1	1302	1302
421	IC0382	Imputation Flag for C0382	Num	1	1303	1303
422	IC0383	Imputation Flag for C0383	Num	1	1304	1304
423	IC0384	Imputation Flag for C0384	Num	1	1305	1305
424	IC0386	Imputation Flag for C0386	Num	1	1306	1306
425	IC0389	Imputation Flag for C0389	Num	1	1307	1307
426	IC0391	Imputation Flag for C0391	Num	1	1308	1308
427	IC0393	Imputation Flag for C0393	Num	1	1309	1309
428	IC0390	Imputation Flag for C0390	Num	1	1310	1310
429	IC0392	Imputation Flag for C0392	Num	1	1311	1311
430	IC0394	Imputation Flag for C0394	Num	1	1312	1312
431	IC0396	Imputation Flag for C0396	Num	1	1313	1313
432	IC0398	Imputation Flag for C0398	Num	1	1314	1314
433	IC0400	Imputation Flag for C0400	Num	1	1315	1315
434	IC0402	Imputation Flag for C0402	Num	1	1316	1316

See notes at end of table.

Table B-1. Variable list, SSOCS:2016—Continued

Order	Variable	Label	Format	Length	Start column	End column
435	IC0404	Imputation Flag for C0404	Num	1	1317	1317
436	IC0406	Imputation Flag for C0406	Num	1	1318	1318
437	IC0408	Imputation Flag for C0408	Num	1	1319	1319
438	IC0410	Imputation Flag for C0410	Num	1	1320	1320
439	IC0412	Imputation Flag for C0412	Num	1	1321	1321
440	IC0414	Imputation Flag for C0414	Num	1	1322	1322
441	IC0416	Imputation Flag for C0416	Num	1	1323	1323
442	IC0418	Imputation Flag for C0418	Num	1	1324	1324
443	IC0420	Imputation Flag for C0420	Num	1	1325	1325
444	IC0422	Imputation Flag for C0422	Num	1	1326	1326
445	IC0424	Imputation Flag for C0424	Num	1	1327	1327
446	IC0426	Imputation Flag for C0426	Num	1	1328	1328
447	IC0428	Imputation Flag for C0428	Num	1	1329	1329
448	IC0430	Imputation Flag for C0430	Num	1	1330	1330
449	IC0432	Imputation Flag for C0432	Num	1	1331	1331
450	IC0434	Imputation Flag for C0434	Num	1	1332	1332
451	IC0436	Imputation Flag for C0436	Num	1	1333	1333
452	IC0438	Imputation Flag for C0438	Num	1	1334	1334
453	IC0440	Imputation Flag for C0440	Num	1	1335	1335
454	IC0442	Imputation Flag for C0442	Num	1	1336	1336
455	IC0444	Imputation Flag for C0444	Num	1	1337	1337
456	IC0446	Imputation Flag for C0446	Num	1	1338	1338
457	IC0448	Imputation Flag for C0448	Num	1	1339	1339
458	IC0450	Imputation Flag for C0450	Num	1	1340	1340
459	IC0452	Imputation Flag for C0452	Num	1	1341	1341
460	IC0454	Imputation Flag for C0454	Num	1	1342	1342
461	IC0456	Imputation Flag for C0456	Num	1	1343	1343
462	IC0518	Imputation Flag for C0518	Num	1	1344	1344
463	IC0520	Imputation Flag for C0520	Num	1	1345	1345
464	IC0526	Imputation Flag for C0526	Num	1	1346	1346
465	IC0528	Imputation Flag for C0528	Num	1	1347	1347
466	IC0532	Imputation Flag for C0532	Num	1	1348	1348
467	IC0534	Imputation Flag for C0534	Num	1	1349	1349
468	IC0536	Imputation Flag for C0536	Num	1	1350	1350
469	IC0538	Imputation Flag for C0538	Num	1	1351	1351
470	IC0560	Imputation Flag for C0560	Num	1	1352	1352
471	IC0562	Imputation Flag for C0562	Num	1	1353	1353
472	IC0568	Imputation Flag for C0568	Num	1	1354	1354
473	IC0570	Imputation Flag for C0570	Num	1	1355	1355
474	IC0572	Imputation Flag for C0572	Num	1	1356	1356
475	IC0578	Imputation Flag for C0578	Num	1	1357	1357
476	IC0580	Imputation Flag for C0580	Num	1	1358	1358

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016
NOTE: Many of the sub-item variables in the ASCII layout/data file are not in the order that they appear in the questionnaire as they are grouped/sorted by variable ID.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix C: List of Variables in the Restricted-Use Data File and Not in the Public-Use Data File

Table C-1. SSOCS:2016 variables in the restricted-use file that were omitted from the public-use file

Variable type and name	Variable label
Frame variables from CCD 2014-15	
FR_ASN	Asian/Pacific Islander students
FR_BLK	Black, non-Hispanic students
FR_CCDID	Unique School ID
FR_CHRT	Charter School Indicator
FR_ETHN	Total Ethnic
FR_FIPST	ANSI State Code
FR_HIGD	School High Grade Offered
FR_HISP	Hispanic students
FR_INDN	Am Indian/Alaska Native students
FR_LEAID	NCES Agency Identification Number
FR_LOC12	NCES urban-centric locale code
FR_LOGD	School Low Grade offered
FR_MEM	Total number of students in district
FR_NOST	Total number of students in school
FR_PERWT	Percent white, non-Hispanic students
FR_SCH	Number of schools in district
FR_WHIT	White, non-Hispanic students
CENREGN	Census Region Code
FR_PAC	Hawaiian Native/Pacific Islander students
FR_TR	Students of two or more races
FR_STCNTY	ANSI County Code
Questionnaire Variables	
C0014	Title/position of respondent
C0015_R	Coded title/position of respondent
C0016	# of years respondent at the school
C0232	# of full-time security guards
C0234	# of part-time security guards
C0236	# of full-time School Resource Officers
C0238	# of part-time School Resource Officers
C0240	# of full-time sworn law enforcement officers-not SROs
C0242	# of part-time sworn law enforcement officers-not SROs
C0310	# of rapes/attempted rapes - total
C0312	# of rapes reported to police
C0314	# of sexual assaults other than rape - total
C0316	# of sexual assaults other than rape reported to police
C0318	# of robberies with weapon - total
C0320	# of robberies with weapon reported to police
C0322	# of robberies without weapon - total
C0324	# of robberies without weapon reported to police
C0326	# of attacks with weapon - total

Table C-1. SSOCS:2016 variables in the restricted-use file that were omitted from the public-use file—Continued

Variable type and name	Variable label
C0328	# of attacks with weapon reported to police
C0330	# of attacks without weapon - total
C0332	# of attacks without weapon reported to police
C0334	# of threats of attack with weapon - total
C0336	# of threats of attack with weapon reported to police
C0338	# of threats of attack without weapon - total
C0340	# of threats of attack without weapon reported to police
C0342	# of incidents theft/larceny - total
C0344	# of incidents theft/larceny reported to police
C0346	# of possession of firearms - total
C0348	# of possession of firearms reported to police
C0350	# of possession knife/sharp object - total
C0352	# of possession knife/sharp object reported to police
C0354	# of distribution, possession, or use of drugs - total
C0355	# of distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs - total
C0356	# of distribution, possession, or use of drugs reported to police
C0357	# of distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs reported to police
C0358	# of distribution, possession, or use of alcohol - total
C0360	# of distribution, possession, or use of alcohol reported to police
C0362	# of incidents of vandalism - total
C0364	# of incidents of vandalism reported to police
C0370	# of times school disrupted due to unplanned fire alarms
C0372	# of times school disrupted (e.g., bomb, chemical, radiological, death threats)
C0458	# students involved in use/possession firearm/explosive device - total
C0460	# of removals for firearm use/possession
C0462	# of transfers for firearm use/possession
C0464	# of suspensions for firearm use/possession
C0466	# of other actions for firearm use/possession
C0468	# of students involved in use/possession weapon (other than firearm/explosive device) - total
C0470	# of removals for weapon use
C0472	# of transfers for weapon use
C0474	# of suspensions for weapon use
C0476	# of other actions for weapon use
C0478	# students involved in distribution/possession/use illegal drugs - total
C0480	# of removals for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs
C0482	# of transfers for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs
C0484	# of suspensions for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs
C0486	# of other actions for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs
C0488	# of students involved in distribution/possession/use alcohol - total
C0490	# of removals for distribution/possession/use - alcohol
C0492	# of transfers for distribution/possession/use - alcohol
C0494	# of suspensions for distribution/possession/use - alcohol

Table C-1. SSOCS:2016 variables in the restricted-use file that were omitted from the public-use file—Continued

Variable type and name	Variable label
C0496	# of other actions for distribution/possession/use - alcohol
C0498	# students involved in attacks/fights - total
C0500	# of removals for attacks/fights
C0502	# of transfers for attacks/fights
C0504	# of suspensions for attacks/fights
C0506	# of other actions for attacks/fights
C0522	Total students
C0524	Percent eligible for free or reduced-price lunch
C0530	Percent male
C0564	School type
C0565_ORIGINAL	Verbatim responses-school type
C0574	Start date for 2015-2016 school year MMDDYYYY
C0574_DD	Start day for 2015-2016 school year
C0574_MM	Start month for 2015-2016 school year
C0574_YY	Start year for 2015-2016 school year
C0576	End date for 2015-2016 school year MMDDYYYY
C0576_DD	End day for 2015-2016 school year
C0576_MM	End month for 2015-2016 school year
C0576_YY	End year for 2015-2016 school year
C0522CAT	Enrollment Size (categorical)
C0524CAT	Percentage of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch (categorical)
C0530CAT	Percentage male enrollment (categorical)
C0690	Number of hate crimes
C0692	Hate crimes motivated by bias against race or color
C0694	Hate crimes motivated by bias against national origin or ethnicity
C0696	Hate crimes motivated by bias against gender
C0698	Hate crimes motivated by bias against religion
C0700	Hate crimes motivated by bias against disability
C0702	Hate crimes motivated by bias against sexual orientation
C0704	Hate crimes motivated by bias against gender identity
C0688	Number of arrests at school
Composite variables	
FTE	Classroom Teachers
FTE16CAT	Teacher (staff) full-time equivalency (categorical)
STPFTE16	Students per teaching staff full-time-equivalency
STRCAT	Student/teaching staff ratio (categorical)
Imputation flags	
IC0232	Imputation flag for C0232
IC0234	Imputation flag for C0234
IC0236	Imputation flag for C0236

Table C-1. SSOCS:2016 variables in the restricted-use file that were omitted from the public-use file—Continued

Variable type and name	Variable label
IC0238	Imputation flag for C0238
IC0240	Imputation flag for C0240
IC0242	Imputation flag for C0242
IC0310	Imputation flag for C0310
IC0312	Imputation flag for C0312
IC0314	Imputation flag for C0314
IC0316	Imputation flag for C0316
IC0318	Imputation flag for C0318
IC0320	Imputation flag for C0320
IC0322	Imputation flag for C0322
IC0324	Imputation flag for C0324
IC0326	Imputation flag for C0326
IC0328	Imputation flag for C0328
IC0330	Imputation flag for C0330
IC0332	Imputation flag for C0332
IC0334	Imputation flag for C0334
IC0336	Imputation flag for C0336
IC0338	Imputation flag for C0338
IC0340	Imputation flag for C0340
IC0342	Imputation flag for C0342
IC0344	Imputation flag for C0344
IC0346	Imputation flag for C0346
IC0348	Imputation flag for C0348
IC0350	Imputation flag for C0350
IC0352	Imputation flag for C0352
IC0354	Imputation flag for C0354
IC0355	Imputation flag for C0355
IC0356	Imputation flag for C0356
IC0357	Imputation flag for C0357
IC0358	Imputation flag for C0358
IC0360	Imputation flag for C0360
IC0362	Imputation flag for C0362
IC0364	Imputation flag for C0364
IC0370	Imputation flag for C0370
IC0372	Imputation flag for C0372
IC0458	Imputation flag for C0458
IC0460	Imputation flag for C0460
IC0462	Imputation flag for C0462
IC0464	Imputation flag for C0464
IC0466	Imputation flag for C0466
IC0468	Imputation flag for C0468

Table C-1. SSOCS:2016 variables in the restricted-use file that were omitted from the public-use file—Continued

Variable type and name	Variable label
IC0470	Imputation flag for C0470
IC0472	Imputation flag for C0472
IC0474	Imputation flag for C0474
IC0476	Imputation flag for C0476
IC0478	Imputation flag for C0478
IC0480	Imputation flag for C0480
IC0482	Imputation flag for C0482
IC0484	Imputation flag for C0484
IC0486	Imputation flag for C0486
IC0488	Imputation flag for C0488
IC0490	Imputation flag for C0490
IC0492	Imputation flag for C0492
IC0494	Imputation flag for C0494
IC0496	Imputation flag for C0496
IC0498	Imputation flag for C0498
IC0500	Imputation flag for C0500
IC0502	Imputation flag for C0502
IC0504	Imputation flag for C0504
IC0506	Imputation flag for C0506
IC0522	Imputation flag for C0522
IC0524	Imputation flag for C0524
IC0530	Imputation flag for C0530
IC0564	Imputation flag for C0564
IC0565	Imputation flag for C0565
IC0574	Imputation flag for C0574
IC0576	Imputation flag for C0576
IC0688	Imputation flag for C0688
IC0690	Imputation flag for C0690
IC0692	Imputation flag for C0692
IC0694	Imputation flag for C0694
IC0696	Imputation flag for C0696
IC0698	Imputation flag for C0698
IC0700	Imputation flag for C0700
IC0702	Imputation flag for C0702
IC0704	Imputation flag for C0704

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2016).

Appendix D: 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety Public-Use Codebook

The 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety public-use codebook was designed to accompany this user's manual to give the analyst a brief overview of the survey variables, composite variables, CCD variables, imputation flags, final weight, and replicate weights. For all categorical variables, unweighted and weighted frequencies and their associated percentages are provided. Descriptive statistics, including minimum value, maximum value, mean, standard deviation, and median, are provided for continuous variables.

SSOCS 2016 Codebook

Variable Name: **SCHID** **Unique school identifier**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent

Please provide the following information: Title/Position

Variable Name: **C0014_R** **Title/position of respondent (recoded)**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-2	Missing	23	1.1
1	Principal	1619	77.4
2	Vice principal or disciplinarian	351	16.8
3	Security staff	20	1.0
4	Other school-level staff	72	3.4
5	Superintendent or district staff	7	0.3
		2092	100.0

Please provide the following information: Number of years at this school

Variable Name: C0016_R **# of years respondent at the school (topcoded)**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-2	-2	37	1.8
0	0	5	0.2
1	1	287	13.7
2	2	248	11.9
3	3	255	12.2
4	4	163	7.8
5	5	152	7.3
6	6	103	4.9
7	7	98	4.7
8	8	100	4.8
9	9	85	4.1
10	10	82	3.9
11	11	65	3.1
12	12	53	2.5
13	13	46	2.2
14	14	39	1.9
15	15	39	1.9
16	16	36	1.7
17	17	27	1.3
18	18	22	1.1
19	19	14	0.7
20	20	27	1.3

21	21	18	0.9
22	22	13	0.6
23	23	6	0.3
24	24	4	0.2
25	25	13	0.6
26	26	12	0.6
27	27	1	0.0
28	28	6	0.3
29	29	1	0.0
30	30	5	0.2
31	More than 30	30	1.4
		2092	100.0

1a. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require visitors to sign or check in and wear badges

Variable Name: C0110 **School practice require visitor check in and badges**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1996	95.4
2	No	96	4.6
		2092	100.0

1b. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Control access to school buildings during school hours (e.g., locked or monitored doors)

Variable Name: C0112 **Building access controlled locked/monitored doors**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1942	92.8
2	No	150	7.2
		2092	100.0

1c. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Control access to school grounds during school hours (e.g., locked or monitored gates)

Variable Name: C0114 **Grounds access controlled locked/monitored gates**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1025	49.0
2	No	1067	51.0
		2092	100.0

1d. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require metal detector checks on students every day

Variable Name: C0116 **Students pass through metal detectors**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	57	2.7
2	No	2035	97.3
		2092	100.0

1e. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Perform one or more random metal detector checks on students

Variable Name: C0120 **Have random metal detector checks on students**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	154	7.4
2	No	1938	92.6
		2092	100.0

1f. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Equip classrooms with locks so that doors can be locked from the inside

Variable Name: C0121 **Equip classrooms with locks so that doors are locked from inside**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1381	66.0
2	No	711	34.0
		2092	100.0

1g. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Close the campus for most or all students during lunch

Variable Name: C0122 **Practice to close campus for lunch**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1509	72.1
2	No	583	27.9
		2092	100.0

1h. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Use one or more random dog sniffs to check for drugs

Variable Name: C0124 **Practice random dog sniffs for drugs**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	877	41.9
2	No	1215	58.1
		2092	100.0

1i. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Perform one or more random sweeps for contraband (e.g., drugs or weapons*), but not including dog sniffs

Variable Name: C0126 **Random sweeps for contraband not including dog sniffs**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	392	18.7
2	No	1700	81.3
		2092	100.0

1j. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require drug testing for athletes

Variable Name: C0128 **Require drug testing for athletes**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	239	11.4
2	No	1853	88.6
		2092	100.0

1k. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require drug testing for students in extra-curricular activities other than athletics

Variable Name: C0130 **Require drug testing for students in extra-curricular activities**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	187	8.9
2	No	1905	91.1
		2092	100.0

1l. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require students to wear uniforms

Variable Name: C0134 **Require students to wear uniforms**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	356	17.0
2	No	1736	83.0
		2092	100.0

1m. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Enforce a strict dress code

Variable Name: C0136 **Practice to enforce a strict dress code**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1215	58.1
2	No	877	41.9
		2092	100.0

1n. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Provide school lockers to students

Variable Name: C0138 **Provide school lockers to students**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1408	67.3
2	No	684	32.7
		2092	100.0

1p. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Have "panic button(s)" or silent alarm(s) that directly connect to law enforcement in the event of an incident

Variable Name: C0139 **Silent alarms directly connected to law enforcement**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	626	29.9
2	No	1466	70.1
		2092	100.0

1o. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require clear book bags or ban book bags on school grounds

Variable Name: C0140 **Require clear book bags or ban book bags**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	118	5.6
2	No	1974	94.4
		2092	100.0

1q. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Provide an electronic notification system that automatically notifies parents in case of a school-wide emergency

Variable Name: C0141 **Provide an electronic notification system that automatically notifies parents in case of a school-wide emergency**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1559	74.5
2	No	533	25.5
		2092	100.0

1s. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require students to wear badges or picture IDs

Variable Name: C0142 **Require students to wear badge or photo ID**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	266	12.7
2	No	1826	87.3
		2092	100.0

1r. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Provide a structured anonymous threat reporting system (e.g., online submission, telephone hotline, or written submission via drop box)

Variable Name: C0143 **Provide a structured anonymous threat reporting system**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1092	52.2
2	No	1000	47.8
		2092	100.0

1t. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Require faculty and staff to wear badges or picture IDs

Variable Name: C0144 **Require faculty/staff to wear badge or photo ID**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1451	69.4
2	No	641	30.6
		2092	100.0

1u. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Use one or more security cameras to monitor the school

Variable Name: C0146 **Security camera(s) monitor the school**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1828	87.4
2	No	264	12.6
		2092	100.0

1v. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Provide telephones in most classrooms

Variable Name: C0148 **Provide telephones in most classrooms**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1699	81.2
2	No	393	18.8
		2092	100.0

1w. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Provide two-way radios to any staff

Variable Name: C0150 **Provide two-way radios to any staff**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1534	73.3
2	No	558	26.7
		2092	100.0

1x. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Limit access to social networking websties (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram) from school computers

Variable Name: C0151 **Limit access to social networking sites**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1858	88.8
2	No	234	11.2
		2092	100.0

1y. During the 2015-16 school year, was it a practice of your school to do the following? Prohibit use of cell phones and text messaging devices during school hours

Variable Name: C0153 **Prohibit use of cell phones and text messaging devices**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1180	56.4
2	No	912	43.6
		2092	100.0

2a. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Active shooter*

Variable Name: C0155 **Written plan for active shooter scenario**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1971	94.2
2	No	121	5.8
		2092	100.0

2h. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Post-crisis reunification of students with their families

Variable Name: C0157 **Written plan for post-crisis reunification of students with their families**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1815	86.8
2	No	277	13.2
		2092	100.0

2b. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Natural disasters (e.g., earthquakes or tornadoes)

Variable Name: C0158 **Written plan for natural disasters**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	2008	96.0
2	No	84	4.0
		2092	100.0

2c. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Hostages

Variable Name: C0162 **Written plan for hostages**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1315	62.9
2	No	777	37.1
		2092	100.0

2d. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Bomb threats or incidents

Variable Name: C0166 **Written plan for bomb threats**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	2017	96.4
2	No	75	3.6
		2092	100.0

2f. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Suicide threat or incident

Variable Name: C0169 **Written plan for suicide threat or incident**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1853	88.6
2	No	239	11.4
		2092	100.0

2e. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Chemical, biological, or radiological threats or incidents (e.g., release of mustard gas, anthrax, smallpox, or radioactive materials)

Variable Name: C0170 **Written plan for chemical, biological, or radiological threats**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1575	75.3
2	No	517	24.7
		2092	100.0

2g. Does your school have a written plan that describes procedures to be performed in the following scenarios? Pandemic flu

Variable Name: C0173 **Written plan for pandemic flu**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1079	51.6
2	No	1013	48.4
		2092	100.0

3a. During the 2015-16 school year, has your school drilled students on the use of the following emergency procedures? Evacuation*

Variable Name: C0163 **Drilled students on plan for evacuation**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1937	92.6
2	No	155	7.4
		2092	100.0

3b. During the 2015-16 school year, has your school drilled students on the use of the following emergency procedures? Lockdown*

Variable Name: C0165 **Drilled students on plan for lockdown**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1998	95.5
2	No	94	4.5
		2092	100.0

3c. During the 2015-16 school year, has your school drilled students on the use of the following emergency procedures? Shelter-in-place*

Variable Name: C0167 **Drilled students on plan for shelter-in-place**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1653	79.0
2	No	439	21.0
		2092	100.0

4a. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Prevention curriculum, instruction, or training for students (e.g., conflict resolution, anti-bullying*, dating violence* prevention)

Variable Name: C0174 **Prevention curriculum/instruction/training**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1895	90.6
2	No	197	9.4
		2092	100.0

4g. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Student involvement in peer mediation

Variable Name: C0175 **Student involvement in peer mediation**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	847	40.5
2	No	1245	59.5
		2092	100.0

4b. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Behavioral or behavior modification intervention for students (including the use of positive reinforcements)

Variable Name: C0176 **Behavioral modification for students**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1948	93.1
2	No	144	6.9
		2092	100.0

4h. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Student court to address student conduct problems or minor offenses

Variable Name: C0177 **Student court to address student conduct problems or minor offenses**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	219	10.5
2	No	1873	89.5
		2092	100.0

4c. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Counseling, social work, psychological, or therapeutic activity for students

Variable Name: C0178 **Student counseling/social work**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1992	95.2
2	No	100	4.8
		2092	100.0

4i. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Student involvement in restorative circles* (e.g., "peace circles," "talking circles," "conflict circles")

Variable Name: C0179 **Student involvement in restorative circles**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	647	30.9
2	No	1445	69.1
		2092	100.0

4d. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Individual attention/mentoring/tutoring/coaching of students by students

Variable Name: C0180 **Individual mentoring/tutoring by students**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1343	64.2
2	No	749	35.8
		2092	100.0

4e. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Individual attention/mentoring/tutoring/coaching of students by adults

Variable Name: C0181 **Individual mentoring/tutoring by adults**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1953	93.4
2	No	139	6.6
		2092	100.0

4f. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Recreational, enrichment, or leisure activities for students

Variable Name: C0182 **Recreation/enrichment student activities**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1864	89.1
2	No	228	10.9
		2092	100.0

4j. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Social emotional learning (SEL) training for students (e.g., social skills, anger management, mindfulness)

Variable Name: C0183 **Social emotional learning training for students**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1343	64.2
2	No	749	35.8
		2092	100.0

4k. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any formal programs intended to prevent or reduce violence* that included the following components for students? Programs to promote a sense of community/social integration among students

Variable Name: C0186 **Promote sense of community/integration**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1680	80.3
2	No	412	19.7
		2092	100.0

5. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have a threat assessment team* or any other formal group of persons to identify students who might be a potential risk for violent or harmful behavior (toward themselves or others)?

Variable Name: C0600 **Have a threat assessment team**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	996	47.6
2	No	1096	52.4
		2092	100.0

6. During the 2015-16 school year, how often did your school's threat assessment team* formally meet?

Variable Name: C0602 **Threat assessment teamformal meetings**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1096	52.4
1	At least once a week	120	5.7
2	At least once a month	273	13.0
3	On occasion	588	28.1
4	Never	15	0.7
		2092	100.0

7a. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any recognized student groups with the following purposes? Acceptance of sexual orientation* and gender identity* of students (e.g., Gay-Straight Alliance)

Variable Name: C0604 **LGBTQ acceptance group**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	578	27.6
2	No	1514	72.4
		2092	100.0

7b. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any recognized student groups with the following purposes? Acceptance of students with disabilities (e.g., Best Buddies)

Variable Name: C0606 **Disability acceptance group**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	786	37.6
2	No	1306	62.4
		2092	100.0

7c. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have any recognized student groups with the following purposes? Acceptance of cultural diversity (e.g., Cultural Awareness Club)

Variable Name: C0608 **Cultural diversity acceptance group**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	709	33.9
2	No	1383	66.1
		2092	100.0

8a. Which of the following does your school do to involve or help parents? Have a formal process to obtain parental input on policies related to school crime and discipline

Variable Name: C0190 **Formal process to obtain parental input**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1066	51.0
2	No	1026	49.0
		2092	100.0

8b. Which of the following does your school do to involve or help parents? Provide training or technical assistance to parents in dealing with students' problem behavior

Variable Name: C0192 **Provide training/assistance to parents**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	904	43.2
2	No	1188	56.8
		2092	100.0

8c. Which of the following does your school do to involve or help parents? Have a program that involves parents at school* helping to maintain school discipline

Variable Name: C0194 **Program involves parents at school**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	355	17.0
2	No	1737	83.0
		2092	100.0

9a. What is your best estimate of the percentage of students who had at least one parent or guardian participating in the following events during the 2015-16 school year? Open house or back-to-school night

Variable Name: C0196 **Parent participates in open house or back to school night**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	0-25%	127	6.1
2	26-50%	493	23.6
3	51-75%	644	30.8
4	76-100%	805	38.5
5	Does not offer	23	1.1
		2092	100.0

9b. What is your best estimate of the percentage of students who had at least one parent or guardian participating in the following events during the 2015-16 school year? Regularly scheduled parent-teacher conferences

Variable Name: C0198 **Parent participates in parent-teacher conference**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	0-25%	227	10.9
2	26-50%	576	27.5
3	51-75%	503	24.0
4	76-100%	657	31.4
5	Does not offer	129	6.2
		2092	100.0

9c. What is your best estimate of the percentage of students who had at least one parent or guardian participating in the following events during the 2015-16 school year? Special subject-area events (e.g., science fair, concerts)

Variable Name: C0200 **Parent participates in subject-area events**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	0-25%	312	14.9
2	26-50%	583	27.9
3	51-75%	658	31.5
4	76-100%	495	23.7
5	Does not offer	44	2.1
		2092	100.0

9d. What is your best estimate of the percentage of students who had at least one parent or guardian participating in the following events during the 2015-16 school year? Volunteered at school* or served on a committee

Variable Name: C0202 **Parent volunteers at school**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	0-25%	1370	65.5
2	26-50%	468	22.4
3	51-75%	161	7.7
4	76-100%	59	2.8
5	Does not offer	34	1.6
		2092	100.0

10a. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Parent groups

Variable Name: C0204 **Community involvement - parent groups**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1236	59.1
2	No	856	40.9
		2092	100.0

10b. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Social service agencies

Variable Name: C0206 **Community involvement - social services**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1356	64.8
2	No	736	35.2
		2092	100.0

10c. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Juvenile justice agencies

Variable Name: C0208 **Community involvement - juvenile justice**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	921	44.0
2	No	1171	56.0
		2092	100.0

10d. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Law enforcement agencies

Variable Name: C0210 **Community involvement - law enforcement**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1673	80.0
2	No	419	20.0
		2092	100.0

10e. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Mental health agencies

Variable Name: C0212 **Community involvement - mental health**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1298	62.0
2	No	794	38.0
		2092	100.0

10f. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Civic organizations/service clubs

Variable Name: C0214 **Community involvement - civic organizations**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	936	44.7
2	No	1156	55.3
		2092	100.0

10g. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Private corporations/businesses

Variable Name: C0216 **Community involvement - business**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	617	29.5
2	No	1475	70.5
		2092	100.0

10h. During the 2015-16 school year, were any of the following community and outside groups involved in your school's efforts to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools? Religious organizations

Variable Name: C0218 **Community involvement - religious organizations**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	611	29.2
2	No	1481	70.8
		2092	100.0

11. During the 2015-16 school year, did you have any sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) present at your school* at least once a week?

Variable Name: C0610 **Sworn law enforcement officers at school**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1360	65.0
2	No	732	35.0
		2092	100.0

12a. Were sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) used at least once a week in or around your school at the following times? At any time during school hours

Variable Name: C0612 **Sworn law enforcement officers present during school**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1299	62.1
2	No	61	2.9
		2092	100.0

12b. Were sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) used at least once a week in or around your school at the following times? While students were arriving or leaving

Variable Name: C0614 **Sworn law enforcement officers while students arriving or leaving**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1183	56.5
2	No	177	8.5
		2092	100.0

12c. Were sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) used at least once a week in or around your school at the following times? At selected school activities (e.g., athletic and social events, open houses, science fairs)

Variable Name: C0616 **Sworn law enforcement officers present at school activities**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1153	55.1
2	No	207	9.9
		2092	100.0

12d. Were sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) used at least once a week in or around your school at the following times? When school/school activities were not occurring

Variable Name: C0618 **Sworn law enforcement officers present at other times**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	602	28.8
2	No	758	36.2
		2092	100.0

13a. Did any of the sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at your school* routinely: Carry a stun gun (e.g., Taser gun)

Variable Name: C0620 **Sworn law enforcement officers with stun gun**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	963	46.0
2	No	397	19.0
		2092	100.0

13b. Did any of the sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at your school* routinely: Carry chemical aerosol sprays (e.g., Mace, pepper spray)

Variable Name: C0622 **Sworn law enforcement officers with chemical sprays**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	982	46.9
2	No	378	18.1
		2092	100.0

13c. Did any of the sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at your school* routinely: Carry a firearm*

Variable Name: C0624 **Sworn law enforcement officers with firearms**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1262	60.3
2	No	98	4.7
		2092	100.0

13d. Did any of the sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at your school* routinely: Wear a body camera

Variable Name: C0626 **Sworn law enforcement officers wear a body camera**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	248	11.9
2	No	1112	53.2
		2092	100.0

14a. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Motor vehicle traffic control

Variable Name: C0628 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in traffic contrd**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1004	48.0
2	No	356	17.0
		2092	100.0

14b. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Security enforcement and patrol

Variable Name: C0630 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in patrd**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1182	56.5
2	No	178	8.5
		2092	100.0

14c. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Maintaining school discipline

Variable Name: C0632 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in discipline**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	854	40.8
2	No	506	24.2
		2092	100.0

14d. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Coordinating with local police and emergency team(s)

Variable Name: C0634 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate with emergency personnel**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1241	59.3
2	No	119	5.7
		2092	100.0

14e. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Identifying problems in the school and proactively seeking solutions to those problems

Variable Name: C0636 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in solving school problems**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1100	52.6
2	No	260	12.4
		2092	100.0

14f. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Training teachers and staff in school safety or crime prevention

Variable Name: C0638 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in prevention training**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	766	36.6
2	No	594	28.4
		2092	100.0

14g. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Mentoring students

Variable Name: C0640 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in student mentoring**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	958	45.8
2	No	402	19.2
		2092	100.0

14h. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Teaching a law-related education course or training students (e.g., drug-related education, criminal law, or crime prevention courses)

Variable Name: C0642 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in teaching law-related courses**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	511	24.4
2	No	849	40.6
		2092	100.0

14i. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Recording or reporting discipline problems to school authorities

Variable Name: C0644 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in recording or reporting discipline problems**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1056	50.5
2	No	304	14.5
		2092	100.0

14j. Did these sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) participate in the following activities at your school*? Providing information to school authorities about the legal definitions of behavior for recording or reporting purposes (e.g., defining assault for school authorities)

Variable Name: C0646 **Sworn law enforcement officers participate in providing legal definitions**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	1085	51.9
2	No	275	13.1
		2092	100.0

15. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school have a sworn law enforcement officer (including School Resource Officers) present for all instructional hours every day that school was in session?

Variable Name: C0648 **Sworn law enforcement officer present for all instructonal hours**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	614	29.3
2	No	746	35.7
		2092	100.0

16. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district have any formalized policies or written documents (e.g., Memorandum of Use, Memorandum of Agreement) that outlined the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school?

Variable Name: C0650 **Formalized policies for sworn law enforcement officers**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	732	35.0
1	Yes	973	46.5
2	No	387	18.5
		2092	100.0

17a. Did these formalized policies or written documents include language defining the role of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school in the following areas? Student discipline

Variable Name: C0652 **Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include student discipline**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1119	53.5
1	Yes	569	27.2
2	No	157	7.5
3	Don't Know	247	11.8
		2092	100.0

17b. Did these formalized policies or written documents include language defining the role of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school in the following areas? Use of physical restraints (e.g., handcuffs, Tasers, Mace, pepper spray, or other physical or chemical restraints)

Variable Name: C0654 **Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include use of restraints**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1119	53.5
1	Yes	462	22.1
2	No	180	8.6
3	Don't Know	331	15.8
		2092	100.0

17c. Did these formalized policies or written documents include language defining the role of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school in the following areas? Use of firearms*

Variable Name: **C0656** **Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include use of firearms**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1119	53.5
1	Yes	418	20.0
2	No	200	9.6
3	Don't Know	355	17.0
		2092	100.0

17d. Did these formalized policies or written documents include language defining the role of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school in the following areas? Making arrests on school grounds

Variable Name: **C0658** **Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include making arrests**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1119	53.5
1	Yes	595	28.4
2	No	112	5.4
3	Don't Know	266	12.7
		2092	100.0

17e. Did these formalized policies or written documents include language defining the role of sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) at school in the following areas? Reporting of criminal offenses to a law enforcement agency

Variable Name: C0660 **Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include reporting of offenses**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1119	53.5
1	Yes	671	32.1
2	No	74	3.5
3	Don't Know	228	10.9
		2092	100.0

20a_1. During the 2015-16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed mental health professional*? Diagnostic assessment* for mental health disorders* AT SCHOOL* by a mental health professional* employed by the school or district

Variable Name: C0662 **Diagnostic assessment at school by school-employed mental health professional**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1009	48.2
2	No	1083	51.8
		2092	100.0

20a_2. During the 2015-16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed mental health professional*? Diagnostic assessment* for mental health disorders* AT SCHOOL* by a mental health professional* other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district

Variable Name: C0664 **Diagnostic assessment at school by school-funded mental health professional**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	729	34.8
2	No	1363	65.2
		2092	100.0

20a_3. During the 2015-16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed mental health professional*? Diagnostic assessment* for mental health disorders* OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL by a mental health professional* other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district

Variable Name: C0666 **Diagnostic assessment outside of school by school-funded mental health professional**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	992	47.4
2	No	1100	52.6
		2092	100.0

20b_1. During the 2015-16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed mental health professional*? Treatment* for mental health disorders* AT SCHOOL* by a mental health professional* employed by the school or district

Variable Name: C0668 **Treatment at school by school-employed mental health professional**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	750	35.9
2	No	1342	64.1
		2092	100.0

20b_2. During the 2015-16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed mental health professional*? Treatment* for mental health disorders* AT SCHOOL* by a mental health professional* other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district

Variable Name: C0670 **Treatment at school by school-funded mental health professional**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	726	34.7
2	No	1366	65.3
		2092	100.0

20b_3. During the 2015-16 school year, were the following mental health services available to students under the official responsibilities of a licensed mental health professional*? Treatment* for mental health disorders* OUTSIDE OF SCHOOL by a mental health professional* other than a school or district employee, funded by the school or district

Variable Name: C0672 **Treatment outside of school by school-funded mental health professional**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	954	45.6
2	No	1138	54.4
		2092	100.0

21a. During the 2015-16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students? Inadequate access to licensed mental health professionals*

Variable Name: C0674 **Inadequate access to professionals limits mental health efforts**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	563	26.9
2	Limits in minor way	718	34.3
3	Does not limit	811	38.8
		2092	100.0

21b. During the 2015-16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students? Inadequate funding

Variable Name: C0676 **Inadequate funding limits mental health efforts**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	918	43.9
2	Limits in minor way	606	29.0
3	Does not limit	568	27.2
		2092	100.0

21c. During the 2015-16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students? Potential legal issues for school or district (e.g., malpractice, insufficient supervision)

Variable Name: C0678 **Potential legal issues limit mental health efforts**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	245	11.7
2	Limits in minor way	625	29.9
3	Does not limit	1222	58.4
		2092	100.0

21d. During the 2015-16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students? Lack of parental support in addressing their children's mental health disorders*

Variable Name: C0680 **Lack of parental support limits mental health efforts**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	445	21.3
2	Limits in minor way	1014	48.5
3	Does not limit	633	30.3
		2092	100.0

21e. During the 2015-16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students? Lack of community support for providing mental health services to students in your school

Variable Name: C0682 **Lack of community support limits mental health efforts**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	228	10.9
2	Limits in minor way	685	32.7
3	Does not limit	1179	56.4
		2092	100.0

21f. During the 2015-16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students? Written or unwritten policies regarding the school's requirement to pay for the diagnostic assessment or treatment of students

Variable Name: C0684 **Payment policies limit mental health efforts**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	288	13.8
2	Limits in minor way	564	27.0
3	Does not limit	1240	59.3
		2092	100.0

21g. During the 2015-16 school year, to what extent did the following factors limit your school's efforts to provide mental health services to students? Reluctance to label students with mental health disorders* to avoid stigmatizing the child

Variable Name: C0686 **Reluctance to label students limits mental health efforts**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	177	8.5
2	Limits in minor way	695	33.2
3	Does not limit	1220	58.3
		2092	100.0

22c. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to cyberbullying*

Variable Name: C0265 **Teacher training - discipline policies related to cyberbullying**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1496	71.5
2	No	596	28.5
		2092	100.0

22a. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in classroom management for teachers

Variable Name: C0266 **Teacher training - classroom management**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1778	85.0
2	No	314	15.0
		2092	100.0

22d. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to bullying* other than cyberbullying*

Variable Name: C0267 **Teacher training - discipline policies related to bullying**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1681	80.4
2	No	411	19.6
		2092	100.0

22b. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to violence*

Variable Name: C0268 **Teacher training - discipline policies related to violence**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1501	71.7
2	No	591	28.3
		2092	100.0

22e. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in school-wide discipline policies and practices related to alcohol and/or drug use

Variable Name: C0269 **Teacher training - alcohol or drug discipline policy**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1042	49.8
2	No	1050	50.2
		2092	100.0

22f. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in safety procedures (e.g., how to handle emergencies)

Variable Name: C0270 **Teacher training - safety procedures**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1980	94.6
2	No	112	5.4
		2092	100.0

22h. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in intervention and referral strategies for students displaying signs of mental health disorders* (e.g., depression, mood disorders, ADHD)

Variable Name: C0271 **Teacher training - intervention and referral strategies**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1157	55.3
2	No	935	44.7
		2092	100.0

22g. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in recognizing early warning signs of students likely to exhibit violent behavior

Variable Name: C0272 **Teacher training - early warning signs for violent behavior**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1038	49.6
2	No	1054	50.4
		2092	100.0

22i. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in recognizing physical, social, and verbal bullying* behaviors

Variable Name: C0273 **Teacher training - recognize bullying behavior**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1592	76.1
2	No	500	23.9
		2092	100.0

22j. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in recognizing signs of students using/abusing alcohol and/or drugs

Variable Name: C0274 **Teacher training - student alcohol/drug abuse**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	810	38.7
2	No	1282	61.3
		2092	100.0

22k. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in positive behavioral intervention strategies

Variable Name: C0276 **Teacher training - positive behavioral intervention**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1662	79.4
2	No	430	20.6
		2092	100.0

22l. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school or school district provide any of the following for classroom teachers or aides? Training in crisis prevention and intervention

Variable Name: C0277 **Teacher training - crisis prevention and intervention**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1521	72.7
2	No	571	27.3
		2092	100.0

23a. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Lack of or inadequate teacher training in classroom management

Variable Name: C0280 **Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of teacher training**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	113	5.4
2	Limits in minor way	737	35.2
3	Does not limit	1242	59.4
		2092	100.0

23b. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Lack of or inadequate alternative placement/programs for disruptive students

Variable Name: C0282 **Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of alternative placement**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	605	28.9
2	Limits in minor way	740	35.4
3	Does not limit	747	35.7
		2092	100.0

23c. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Likelihood of complaints from parents

Variable Name: C0284 **Efforts limited by parental complaints**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	110	5.3
2	Limits in minor way	635	30.4
3	Does not limit	1347	64.4
		2092	100.0

23d. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Lack of teacher support for school policies

Variable Name: C0286 **Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of teacher support**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	49	2.3
2	Limits in minor way	490	23.4
3	Does not limit	1553	74.2
		2092	100.0

23e. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Lack of parental support for school policies

Variable Name: C0288 **Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of parent support**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	151	7.2
2	Limits in minor way	819	39.1
3	Does not limit	1122	53.6
		2092	100.0

23f. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Teachers' fear of student retaliation

Variable Name: C0290 **Efforts limited by fear of student retaliation**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	49	2.3
2	Limits in minor way	430	20.6
3	Does not limit	1613	77.1
		2092	100.0

23g. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Fear of litigation

Variable Name: C0292 **Efforts limited by fear of litigation**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	124	5.9
2	Limits in minor way	623	29.8
3	Does not limit	1345	64.3
		2092	100.0

23h. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Inadequate funds

Variable Name: C0294 **Efforts limited by inadequate funds**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	556	26.6
2	Limits in minor way	723	34.6
3	Does not limit	813	38.9
		2092	100.0

23i. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Inconsistent application of school policies by faculty or staff

Variable Name: C0296 **Efforts limited by inconsistent application of policies**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	160	7.6
2	Limits in minor way	820	39.2
3	Does not limit	1112	53.2
		2092	100.0

23j. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Fear of district or state reprisal

Variable Name: C0298 **Efforts limited by fear of district or state reprisal**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	63	3.0
2	Limits in minor way	395	18.9
3	Does not limit	1634	78.1
		2092	100.0

23k. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Federal, state, or district policies on disciplining special education students*

Variable Name: C0300 **Efforts limited by fed policies/special ed**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	372	17.8
2	Limits in minor way	748	35.8
3	Does not limit	972	46.5
		2092	100.0

23l. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? Federal policies on discipline and safety other than those for special education students*

Variable Name: C0302 **Efforts limited by other federal policies-not special ed**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	172	8.2
2	Limits in minor way	615	29.4
3	Does not limit	1305	62.4
		2092	100.0

23m. To what extent do the following factors limit your school's efforts to reduce or prevent crime? State or district policies on discipline and safety other than those for special education students*

Variable Name: C0304 **Efforts limited by other state/district policies-not special ed**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Limits in major way	180	8.6
2	Limits in minor way	626	29.9
3	Does not limit	1286	61.5
		2092	100.0

24. During the 2015-16 school year, have any of your school's students, faculty, or staff died as a result of a homicide committed at your school*?

Variable Name: C0306 **Any school deaths from homicides**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	4	0.2
2	No	2088	99.8
		2092	100.0

25. During the 2015-16 school year, has there been at least one incident at your school* that involved a shooting (regardless of whether anyone was hurt)? Please include those incidents that occurred at school*, regardless of whether a student or non-student used the firearm*.

Variable Name: C0308 **School shooting incidents**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	10	0.5
2	No	2082	99.5
		2092	100.0

27. Please record the number of arrests that occurred at your school during the 2015-16 school year. Please include all arrests that occurred at school*, regardless of whether a student or non-student was arrested.

Variable Name: C0688_R **Number of arrests at school**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	None	1350	64.5
2	1-5	500	23.9
3	6-10	111	5.3
4	11 or more	131	6.3
		2092	100.0

28. During the 2015-16 school year, how many hate crimes* occurred at your school*?

Variable Name: C0690_R **Any hate crimes**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	43	2.1
2	No	2049	97.9
		2092	100.0

32a. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Student racial/ethnic tensions

Variable Name: C0374 **How often student racial/ethnic tensions**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	8	0.4
2	Happens at least once a week	43	2.1
3	Happens at least once a month	101	4.8
4	Happens on occasion	1264	60.4
5	Never happens	676	32.3
		2092	100.0

32b. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Student bullying*

Variable Name: C0376 **How often student bullying occurs**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	79	3.8
2	Happens at least once a week	268	12.8
3	Happens at least once a month	435	20.8
4	Happens on occasion	1257	60.1
5	Never happens	53	2.5
		2092	100.0

32c. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Student sexual harassment* of other students

Variable Name: C0378 **How often student sexual harassment of students**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	5	0.2
2	Happens at least once a week	35	1.7
3	Happens at least once a month	132	6.3
4	Happens on occasion	1276	61.0
5	Never happens	644	30.8
		2092	100.0

32g. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Student verbal abuse of teachers

Variable Name: C0380 **How often student verbal abuse of teachers**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	27	1.3
2	Happens at least once a week	109	5.2
3	Happens at least once a month	206	9.8
4	Happens on occasion	1184	56.6
5	Never happens	566	27.1
		2092	100.0

32d. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Student harassment of other students based on sexual orientation*

Variable Name: C0381 **How often student harassment based on sexual orientation**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	3	0.1
2	Happens at least once a week	22	1.1
3	Happens at least once a month	60	2.9
4	Happens on occasion	935	44.7
5	Never happens	1072	51.2
		2092	100.0

32f. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Widespread disorder in classrooms

Variable Name: C0382 **How often widespread disorder in classrooms**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	16	0.8
2	Happens at least once a week	53	2.5
3	Happens at least once a month	78	3.7
4	Happens on occasion	607	29.0
5	Never happens	1338	64.0
		2092	100.0

32e. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Student harassment of other students based on gender identity*

Variable Name: C0383 **How often student harassment based on gender identity**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	2	0.1
2	Happens at least once a week	12	0.6
3	Happens at least once a month	32	1.5
4	Happens on occasion	661	31.6
5	Never happens	1385	66.2
		2092	100.0

32h. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Student acts of disrespect for teachers other than verbal abuse

Variable Name: C0384 **How often student acts of disrespect for teachers-not verbal abuse**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	65	3.1
2	Happens at least once a week	202	9.7
3	Happens at least once a month	269	12.9
4	Happens on occasion	1081	51.7
5	Never happens	475	22.7
		2092	100.0

32i. To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following types of problems occur at your school*? Gang* activities

Variable Name: C0386 **How often student gang activities**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	3	0.1
2	Happens at least once a week	12	0.6
3	Happens at least once a month	35	1.7
4	Happens on occasion	373	17.8
5	Never happens	1669	79.8
		2092	100.0

33a. To the best of your knowledge, thinking about problems that can occur anywhere (both at your school and away from school), how often do the following occur? Cyberbullying* among students who attend your school

Variable Name: C0389 **How often cyberbullying among students**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	115	5.5
2	Happens at least once a week	324	15.5
3	Happens at least once a month	464	22.2
4	Happens on occasion	1003	47.9
5	Never happens	186	8.9
		2092	100.0

33b. To the best of your knowledge, thinking about problems that can occur anywhere (both at your school and away from school), how often do the following occur? School environment is affected by cyberbullying*

Variable Name: C0391 **How often school environment affected by cyberbullying**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	50	2.4
2	Happens at least once a week	207	9.9
3	Happens at least once a month	378	18.1
4	Happens on occasion	1065	50.9
5	Never happens	392	18.7
		2092	100.0

33c. To the best of your knowledge, thinking about problems that can occur anywhere (both at your school and away from school), how often do the following occur? Staff resources are used to deal with cyberbullying*

Variable Name: C0393 **How often staff resources used to deal with cyberbullying**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Happens daily	46	2.2
2	Happens at least once a week	201	9.6
3	Happens at least once a month	392	18.7
4	Happens on occasion	1095	52.3
5	Never happens	358	17.1
		2092	100.0

34a_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Removal with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year - allowed

Variable Name: C0390 **Removal with no services available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	896	42.8
2	No	1196	57.2
		2092	100.0

34a_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Removal with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year - used

Variable Name: C0392 **Removal with no services available - action used**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1196	57.2
1	Yes	288	13.8
2	No	608	29.1
		2092	100.0

34b_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Removal with school-provided tutoring/at-home instruction for at least the remainder of the school year - allowed

Variable Name: C0394 **Removal with tutoring/at-home instruction available**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1074	51.3
2	No	1018	48.7
		2092	100.0

34b_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Removal with school-provided tutoring/at-home instruction for at least the remainder of the school year - used

Variable Name: C0396 **Removal with tutoring/at-home instrudion available - action used**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1018	48.7
1	Yes	494	23.6
2	No	580	27.7
		2092	100.0

34c_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Transfer to a specialized school* for disciplinary reasons - allowed

Variable Name: C0398 **Transfer to specialized school available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1453	69.5
2	No	639	30.5
		2092	100.0

34c_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Transfer to a specialized school* for disciplinary reasons - used

Variable Name: C0400 **Transfer to specialized school available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	639	30.5
1	Yes	821	39.2
2	No	632	30.2
		2092	100.0

34d_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Transfer to another regular school for disciplinary reasons - allowed

Variable Name: C0402 **Transfer to regular school available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	757	36.2
2	No	1335	63.8
		2092	100.0

34d_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Transfer to another regular school for disciplinary reasons - used

Variable Name: C0404 **Transfer to regular school available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1335	63.8
1	Yes	381	18.2
2	No	376	18.0
		2092	100.0

34e_i_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Out-of-school suspension or removal for less than the remainder of the school year with no curriculum/services provided - allowed

Variable Name: C0406 **Outside suspension/no services available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1033	49.4
2	No	1059	50.6
		2092	100.0

34e_i_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Out-of-school suspension or removal for less than the remainder of the school year with no curriculum/services provided - used

Variable Name: C0408 **Outside suspension/no services available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1059	50.6
1	Yes	845	40.4
2	No	188	9.0
		2092	100.0

34e_ii_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Out-of-school suspension or removal for less than the remainder of the school year with curriculum/services provided - allowed

Variable Name: C0410 **Outside suspension with services available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1679	80.3
2	No	413	19.7
		2092	100.0

34e_ii_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Out-of-school suspension or removal for less than the remainder of the school year with curriculum/services provided - used

Variable Name: C0412 **Outside suspension with services available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	413	19.7
1	Yes	1374	65.7
2	No	305	14.6
		2092	100.0

34f_i_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? In-school suspension for less than the remainder of the school year with no curriculum/services provided - allowed

Variable Name: C0414 **In-school suspension/no services available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	376	18.0
2	No	1716	82.0
		2092	100.0

34f_i_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? In-school suspension for less than the remainder of the school year with no curriculum/services provided - used

Variable Name: C0416 **In-school suspension/no services available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1716	82.0
1	Yes	265	12.7
2	No	111	5.3
		2092	100.0

34f_ii_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? In-school suspension for less than the remainder of the school year with curriculum/services provided - allowed

Variable Name: C0418 **In-school suspension with services available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1704	81.5
2	No	388	18.5
		2092	100.0

34f_ii_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? In-school suspension for less than the remainder of the school year with curriculum/services provided - used

Variable Name: C0420 **In-school suspension with services available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	388	18.5
1	Yes	1559	74.5
2	No	145	6.9
		2092	100.0

34g_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Referral to a school counselor - allowed

Variable Name: C0422 **Referral to school counselor available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	2006	95.9
2	No	86	4.1
		2092	100.0

34g_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Referral to a school counselor - used

Variable Name: C0424 **Referral to school counselor available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	86	4.1
1	Yes	1973	94.3
2	No	33	1.6
		2092	100.0

34h_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Assignment to a program (during school hours) designed to reduce disciplinary problems - allowed

Variable Name: C0426 **In-school disciplinary plan available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1158	55.4
2	No	934	44.6
		2092	100.0

34h_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Assignment to a program (during school hours) designed to reduce disciplinary problems - used

Variable Name: C0428 **In-school disciplinary plan available - action used**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	934	44.6
1	Yes	1048	50.1
2	No	110	5.3
		2092	100.0

34i_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Assignment to a program (outside of school hours) designed to reduce disciplinary problems - allowed

Variable Name: C0430 **Outside school disciplinary plan available**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	696	33.3
2	No	1396	66.7
		2092	100.0

34i_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Assignment to a program (outside of school hours) designed to reduce disciplinary problems - used

Variable Name: C0432 **Outside school disciplinary plan available - action used**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1396	66.7
1	Yes	528	25.2
2	No	168	8.0
		2092	100.0

34j_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Loss of school bus privileges due to misbehavior - allowed

Variable Name: C0434 **Loss of bus privileges for misbehavior available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1757	84.0
2	No	335	16.0
		2092	100.0

34j_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Loss of school bus privileges due to misbehavior - used

Variable Name: C0436 **Loss of bus privileges for misbehavior available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	335	16.0
1	Yes	1437	68.7
2	No	320	15.3
		2092	100.0

34k_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Corporal punishment - allowed

Variable Name: C0438 **Corporal punishment available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	182	8.7
2	No	1910	91.3
		2092	100.0

34k_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Corporal punishment - used

Variable Name: C0440 **Corporal punishment available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1910	91.3
1	Yes	122	5.8
2	No	60	2.9
		2092	100.0

34l_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Placement on school probation with consequences if another incident occurs - allowed

Variable Name: C0442 **School probation available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1208	57.7
2	No	884	42.3
		2092	100.0

34l_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Placement on school probation with consequences if another incident occurs - used

Variable Name: C0444 **School probation available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	884	42.3
1	Yes	1018	48.7
2	No	190	9.1
		2092	100.0

34m_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Detention and/or Saturday school - allowed

Variable Name: C0446 **Detention/Saturday school available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1609	76.9
2	No	483	23.1
		2092	100.0

34m_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Detention and/or Saturday school - used

Variable Name: C0448 **Detention/Saturday school available - action used**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	483	23.1
1	Yes	1525	72.9
2	No	84	4.0
		2092	100.0

34n_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Loss of student privileges - allowed

Variable Name: C0450 **Loss of student privileges available**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	1991	95.2
2	No	101	4.8
		2092	100.0

34n_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Loss of student privileges - used

Variable Name: **C0452** **Loss of student privileges available - action used**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	101	4.8
1	Yes	1923	91.9
2	No	68	3.3
		2092	100.0

34o_1. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Requirement of participation in community service - allowed

Variable Name: **C0454** **Require community service available**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Yes	731	34.9
2	No	1361	65.1
		2092	100.0

34o_2. During the 2015-16 school year, did your school allow for the use of the following disciplinary actions? If "yes," were the actions used this school year? Requirement of participation in community service - used

Variable Name: **C0456** **Require community service available - action used**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
-1	Legitimate skip	1361	65.1
1	Yes	586	28.0
2	No	145	6.9
		2092	100.0

36a. During the 2015-16 school year, how many of the following occurred? Students were removed from your school without continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for disciplinary reasons

Variable Name: C0518 **# of removals with no service - total**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	94
Mean	0.55
StDev	3.07
Median	0

36b. During the 2015-16 school year, how many of the following occurred? Students were transferred to specialized schools* for disciplinary reasons

Variable Name: C0520 **# of transfers to specialized schools - total**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	174
Mean	3.65
StDev	11.24
Median	0

38b. What percentage of your current students fit the following criteria? Limited English Proficient (LEP)

Variable Name: C0526 **Percent students limited English proficient**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	100
Mean	9.52
StDev	14.36
Median	4

38c. What percentage of your current students fit the following criteria? Special education students*

Variable Name: C0528 **Percent special education students**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	96
Mean	13.85
StDev	8.01
Median	12

39a. What is your best estimate of the percentage of your current students who meet the following criteria? Below the 15th percentile on standardized tests

Variable Name: C0532 **Percent students below 15th percentile standardized tests**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	100
Mean	16.41
StDev	16.91
Median	10

39b. What is your best estimate of the percentage of your current students who meet the following criteria? Likely to go to college after high school

Variable Name: C0534 **Percent students likely to go to college**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	100
Mean	63.33
StDev	24.28
Median	70

39c. What is your best estimate of the percentage of your current students who meet the following criteria? Consider academic achievement to be very important

Variable Name: C0536 Percent students academic achievement important

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	100
Mean	71.85
StDev	21.46
Median	75

40. How many classroom changes do most students make in a typical day?

Variable Name: C0538 Typical number of classroom changes

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	16
Mean	6.02
StDev	2.25
Median	6

41. How would you describe the crime level in the area(s) in which your students live?

Variable Name: C0560 Crime where students live

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	High level of crime	168	8.0
2	Moderate level of crime	437	20.9
3	Low level of crime	1206	57.6
4	Students come from areas with very different levels of crime	281	13.4
		2092	100.0

42. How would you describe the crime level in the area where your school is located?

Variable Name: C0562 Crime where school located

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	High level of crime	122	5.8
2	Moderate level of crime	402	19.2
3	Low level of crime	1568	75.0
		2092	100.0

44. What is your school's average daily attendance?

Variable Name: C0568 Average percent daily attendance

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	1
Max	100
Mean	93.47
StDev	8.24
Median	95

45a. During the 2015-16 school year, how many students transferred to or from your school after the start of school year? Please report on the total mobility, not just transfers due to disciplinary actions. Transferred to the school

Variable Name: C0570 # of students transferred to school

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	1243
Mean	62.28
StDev	89.31
Median	34

45b. During the 2015-16 school year, how many students transferred to or from your school after the start of school year? Please report on the total mobility, not just transfers due to disciplinary actions. Transferred from the school

Variable Name: C0572 **# of students transferred from school**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	909
Mean	53.14
StDev	74.54
Median	30

46c. Please provide the following dates. Date you completed the questionnaire

Variable Name: C0578 **Date questionnaire completed MMDDYYYY**

Distribution:

	Frequency	Unweighted Percent

Variable Name: C0578_DD **Day questionnaire completed**

Distribution:

	Frequency	Unweighted Percent

Variable Name: C0578_MM **Month questionnaire completed**

Distribution:

	Frequency	Unweighted Percent

Variable Name: C0578_YY **Year questionnaire completed**

Distribution:

	Frequency	Unweighted Percent

47. How long did it take you to complete this form, not counting interruptions?

Variable Name: C0580 **Number of minutes to complete questionnaire**

Distribution:

	Frequency

Variable Name: CRISIS16 **# of types of crises covered in written plans**

Continuous Statistics:

	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	8
Mean	6.51
StDev	1.59
Median	7

Variable Name: DISTOT16 **Total number of disciplinary actions recorded**

Continuous Statistics:

	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	1044
Mean	18.16
StDev	41.53
Median	8

Variable Name: INCID16 **Total number of incidents recorded**

Continuous Statistics:

	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	535
Mean	28.14
StDev	39.58
Median	15

Variable Name: INCPOL16 **Total number of incidents reported to police**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	291
Mean	12.21
StDev	23.99
Median	3

Variable Name: OTHACT16 **Total 'other actions' for specified offenses**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	900
Mean	9.74
StDev	33.08
Median	3

Variable Name: OUTSUS16 **Total out-of-school suspensions > 5 days but < the remainder of school for specified offenses**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	186
Mean	6.00
StDev	14.75
Median	0

Variable Name: **PROBWK16** **# of types of problems that occur at least once a week**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	7
Mean	0.46
StDev	0.95
Median	0

Variable Name: **REMOVL16** **Total removals with no continuing school services for specified offenses**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	39
Mean	0.33
StDev	1.75
Median	0

Variable Name: STRATA **Collapsed STRATUM code**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
111	Primary, <300, City	17	0.8
112	Primary, <300, Suburb	18	0.9
113	Primary, <300, Town	9	0.4
114	Primary, <300, Rural	36	1.7
121	Primary, 300-499, City	42	2.0
122	Primary, 300-499, Suburb	67	3.2
123	Primary, 300-499, Town	25	1.2
124	Primary, 300-499, Rural	40	1.9
131	Primary, 500-999, City	80	3.8
132	Primary, 500-999, Suburb	106	5.1
133	Primary, 500-999, Town	21	1.0
134	Primary, 500-999, Rural	35	1.7
141	Primary, 1,000+, City	6	0.3
142	Primary, 1,000+, Suburb	10	0.5
144	Primary, 1,000+, Town or Rural	4	0.2
211	Middle, <300, City	9	0.4
212	Middle, <300, Suburb	9	0.4
213	Middle, <300, Town	18	0.9
214	Middle, <300, Rural	37	1.8
221	Middle, 300-499, City	24	1.1
222	Middle, 300-499, Suburb	32	1.5
223	Middle, 300-499, Town	51	2.4

224	Middle, 300-499, Rural	34	1.6
231	Middle, 500-999, City	116	5.5
232	Middle, 500-999, Suburb	172	8.2
233	Middle, 500-999, Town	46	2.2
234	Middle, 500-999, Rural	55	2.6
241	Middle, 1,000+, City	41	2.0
242	Middle, 1,000+, Suburb	63	3.0
243	Middle, 1,000+, Town	3	0.1
244	Middle, 1,000+, Rural	9	0.4
311	High, <300, City	12	0.6
312	High, <300, Suburb	7	0.3
313	High, <300, Town	10	0.5
314	High, <300, Rural	28	1.3
321	High, 300-499, City	21	1.0
322	High, 300-499, Suburb	16	0.8
323	High, 300-499, Town	19	0.9
324	High, 300-499, Rural	31	1.5
331	High, 500-999, City	31	1.5
332	High, 500-999, Suburb	47	2.2
333	High, 500-999, Town	49	2.3
334	High, 500-999, Rural	47	2.2
341	High, 1,000+, City	145	6.9
342	High, 1,000+, Suburb	224	10.7
343	High, 1,000+, Town	34	1.6

344	High, 1,000+, Rural	53	2.5
412	Combined, <300, City or Suburb	3	0.1
414	Combined, <300, Town or Rural	21	1.0
421	Combined, 300-499, City	4	0.2
422	Combined, 300-499, Suburb	2	0.1
423	Combined, 300-499, Town	3	0.1
424	Combined, 300-499, Rural	15	0.7
431	Combined, 500-999, City	7	0.3
432	Combined, 500-999, Suburb	3	0.1
433	Combined, 500-999, Town	4	0.2
434	Combined, 500-999, Rural	12	0.6
441	Combined, 1,000+, City	2	0.1
442	Combined, 1,000+, Suburb	3	0.1
444	Combined, 1,000+, Town or Rural	4	0.2
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: STUOFF16 **Total students involved in specified offenses**

Continuous Statistics:

	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	321
Mean	16.92
StDev	28.12
Median	8

Variable Name: SVINC16 **Total number of serious violent incidents recorded**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	75
Mean	0.84
StDev	3.23
Median	0

Variable Name: SVPOL16 **Total number of serious violent incidents reported to police**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	34
Mean	0.50
StDev	1.87
Median	0

Variable Name: TRANSF16 **Total transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	106
Mean	2.07
StDev	6.89
Median	0

Variable Name: VIOINC16 **Total number of violent incidents recorded**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	279
Mean	15.53
StDev	26.10
Median	7

Variable Name: VIOPOL16 **Total number of violent incidents reported to police**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	149
Mean	4.80
StDev	12.45
Median	1

Variable Name: DISFIRE16 **Total # of disciplinary actions for firearm use/possession**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	77
Mean	0.18
StDev	2.39
Median	0

Variable Name: **DISDRUG16** **Total # of disciplinary actions for distribution/possession/use-illegal drugs**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	311
Mean	3.94
StDev	11.33
Median	0

Variable Name: **DISWEAP16** **Total # of disciplinary actions for weapon use**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	29
Mean	0.82
StDev	2.27
Median	0

Variable Name: **DISRUPT** **Total number of disruptions**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	32
Mean	0.82
StDev	1.70
Median	0

Variable Name: DISATT16 **Total # of disciplinary actions for attacks/fights**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	1044
Mean	12.29
StDev	37.17
Median	4

Variable Name: DISALC16 **Total # of disciplinary actions for distribution/possession/use-alcohol**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	42
Mean	0.92
StDev	2.73
Median	0

Variable Name: SEC_FT16 **Total # of full-time security guards, SROs, or sworn law enforcement officers**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	80
Mean	1.59
StDev	3.98
Median	1

Variable Name: SEC_PT16 **Total # of part-time security guards, SROs, or sworn law enforcement officers**

Continuous Statistics:

	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	44
Mean	0.71
StDev	2.10
Median	0

Variable Name: FR_URBAN **Urbanicity - Based on Urban-centric location of school**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	City	558	26.7
2	Suburb	781	37.3
3	Town	295	14.1
4	Rural	458	21.9
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: FR_LVEL **Grade Level of school**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	Primary	516	24.7
2	Middle	719	34.4
3	High	774	37.0
4	Combined	83	4.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: FR_SIZE **Size of school**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	< 300	234	11.2
2	300 - 499	426	20.4
3	500 - 999	831	39.7
4	1,000 +	601	28.7
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: PERCWHT **Percent non-Hispanic White enrollment-categorical**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
1	More than 95 percent	108	5.2
2	More than 80 but less than or equal to 95 percent	543	26.0
3	More than 50 but less than or equal to 80 percent	606	29.0
4	50 percent or less	835	39.9
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: FINALWGT **Final weight for the sample**

Continuous Statistics:

	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	9.71
Max	200.79
Mean	39.95
StDev	36.43
Median	20.5

Variable Name: REPFWT1 **Jackknife replicate 1**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	207.64
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.39
Median	19.85

Variable Name: REPFWT2 **Jackknife replicate 2**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	207.09
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.21
Median	19.66

Variable Name: REPFWT3 **Jackknife replicate 3**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	201.56
Mean	39.96
StDev	37.14
Median	19.97

Variable Name: REPFWT4 **Jackknife replicate 4**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	208.22
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.47
Median	20.1

Variable Name: REPFWT5 **Jackknife replicate 5**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.71
Mean	39.96
StDev	37.12
Median	19.98

Variable Name: REPFWT6 **Jackknife replicate 6**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	204.36
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.08
Median	20.23

Variable Name: REPFWT7 **Jackknife replicate 7**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.45
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.11
Median	19.92

Variable Name: REPFWT8 **Jackknife replicate 8**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	209.34
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.46
Median	19.75

Variable Name: REPFWT9 **Jackknife replicate 9**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	200.06
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.38
Median	19.72

Variable Name: REPFWT10 **Jackknife replicate 10**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	203.85
Mean	39.96
StDev	37.33
Median	20.6

Variable Name: REPFWT11 **Jackknife replicate 11**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.75
Mean	39.98
StDev	37.36
Median	19.61

Variable Name: REPFWT12 **Jackknife replicate 12**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	215.7
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.47
Median	19.57

Variable Name: REPFWT13 **Jackknife replicate 13**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	211.62
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.46
Median	20.15

Variable Name: REPFWT14 **Jackknife replicate 14**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	204.14
Mean	39.97
StDev	37.21
Median	19.53

Variable Name: REPFWT15 **Jackknife replicate 15**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	212.73
Mean	39.98
StDev	37.24
Median	20.43

Variable Name: REPFWT16 **Jackknife replicate 16**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	190.37
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.06
Median	20.23

Variable Name: REPFWT17 **Jackknife replicate 17**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	210.6
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.36
Median	19.73

Variable Name: REPFWT18 **Jackknife replicate 18**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.22
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.01
Median	20.07

Variable Name: REPFWT19 **Jackknife replicate 19**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	217.4
Mean	39.97
StDev	37.43
Median	19.57

Variable Name: REPFWT20 **Jackknife replicate 20**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	206.26
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.10
Median	20.83

Variable Name: REPFWT21 **Jackknife replicate 21**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	203.97
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.13
Median	19.54

Variable Name: REPFWT22 **Jackknife replicate 22**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	195.46
Mean	39.95
StDev	36.94
Median	20.28

Variable Name: REPFWT23 **Jackknife replicate 23**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	203.04
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.27
Median	19.54

Variable Name: REPFWT24 **Jackknife replicate 24**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	199.75
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.25
Median	19.72

Variable Name: REPFWT25 **Jackknife replicate 25**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	203.35
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.18
Median	20.07

Variable Name: REPFWT26 **Jackknife replicate 26**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	196.49
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.02
Median	20.47

Variable Name: REPFWT27 **Jackknife replicate 27**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	202.01
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.20
Median	19.95

Variable Name: REPFWT28 **Jackknife replicate 28**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	213.49
Mean	40.00
StDev	37.53
Median	19.95

Variable Name: REPFWT29 **Jackknife replicate 29**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	201.46
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.21
Median	20.04

Variable Name: REPFWT30 **Jackknife replicate 30**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	203.17
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.24
Median	19.61

Variable Name: REPFWT31 **Jackknife replicate 31**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205
Mean	39.98
StDev	37.39
Median	20.06

Variable Name: REPFWT32 **Jackknife replicate 32**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	212.21
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.33
Median	19.86

Variable Name: REPFWT33 **Jackknife replicate 33**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.37
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.14
Median	20.23

Variable Name: REPFWT34 **Jackknife replicate 34**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	202.1
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.22
Median	19.94

Variable Name: REPFWT35 **Jackknife replicate 35**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	202.26
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.08
Median	20.15

Variable Name: REPFWT36 **Jackknife replicate 36**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	206.16
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.37
Median	19.76

Variable Name: REPFWT37 **Jackknife replicate 37**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	208.96
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.26
Median	19.94

Variable Name: REPFWT38 **Jackknife replicate 38**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	199.66
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.45
Median	19.93

Variable Name: REPFWT39 **Jackknife replicate 39**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	201.12
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.20
Median	20.42

Variable Name: REPFWT40 **Jackknife replicate 40**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.99
Mean	39.98
StDev	37.31
Median	19.78

Variable Name: REPFWT41 **Jackknife replicate 41**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	204.05
Mean	40.00
StDev	37.33
Median	19.88

Variable Name: REPFWT42 **Jackknife replicate 42**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	209
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.41
Median	19.61

Variable Name: REPFWT43 **Jackknife replicate 43**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	204.42
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.23
Median	20.25

Variable Name: REPFWT44 **Jackknife replicate 44**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.79
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.29
Median	19.82

Variable Name: REPFWT45 **Jackknife replicate 45**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	201.3
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.06
Median	20.33

Variable Name: REPFWT46 **Jackknife replicate 46**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	206.57
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.18
Median	20.24

Variable Name: REPFWT47 **Jackknife replicate 47**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	202.97
Mean	39.96
StDev	37.07
Median	20.14

Variable Name: REPFWT48 **Jackknife replicate 48**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	203.94
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.34
Median	19.86

Variable Name: REPFWT49 **Jackknife replicate 49**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	203.29
Mean	39.94
StDev	37.32
Median	19.93

Variable Name: REPFWT50 **Jackknife replicate 50**

Continuous Statistics:	Unweighted
N	2092
Min	0
Max	205.09
Mean	39.95
StDev	37.21
Median	19.92

Variable Name: IC0110 **Imputation Flag for C0110**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0112 **Imputation Flag for C0112**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0114 **Imputation Flag for C0114**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0116 **Imputation Flag for C0116**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2082	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	10	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0120 **Imputation Flag for C0120**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0121 **Imputation Flag for C0121**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2070	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	22	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0122 **Imputation Flag for C0122**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2066	98.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	26	1.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0124 **Imputation Flag for C0124**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0126 **Imputation Flag for C0126**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0128 **Imputation Flag for C0128**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2069	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	23	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0130 **Imputation Flag for C0130**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0134 **Imputation Flag for C0134**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0136 **Imputation Flag for C0136**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2073	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	19	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0138 **Imputation Flag for C0138**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0139 **Imputation Flag for C0139**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0140 **Imputation Flag for C0140**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0141 **Imputation Flag for C0141**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2073	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	19	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0142 **Imputation Flag for C0142**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0143 **Imputation Flag for C0143**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2061	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	31	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0144 **Imputation Flag for C0144**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0146 **Imputation Flag for C0146**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0148 **Imputation Flag for C0148**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0150 **Imputation Flag for C0150**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0151 **Imputation Flag for C0151**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0153 **Imputation Flag for C0153**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0155 **Imputation Flag for C0155**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2068	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	24	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0157 **Imputation Flag for C0157**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0158 **Imputation Flag for C0158**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0162 **Imputation Flag for C0162**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2067	98.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	25	1.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0166 **Imputation Flag for C0166**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0169 **Imputation Flag for C0169**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2075	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	17	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0170 **Imputation Flag for C0170**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0173 **Imputation Flag for C0173**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0163 **Imputation Flag for C0163**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0165 **Imputation Flag for C0165**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2082	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	10	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0167 **Imputation Flag for C0167**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2082	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	10	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0174 **Imputation Flag for C0174**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0175 **Imputation Flag for C0175**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2072	99.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	20	1.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0176 **Imputation Flag for C0176**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0177 **Imputation Flag for C0177**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0178 **Imputation Flag for C0178**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0179 **Imputation Flag for C0179**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0180 **Imputation Flag for C0180**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0181 **Imputation Flag for C0181**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0182 **Imputation Flag for C0182**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2075	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	17	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0183 **Imputation Flag for C0183**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0186 **Imputation Flag for C0186**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2073	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	19	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0600 **Imputation Flag for C0600**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2075	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	17	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0602 **Imputation Flag for C0602**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2043	97.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	49	2.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0604 **Imputation Flag for C0604**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2069	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	23	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0606 **Imputation Flag for C0606**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2069	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	23	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0608 **Imputation Flag for C0608**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2069	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	23	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0190 **Imputation Flag for C0190**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0192 **Imputation Flag for C0192**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0194 **Imputation Flag for C0194**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0196 **Imputation Flag for C0196**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0198 **Imputation Flag for C0198**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0200 **Imputation Flag for C0200**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0202 **Imputation Flag for C0202**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0204 **Imputation Flag for C0204**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0206 **Imputation Flag for C0206**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0208 **Imputation Flag for C0208**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0210 **Imputation Flag for C0210**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0212 **Imputation Flag for C0212**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0214 **Imputation Flag for C0214**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0216 **Imputation Flag for C0216**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0218 **Imputation Flag for C0218**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0610 **Imputation Flag for C0610**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2089	99.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	3	0.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0612 **Imputation Flag for C0612**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2055	98.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	37	1.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0614 **Imputation Flag for C0614**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2055	98.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	37	1.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0616 **Imputation Flag for C0616**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2055	98.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	37	1.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0618 **Imputation Flag for C0618**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2054	98.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	38	1.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0620 **Imputation Flag for C0620**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2058	98.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	34	1.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0622 **Imputation Flag for C0622**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2056	98.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	36	1.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0624 **Imputation Flag for C0624**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2056	98.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	36	1.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0626 **Imputation Flag for C0626**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2058	98.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	34	1.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0628 **Imputation Flag for C0628**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2061	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	31	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0630 **Imputation Flag for C0630**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2059	98.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	33	1.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0632 **Imputation Flag for C0632**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2060	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	32	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0634 **Imputation Flag for C0634**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2062	98.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	30	1.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0636 **Imputation Flag for C0636**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2065	98.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	27	1.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0638 **Imputation Flag for C0638**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2062	98.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	30	1.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0640 **Imputation Flag for C0640**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2062	98.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	30	1.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0642 **Imputation Flag for C0642**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2060	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	32	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0644 **Imputation Flag for C0644**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2063	98.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	29	1.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0646 **Imputation Flag for C0646**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2063	98.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	29	1.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0648 **Imputation Flag for C0648**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2059	98.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	33	1.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0650 **Imputation Flag for C0650**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2050	98.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	42	2.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0652 **Imputation Flag for C0652**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2061	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	31	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0654 **Imputation Flag for C0654**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2060	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	32	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0656 **Imputation Flag for C0656**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2060	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	32	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0658 **Imputation Flag for C0658**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2061	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	31	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0660 **Imputation Flag for C0660**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2064	98.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	28	1.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0662 **Imputation Flag for C0662**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1988	95.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	104	5.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0664 **Imputation Flag for C0664**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1953	93.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	139	6.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0666 **Imputation Flag for C0666**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1951	93.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	141	6.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0668 **Imputation Flag for C0668**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1962	93.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	130	6.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0670 **Imputation Flag for C0670**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1939	92.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	153	7.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0672 **Imputation Flag for C0672**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1946	93.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	146	7.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0674 **Imputation Flag for C0674**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2065	98.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	27	1.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0676 **Imputation Flag for C0676**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2059	98.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	33	1.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0678 **Imputation Flag for C0678**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2050	98.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	42	2.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0680 **Imputation Flag for C0680**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2057	98.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	35	1.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0682 **Imputation Flag for C0682**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2064	98.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	28	1.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0684 **Imputation Flag for C0684**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2060	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	32	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0686 **Imputation Flag for C0686**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2061	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	31	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0265 **Imputation Flag for C0265**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0266 **Imputation Flag for C0266**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0267 **Imputation Flag for C0267**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0268 **Imputation Flag for C0268**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2075	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	17	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0269 **Imputation Flag for C0269**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0270 **Imputation Flag for C0270**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0271 **Imputation Flag for C0271**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0272 **Imputation Flag for C0272**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0273 **Imputation Flag for C0273**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0274 **Imputation Flag for C0274**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2073	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	19	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0276 **Imputation Flag for C0276**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0277 **Imputation Flag for C0277**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2073	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	19	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0280 **Imputation Flag for C0280**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2071	99.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	21	1.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0282 **Imputation Flag for C0282**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2076	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	16	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0284 **Imputation Flag for C0284**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2075	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	17	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0286 **Imputation Flag for C0286**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0288 **Imputation Flag for C0288**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2072	99.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	20	1.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0290 **Imputation Flag for C0290**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2073	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	19	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0292 **Imputation Flag for C0292**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0294 **Imputation Flag for C0294**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2071	99.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	21	1.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0296 **Imputation Flag for C0296**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0298 **Imputation Flag for C0298**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2070	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	22	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0300 **Imputation Flag for C0300**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2069	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	23	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0302 **Imputation Flag for C0302**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2072	99.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	20	1.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0304 **Imputation Flag for C0304**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2072	99.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	20	1.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0306 **Imputation Flag for C0306**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0308 **Imputation Flag for C0308**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0688 **Imputation Flag for C0688**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2064	98.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	27	1.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0690 **Imputation Flag for C0690**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2089	99.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	0	0.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	3	0.1
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0374 **Imputation Flag for C0374**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0376 **Imputation Flag for C0376**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0378 **Imputation Flag for C0378**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0380 **Imputation Flag for C0380**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2087	99.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	5	0.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0381 **Imputation Flag for C0381**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2084	99.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	8	0.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0382 **Imputation Flag for C0382**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2086	99.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	6	0.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0383 **Imputation Flag for C0383**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2087	99.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	5	0.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0384 **Imputation Flag for C0384**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2085	99.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	7	0.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0386 **Imputation Flag for C0386**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0389 **Imputation Flag for C0389**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2085	99.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	7	0.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0391 **Imputation Flag for C0391**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2087	99.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	5	0.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0393 **Imputation Flag for C0393**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2085	99.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	7	0.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0390 **Imputation Flag for C0390**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2088	99.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	4	0.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0392 **Imputation Flag for C0392**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2089	99.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	3	0.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0394 **Imputation Flag for C0394**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2074	99.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	18	0.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0396 **Imputation Flag for C0396**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2059	98.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	33	1.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0398 **Imputation Flag for C0398**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0400 **Imputation Flag for C0400**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2087	99.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	5	0.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0402 **Imputation Flag for C0402**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2065	98.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	27	1.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0404 **Imputation Flag for C0404**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2060	98.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	32	1.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0406 **Imputation Flag for C0406**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1993	95.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	98	4.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0408 **Imputation Flag for C0408**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1994	95.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	98	4.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0410 **Imputation Flag for C0410**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2024	96.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	68	3.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0412 **Imputation Flag for C0412**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1925	92.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	166	7.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0414 **Imputation Flag for C0414**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2029	97.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	63	3.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0416 **Imputation Flag for C0416**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2063	98.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	29	1.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0418 **Imputation Flag for C0418**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2071	99.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	21	1.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0420 **Imputation Flag for C0420**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1999	95.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	92	4.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0422 **Imputation Flag for C0422**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2082	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	10	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0424 **Imputation Flag for C0424**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1979	94.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	112	5.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0426 **Imputation Flag for C0426**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2075	99.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	17	0.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0428 **Imputation Flag for C0428**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2043	97.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	49	2.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0430 **Imputation Flag for C0430**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2068	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	24	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0432 **Imputation Flag for C0432**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2051	98.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	40	1.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0434 **Imputation Flag for C0434**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2082	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	10	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0436 **Imputation Flag for C0436**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2024	96.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	67	3.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0438 **Imputation Flag for C0438**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0440 **Imputation Flag for C0440**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2089	99.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	3	0.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0442 **Imputation Flag for C0442**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2065	98.7
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	27	1.3
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0444 **Imputation Flag for C0444**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2038	97.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	54	2.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0446 **Imputation Flag for C0446**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2080	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	12	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0448 **Imputation Flag for C0448**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2033	97.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	58	2.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0450 **Imputation Flag for C0450**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2081	99.5
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	11	0.5
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0452 **Imputation Flag for C0452**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2006	95.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	85	4.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	1	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0454 **Imputation Flag for C0454**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2078	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	14	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0456 **Imputation Flag for C0456**

Distribution:

		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2062	98.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	30	1.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0518 **Imputation Flag for C0518**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2025	96.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	67	3.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0520 **Imputation Flag for C0520**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1974	94.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	113	5.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	5	0.2
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0526 **Imputation Flag for C0526**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2046	97.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	46	2.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0528 **Imputation Flag for C0528**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2048	97.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	44	2.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0532 **Imputation Flag for C0532**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1942	92.8
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	150	7.2
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0534 **Imputation Flag for C0534**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2020	96.6
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	72	3.4
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0536 **Imputation Flag for C0536**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2031	97.1
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	61	2.9
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0538 **Imputation Flag for C0538**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2068	98.9
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	24	1.1
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0560 **Imputation Flag for C0560**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2079	99.4
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	13	0.6
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0562 **Imputation Flag for C0562**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2077	99.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	15	0.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0568 **Imputation Flag for C0568**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2056	98.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	36	1.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0570 **Imputation Flag for C0570**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1952	93.3
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	140	6.7
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0572 **Imputation Flag for C0572**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	1907	91.2
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	164	7.8
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	21	1.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0578 **Imputation Flag for C0578**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2092	100.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	0	0.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

Variable Name: IC0580 **Imputation Flag for C0580**

Distribution:		Frequency	Unweighted Percent
0	Not imputed	2092	100.0
7	Item was imputed by using data from the record for a similar case (donor)	0	0.0
8	Item was imputed by using the mean or mode of data for groups of similar cases	0	0.0
9	Data value was adjusted during analysts' post-imputation review of data	0	0.0
		2092	100.0

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix E: Advance Letter to Principals

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

SSOCS-12(L)
(1-2016)

School Survey On Crime & Safety

SSOCS is endorsed by:
- American Association of School Administrators
- American Federation of Teachers
- American School Counselors Association
- Association for Middle Level Education
- Association of American Educators
- Council of Chief State School Officers
- Education Northwest
- National Association of State Boards of Education
- National Association of Elementary School Principals
- National Association of School Resource Officers
- National Association of Secondary School Principals
- National PTA
- National School Safety Center
- School Safety Advocacy Council
- UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools
- National Association of School Psychologists
- School Social Work Association of America

Data collected by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

Study conducted by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Dear

I am writing to invite you to participate in the 2016 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS). Data collection for this survey is being carried out by the U.S. Census Bureau on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education. SSOCS is a recurring survey that focuses on the frequency of crime and violence in public schools and the programs and practices schools have developed to provide a safe school environment. It provides a unique opportunity to collect national data on crime and safety from the school's perspective. **SSOCS is the only survey of its kind.**

Your response is critical to the success of this study because your school is one of only a small number invited to participate in SSOCS. Your school represents hundreds of similar schools nationwide. Your involvement will only require the completion of a questionnaire. The person most knowledgeable about school crime and school policies to provide a safe environment should complete this survey.

NCES is authorized to conduct this survey by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA; 20 U.S.C., § 9543). Your answers may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law (20 U.S.C., § 9573). Reports of the findings from the survey will not identify participating districts, schools, or staff. Individual responses will be combined with those from other participants to produce summary statistics and reports.

The U.S. Census Bureau will be sending the SSOCS questionnaire to your school next week. If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332. Someone will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Thank you for giving this matter your attention. We look forward to your school's participation in this important data collection effort.

Sincerely,

Peggy G. Carr, Ph. D.
Acting Commissioner
National Center for Education Statistics

Enclosures

WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Appendix F: Principal Cover Letter

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

SSOCS-13(L)
(1-2016)

School Survey On Crime & Safety

SSOCS is endorsed by:
- American Association of School Administrators
- American Federation of Teachers
- American School Counselors Association
- Association for Middle Level Education
- Association of American Educators
- Council of Chief State School Officers
- Education Northwest
- National Association of State Boards of Education
- National Association of Elementary School Principals
- National Association of School Resource Officers
- National Association of Secondary School Principals
- National PTA
- National School Safety Center
- School Safety Advocacy Council
- UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools
- National Association of School Psychologists
- School Social Work Association of America

Data collected by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

Study conducted by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Dear

Last week, I wrote to request your participation in the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), an important national study that collects information about crime and safety in public schools. Data collection for this survey is being carried out by the U.S. Census Bureau on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education.

As we mentioned in our previous letter, SSOCS provides a unique opportunity to collect national data on crime and safety from the school's perspective. We are confident that, with your participation, we can provide data to state and federal agencies about various types of crime and discipline that exist in schools today. Although SSOCS may ask some questions that appear similar to those on other surveys, this survey is not connected to any other state or federal data collection system. **SSOCS is unique in that it provides national estimates of school crime and safety using common definitions across all states**.

NCES is authorized to conduct this survey by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA; 20 U.S.C., § 9543). We realize that data on school crime are highly sensitive, so we want to remind you that information provided as part of this study may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law (20 U.S.C., § 9573). Reports of the findings from the survey will not identify participating districts, schools, or staff. Individual responses will be combined with those from other participants to produce summary statistics and reports.

While your participation in this survey is voluntary and your decision will not affect any benefits or funding you receive from the U.S. Department of Education, we do hope that you will participate in this important national survey.

We would appreciate the return of the questionnaire within two weeks. A postage-paid return envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332. Someone will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Sincerely,

Peggy G. Carr, Ph. D.
Acting Commissioner
National Center for Education Statistics

Enclosures

WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Appendix G: Chief State School Officer Letter

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

SSOCS-11(L)
(1-2016)

School Survey On Crime & Safety

SSOCS is endorsed by:
- American Association of School Administrators
- American Federation of Teachers
- American School Counselors Association
- Association for Middle Level Education
- Association of American Educators
- Council of Chief State School Officers
- Education Northwest
- National Association of State Boards of Education
- National Association of Elementary School Principals
- National Association of School Resource Officers
- National Association of Secondary School Principals
- National PTA
- National School Safety Center
- School Safety Advocacy Council
- UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools
- National Association of School Psychologists
- School Social Work Association of America

Data collected by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

Study conducted by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Dear

The U.S. Census Bureau is collecting data on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education, for an important national study that collects information about crime and safety in public schools from school principals. The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) was previously conducted in the 1999–2000, 2003–04, 2005–06, 2007–08, and 2009–10 school years.

At least one school in your state has been selected to participate in SSOCS. For your information, we are enclosing the materials that are being sent to the school(s), including the letter asking them to participate, the questionnaire, and a brochure describing the survey. This questionnaire is only for your reference; you do not need to take any action regarding this survey.

We recognize that some schools may not want to share information related to crime for fear of receiving negative attention. Please be assured that by federal mandate we are required to protect the identity of all schools included in our survey from public disclosure. NCES is authorized to conduct this survey by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA; 20 U.S.C., § 9543). Information provided as part of this study may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law (20 U.S.C., § 9573). Reports of the findings from the survey will not identify participating districts, schools, or staff. Individual responses will be combined with those from other participants to produce summary statistics and reports.

Though participation in the survey is voluntary, the success of any survey depends on the willingness of those selected to participate. The greater the level of participation, the better our survey data can provide a current picture of the full diversity of situations found across the nation's schools. **We hope that you will encourage the school(s) in your state to participate.**

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–800–221–1204. Someone will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Sincerely,

Peggy G. Carr, Ph. D.
Acting Commissioner
National Center for Education Statistics

Enclosures

WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Appendix H: Superintendent Letter

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

SSOCS-10(L)
(1-2016)

School Survey On Crime & Safety

SSOCS is endorsed by:
- American Association of School Administrators
- American Federation of Teachers
- American School Counselors Association
- Association for Middle Level Education
- Association of American Educators
- Council of Chief State School Officers
- Education Northwest
- National Association of State Boards of Education
- National Association of Elementary School Principals
- National Association of School Resource Officers
- National Association of Secondary School Principals
- National PTA
- National School Safety Center
- School Safety Advocacy Council
- UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools
- National Association of School Psychologists
- School Social Work Association of America

Data collected by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Economics and Statistics Administration
U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

Study conducted by:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Dear Superintendent:

The U.S. Census Bureau is collecting data on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education, for an important national study that collects information about crime and safety in public schools from school principals. The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) was previously conducted in the 1999–2000, 2003–04, 2005–06, 2007–08, and 2009–10 school years.

At least one school in your district has been selected to participate in SSOCS. For your information, we are enclosing the materials that are being sent to the school(s), including the letter asking them to participate, the questionnaire, and a brochure describing the survey. Please do not provide this questionnaire to any school or complete it with district information. This questionnaire is only for your reference; you do not need to take any action regarding this survey.

We recognize that some schools may not want to share information related to crime for fear of receiving negative attention. Please be assured that by federal mandate we are required to protect the identity of all schools included in our survey from public disclosure. NCES is authorized to conduct this survey by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA; 20 U.S.C., § 9543). Information provided as part of this study may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law (20 U.S.C., § 9573). Reports of the findings from the survey will not identify participating districts, schools, or staff. Individual responses will be combined with those from other participants to produce summary statistics and reports.

Though participation in the survey is voluntary, the success of any survey depends on the willingness of those selected to participate. The greater the level of participation, the better our survey data can provide a current picture of the full diversity of situations found across the nation's schools. **We hope that you will encourage the selected school(s) in your district to participate.**

Thank you for your assistance. If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–800–221–1204. Someone will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Sincerely,

Peggy G. Carr, Ph. D.
Acting Commissioner
National Center for Education Statistics

Enclosures

WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Appendix I: Interviewer Self-Study Guide

SCHOOL SURVEY ON CRIME AND SAFETY (SSOCS)

INCOMING CALLS OPERATION

INTERVIEWER SELF STUDY GUIDE

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
	Purpose of the School Survey on Crime & Safety (SSOCS)	3
	Survey Design and Sample Size	3
	SSOCS Telephone Operations	3
II.	CONCEPTS	4
	Challenges Collecting Data from Schools	4
	Special Permission Districts	4
	Late Mail Returns (LMRs)	5
III.	NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND and EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT	5
	SSOCS and NCLB and ESSA	6
IV.	REFUSAL AVERSION AND CONVERSION	6
	Aversion vs. Conversion	6
	Keys to Success	7
V.	MATERIALS	10
VI.	FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS & REFUSAL RESPONSES	11

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the School Survey on Crime & Safety (SSOCS)

The SSOCS is the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) primary source of school-level data on crime and safety. It provides estimates of school crime, discipline, disorder, programs, and policies. The SSOCS questionnaire asks principals to report on a variety of topics related to crime and safety, including the following:

- Characteristics of school policies and procedures;
- School violence prevention programs and practices;
- Use of law enforcement or security services;
- Frequency of criminal incidents at schools;
- Frequency of incidents reported to police or law enforcement;
- Frequency of hate-related and gang-related incidents;
- Disciplinary problems and disciplinary actions;
- Mental health services available to students at school, and
- Other school characteristics related to school crime.

Survey Design and Sample Size

The SSOCS is a nationally representative cross-sectional survey of about 3,550 public elementary and secondary schools. The SSOCS sample is large enough to provide national estimates of all public schools, while taking into account the level of instruction, type of location, and size of the student enrollment.

The SSOCS is a self-administered survey. Paper questionnaires are mailed to school principals and a follow-up of non-respondents is conducted by telephone. The SSOCS is administered towards the end of the school year to allow principals to report the most complete information possible.

For the 2016 SSOCS, an advance e-mail, as well as several e-mail reminders, will be sent to school principals. Therefore, you may receive incoming calls in response to e-mails as well as in response to mailings.

SSOCS Telephone Operations

Incoming calls

Principals or other school staff may call in response to receiving the advance letter or the initial questionnaire package or may call in response to receiving the advance or the reminder e-mail.

Reminder

- Phase 1: The purpose is to remind schools to return their completed SSOCS questionnaire. However, you may complete the questionnaire over the phone at the respondent's request.

- Phase 2: The purpose is still to remind schools to return their completed SSOCS questionnaire; however, you may complete the questionnaire over the phone at the respondent's request.

Non-response Follow-up

The purpose of Non-response Follow-up (NRFU) is to complete the questionnaire over the phone with the respondent.

Failed Edit Follow-up

The purpose of Failed Edit Follow-up (FEFU) is to call schools that have returned the SSOCS questionnaire to verify that their answers to critical questions are correct. This is done when the answer provided falls outside of the expected range or is inconsistent with other answers. During these callbacks, you may also be asking the respondent questions that he/she left blank.

II. CONCEPTS

Challenges Collecting Data from Schools

- Principals have many responsibilities and are pressed for time to take surveys.
- Schools are a heavily studied population – this survey may be one of several that the principal has on his or her desk.
- Schools in many areas have faced budget cuts and have had to reduce personnel. Therefore, school staff members may have more responsibilities than they used to and less time to complete "extra" tasks.
- Media coverage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation has been negative. Some principals may link the SSOCS to the NCLB provision regarding "persistently dangerous schools." See Section III and Frequently Asked Question O.
- Information may be perceived as sensitive, since some respondents may think it reflects negatively on the school.
- Principals often have office staff to screen their calls.

Special Permission Districts

Some school districts must approve the research project before data can be collected at their school(s). Some "special permission" districts were already identified and

research applications were completed in the fall of 2015; however, some additional schools you talk to may notify you that they require "special permission."

If a school staff member calls to tell you that their Local Education Agency (LEA) or School District requires that permission be received to complete the SSOCS, ask who should be contacted at the school district to apply to conduct the SSOCS. Probe for as much information as possible, including contact name, contact phone number, and the type of approval process (e.g., written or verbal application).

Late Mail Returns (LMRs)

Once questionnaires begin to be received, your supervisor will receive a list of completed questionnaires daily. Although you will not be calling schools during this time, and therefore do not need to "pull" LMRs from the workload, respondents may want to verify that their completed questionnaire was received. Use the list of completed questionnaires to verify that their questionnaire was received. If it was not received, let the respondent know that sometimes it takes longer than expected to receive a questionnaire and that we should receive it soon. Some respondents may wish to be alerted when their questionnaire is received. Take their information so that you or another interviewer can contact them when the questionnaire is received. Be sure to thank the respondent for completing and returning the questionnaire.

III. NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND and EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), was replaced by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) on December 10, 2015. You may be asked how the SSOCS relates to either of these acts. Below you will find background information on both so you are better prepared to answer respondent questions about either act.

SSOCS and NCLB and ESSA

The Passage of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994 gave the Department the ability to support drug and violence prevention programs, and included an impact evaluation component and provision for NCES to collect data on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence in elementary and secondary schools. Even with this provision, NCES only collected this data on an ad-hoc basis. It wasn't until the perceived increase in school shootings, including the Columbine shooting in 1999, where it was determined a recurring survey collecting crime and safety data was imperative to inform policy-makers on appropriate policies and programs to implement in schools. In addition to the aforementioned legislation, NCES is authorized to collect this data by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. However, while these are the authoritative legislation that provide us the ability to collect these data, it is important to know this does not mean this collection is mandatory. There may be an assumption that all data collections sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education are mandatory. While some definitely are, especially those under the umbrella of NCLB and the newly reauthorized ESSA, SSOCS is not

under this umbrella. SSOCS does continue to inform the Office of Safe and Healthy Students on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence in schools but is no way a part of any mandatory collection.

SSOCS was previously administered in 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008 and 2010. We anticipate a collection every two years. Information gathered in the SSOCS is confidential and is reported in aggregate to protect the identity of participating schools. Principals can be rest assured that this is also how the data are shared with program offices within the Department, outside of NCES. In addition, schools were not selected to participate in the SSOCS because they were deemed "persistently dangerous" as defined under NCLB. Furthermore, the results of the SSOCS 2016 will not flag participating schools as being "persistently dangerous" as determined by ESSA.

Participating principals may object to filling out the survey because they feel as though they are repeating data reported under the former NCLB mandatory collections sponsored by other offices within the Department, such as the Civil Rights Data Collection. While we are sympathetic to their frustration, the fact remains that we are not privy to these data, and these data are collected on a later schedule than SSOCS, which does not meet the needs of researchers needing this data to inform program evaluations and policy-related decisions. It is important to stress to responding principals that not only is the SSOCS an important survey, it is the only national survey of its kind. Rather than relying on states to define certain crimes, the SSOCS uses common definitions across states to produce national estimates of school crime. Principals participating in 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008 and 2010 reported that they found the survey to be helpful because it allowed them to reflect upon incidents of crime and safety and direct policies and programs designed to prevent them. We realize that principals may see our survey as another nuisance in this era of standards and evaluation, but we believe good research can drive good policy. The SSOCS is therefore in the best interest of participating schools because it allows their particular experiences to be recorded, in aggregate, for researchers and policy-makers who will determine the next generation of education legislation.

IV. REFUSAL AVERSION AND CONVERSION

Aversion vs. Conversion

Refusal Aversion is the process by which the general interviewing staff AVOIDS refusals with a respondent by practicing good interviewing skills and exhibiting a high degree of professionalism.

Refusal Conversion involves contacting cases we have already had contact with, who have refused to participate in the study. When we contact these cases, we will be attempting to complete interviews with them and "convert" their refusal through persuasion, active listening techniques, or addressing concerns they may have about participation in the study.

Studies have shown that the longer an interviewer can keep a respondent on the phone, the higher the chances of obtaining a complete interview.

Keys to Success

There are many reasons that a respondent may refuse to participate. They may not understand what we are doing or how important the survey is, we may have caught them at a 'bad time' when they are unable or unwilling to speak, or maybe they are simply exercising their right to refuse. If you can determine why they are reluctant to participate you will increase your chance at conversion.

- **The first key to success is strong communication skills.** Pretend you're having a conversation with the respondent. Maintain a tone of confidence in your work and good will towards the person. Watch your delivery and avoid sounding mechanical at all costs. Listen carefully for the respondent's tone, mood, and disposition, and try to vary your tone accordingly. If the person sounds abrupt and cold, use a calm but business-like tone. If the person sounds timid and unsure, use a relaxed, friendly, warm tone. If he/she sounds rushed, speed up a little. If he/she sounds like he/she is used to taking his/her time, slow down. **Refusal converters who can vary their tone to match the demeanor of the respondent obtain a higher number of completes and fewer refusals.** Without the ability to think quickly and respond with a well thought out, professional response that is warm and courteous, you will not convince the respondent to participate. Have confidence! Be sincere! Listen! You cannot fake these skills. Believe in your ability to convert and you will be surprised at your success rate.

- **The second key to success is project knowledge.** Possession of thorough and complete knowledge of the study's goals and objectives is vital. Without it, you will be ill prepared to alleviate your respondent's fears and answer their questions.

- **The third key to success is knowledge of the case history.** Prior to calling a case, develop a strategy based upon the information contained in the Call Record and Comments Section (pertains to the Reminder and NRFU operations). If appropriate, acknowledge that we've called before with, "Recently we called you about this study. . ." If the comments indicate a specific reason for the refusal, be prepared to address this issue before you dial the case. If the respondent was concerned about solicitations, say "We are not selling anything." in the introduction. If necessary, review the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) and Refusal Responses to determine which answers you are likely to need to convert the case.

- **The fourth key to success is the ability to 'think on your feet'.** Averting a respondent's refusal during the initial call is more effective than attempting

to convert the respondent later. During refusal conversion, respondents may feel pressured because we are calling back to try to gain their cooperation. Because of this, they may throw out comments and questions from all directions, and you have to gracefully field every one, while staying relaxed and confident. Stay focused and be prepared to think quickly and clearly of the most important thing to say to that respondent on the issues they have raised. Avoid the habit of saying the same thing to every respondent.

- **Respond only to issues the respondent has raised.** This is a very easy rule to remember, but often difficult to follow. If you respond to issues that have not been raised, you are giving your respondent additional ammunition. For example, if the respondent states that they do not have time, it will not help to explain that answers will be kept in confidence.

    - Sometimes, however, it is helpful to be proactive in sharing information with a respondent. If you sense that they are getting bored, it may be helpful to assure them that the survey is almost done. If the respondent sounds hesitant, tell them a little more about why they are important. A few words of encouragement will go a long way.

    - Either way, immediately return to reading the survey questions after answering a respondent's question or giving a rebuttal. YOU are in control of the interview and it is more effective to assertively move forward than to passively wait for an indication that it is okay to continue.

- **As with customer service, the respondent is always right.** Do not argue with a respondent or lose your composure. Know when to accept a refusal. Never hang up on respondents, even if they are being abusive, without first thanking them for their time. Always conduct yourself in a professional, courteous manner regardless of how the respondent is treating you. There are no exceptions to this rule.

- **Know when it's over**. If the respondent understands the reason for the call and insists that they do not want to participate and you have given your best effort at a strong conversion attempt, let it go. Do not force the issue and anger the respondent. Always remember that participation is voluntary. Refusal converters do not make respondents feel coerced into providing information. Every respondent has a right to refuse to participate in the study or to refuse to answer any question in the study.

- **Persuasion is a must.** Remind yourself on every call to focus on what each respondent may need to know about the study in order to feel good about participating. Conversion is most effective when you believe you can persuade the respondent to participate. Make conversion a conversation as

often as possible—you and the respondent discussing a worthwhile goal you can only accomplish if you work together.

  - You need to convince the respondent that they want to do the survey. Don't tell them that it is an important study; you should already be conveying this in your tone and demeanor. Tell them why the study is important and what they will gain from participating (see FAQ H and T). Tell them what the problem is that the study is addressing and how they will be part of the solution. Tell them many people find the survey interesting and enjoy doing it.

  - Pay attention to which bits of information are most effective at converting respondents. With practice you will find what works best for you, but don't be afraid to try a new tactic.

- **Countering refusals requires calm and understanding.** As you listen to your respondent, be aware of not only the words, but also the intensity of voice, pace of words, and tonal expression. Rather than jumping in with your rebuttal and appearing aggressive or rude, take it slowly and calmly. Let respondents say what they have to say without interrupting them, then retreat with a positive tone, recognizing the respondent's objections. Warmth and courtesy go a very long way!

- **Be ready to probe for the reason they refused.** The most difficult refusal is the respondent who 'just doesn't want to.' Perhaps this person cannot think of a good reason to decline, or maybe the respondent understands that participation is voluntary and is exercising the right to refuse. It is nearly impossible to counter a 'no reason' with a reasonable reply. Don't be afraid to speak to your respondent conversationally. They are only human and the worst that can happen is they will say no. Talk to them and find out why they do not want to participate.

- **Be prepared to listen.** Good listening skills are important for conducting good interviews. It is doubly important that these skills are used when gaining respondent cooperation. Actively listen to what the respondent is saying in words and in tone. Active listening means that you hear and remember what the respondent said in such detail you could write it down or repeat it back if necessary. Listen carefully to everything the respondent has to say, acknowledge that the respondent raised many issues, then start with the one that seems most important.

  To let the respondent know you are sincerely listening, an effective measure is to rephrase and repeat back what you heard:

- "I understand that you are busy; we could call you back at another time when it is more convenient for you, or we can start the interview now. I'll move through the questions as quickly as possible."
- "I understand that you are concerned about confidentiality, however, I can assure you that confidentiality is mandated by law."

- **Vary your tone to match the demeanor of the respondent.** Listen carefully for the respondent's tone, mood, and disposition, and try to vary your tone accordingly.

  - If the person sounds abrupt and cold, use a calm but business like tone.
  - If the person sounds timid and unsure, use a relaxed, friendly, warm tone.
  - If the person sounds rushed, speed up a little.
  - If the person sounds like they are taking their time, slow down a little.

  You will have fewer refusals and more completes if you can work with the respondent.

- **Use the resources available to you.** We have numerous ways in which a respondent can verify that the study is legitimate and an important survey, for example, the respondent may call headquarters at 1-800-221-1204 or visit the survey website at **http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs/**. A respondent who is reluctant to participate may change their mind when they can confirm legitimacy and call us. Sometimes, just offering all the sources of legitimacy is enough to convince them that we are!

- **Leave good comments.** Writing detailed, accurate comments on each call informs and prepares other interviewers who may deal with that case next and it properly documents what happened when you called.

V. MATERIALS

- Copies of the correspondence sent to schools (SSOCS-10(L), SSOCS-11(L), SSOCS-12(L)/SSOCS-12(L)S, SSOCS-13(L), and SSOCS-13(I)) are also included in your training packet.

- Pencils

- Frequently Asked Questions and Refusal Responses (see Section VI; this will also be provided as a Job Aid).

- Call Log: You will receive a call log for recording information about each incoming call.

VI. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS & REFUSAL RESPONSES

A. Why did our school get selected?

From all the public schools in the United States, we selected a random stratified sample of about 3,550 schools that represent the nation for the 2016 School Survey on Crime and Safety. Your school happened to be one of those selected. Your responses will represent schools with similar demographics that were not selected for the survey.

B. What kinds of questions does the School Survey on Crime & Safety ask?

- Frequency and types of crimes at schools, including homicide, rape, sexual battery, attacks with or without weapons, robbery, theft, and vandalism;
- Frequency and types of disciplinary actions such as expulsions, transfers, and suspensions for selected offenses;
- Perceptions of other disciplinary problems such as bullying, verbal abuse, and disorder in the classroom;
- Description of school policies and programs concerning crime and safety;
- Description of the pervasiveness of student and teacher involvement in efforts that are intended to prevent or reduce school violence;
- Mental health services available to students at school; and
- General school characteristics.

C. What is the purpose of this survey?

The SSOCS is the primary source of school-level data on crime and safety for the U.S. Department of Education. This study collects information on school crime and safety from school principals in elementary and secondary schools across the United States. As an ongoing survey, the SSOCS measures changes over time on key issues.

Gathering this information will help schools compare their policies and programs to schools nationwide. It will also help researchers and policymakers identify trends in crime and safety issues across time and identify emerging problems or issues.

D. Why should I participate in this survey?

Although this is a voluntary survey, your cooperation is essential to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely. Policymakers and educational leaders rely on data from this survey to inform their decisions concerning school programs and policies to reduce crime. Since it is a sample survey, your responses represent the responses of many schools that serve

similar student populations. Higher response rates give us confidence that the findings are accurate.

E. Who is conducting this survey?

The U.S. Census Bureau is conducting this survey for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The NCES, Institute of Education Sciences, sponsors the survey under the authority of Title I, Part E, Sections 151(b) and 153(a) of Public Law 107-279, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002. Participation is voluntary. The U.S. Census Bureau performs the work under the authority of Title 15, United States Code, Section 1525.

As part of the Department of Education, the National Center for Education Statistics fulfills a Congressional mandate to:

- Collect, collate, analyze and report complete statistics on the condition of American education;
- Conduct and publish reports; and
- Review and report on education activities internationally.

F. Will my responses be kept confidential?

I can assure you that no identifying information will be used by anyone besides those working on the School Survey on Crime and Safety project. The results from the survey will only be reported as combined totals across the thousands of schools who answer the survey, never as individual results.

Your answers may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law [Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA 2002) 20 U.S.C., § 9573]. Reports of the findings from the survey will not identify participating districts, schools, or staff. Individual responses will be combined with those from other participants to produce summary statistics and reports.

G. How will my information be reported?

The information you provide will be combined with the information provided by others in statistical reports. No individual data that links your name, address, or telephone number will be included in the statistical reports.

H. How will these data be used?

These data are being collected for the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Results from the study will be used to increase knowledge of policies and programs schools use to address school crime and safety. Results will also show comparisons on crime and safety data across time from the 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008 and 2010 surveys.

Summary data from the study will be placed into a public-use dataset for researchers and policy makers. The dataset is rigorously tested prior to release to ensure no individual schools can be identified.

Reports will be published based on the SSOCS data. You will be able to compare your school's problems and policies with those of schools that are similar to yours.

I. How often is the SSOCS administered?

The SSOCS was administered in the spring of the 1999-2000, 2003-04, 2005-06, 2007-08 and 2009-2010 school years. The SSOCS will now be administered every two years.

J. Where can I see the results of the SSOCS?

Downloadable reports from the 1999-2000, 2003-04, 2005-06, 2007-08 and 2009-10 collection of the SSOCS such as Crime and Safety in America's Public Schools: Selected Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety are available at http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs. Also included on the website is a table library with hundreds of tables that provide estimates on school crime and violence by selected school and student characteristics.

K. How do I know this survey is legitimate?

I understand your concern. I am conducting this survey on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Did you receive a letter from the NCES? An advance letter and the questionnaire were sent to explain the survey. We can send you another questionnaire package if you didn't receive it.

You can verify the legitimacy of our survey or to find out more information on the survey's website at www.nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs.

L. Has the survey been endorsed by any professional organizations?

Yes! The School Survey on Crime and Safety has been endorsed by:

- The National PTA
- The Council of Chief State School Officers
- The National Association of School Resource Officers

As well as:

- The American Association of School Administrators
- The American Federation of Teachers
- The American School Counselors Association
- The Association of Middle Level Education
- The Association of American Educators
- Education Northwest (formerly the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory)
- The National Association of Elementary School Principals
- The National Association of Secondary School Principals
- The National Association of State Boards of Education
- The National School Safety Center
- The School Safety Advocacy Council
- UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools
- National Association of School Psychologists
- School Social Work Association of America

M. How long will the survey take to complete?

The length of the survey will depend on the characteristics of your school, but for most people it will take about 52 minutes to complete. That time includes time spent filling out the survey itself, as well as referring to additional information sources for the information requested.

N. What information was sent to us?

- On February 16th, your school was mailed an advance letter describing the study.
- On February 22nd, the questionnaire was sent via FedEx, addressed to the Principal.
- A packet of information about the study was mailed to your District Superintendent and the Chief State School Officer.

O. What is the relationship between the SSOCS and the former No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) or the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)?

The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) is NOT related to former No Child Left Behind of 2001 (NCLB) or to the new Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The data for both the SSOCS and NCLB/ESSA are reported to the U.S. Department of Education, so you may see similar types of questions, but they are not the same questions.

Each state decides how information will be organized for ESSA and states may define terms differently. Therefore, it would be impossible to compare these data at a national level. SSOCS, on the other hand, uses standard definitions across states to create national estimates of school crime and the programs aimed at reducing school crime.

The information your school reports will NOT be given to your school district or your state board of education.

P. Can I complete the questionnaire over the phone?

Prior to Reminder Phase 1: We will be conducting interviews over the phone beginning March 17th. We'll be happy to call you then to conduct the interview with you. Is there a day and time when it would be convenient for us to call you?

During Reminder: Yes, we can complete the interview now.

Interviewer: Record respondent name, and the appointment day and time; continue to answer respondent's questions. Refer the case to your supervisor after call.

Q. I don't want to buy anything.

I assure you we are not trying to sell anything. We are conducting a survey to help the National Center for Education Statistics gather information about school crime and safety across the United States. No information that identifies you or your school will ever be given to any company that is trying to sell products or services to you.

In fact, no information about you will be given to anyone besides the National Center for Education Statistics.

R. This is not a good time!

I apologize for the inconvenience. We can schedule a better time to call you back. When would be a more convenient day and time for us to reach you?

Is there a direct line I can reach you at?

S. I'm not interested / I'm too busy. / We do not want to participate we are too busy/we take part in so many other studies!

We understand how overloaded schools are and that you probably get a lot of surveys in the mail. However, this is the fifth round of a national study to collect data on school crime and safety. The data from this study will help us in developing a national understanding of crime and safety issues, which rank among the most critical issues faced by U.S. schools.

Because providing a safe, disciplined environment is a key responsibility of our school systems, researchers and policymakers need an accurate picture of crime and safety issues at public schools across the country.

I understand that your time is limited. However, the data you provide represents other schools in the nation that serve similar student populations and your participation ensures we get an accurate picture for schools like yours across the country.

T. I don't see the importance of this survey!

Measuring the extent of school crime is important for many reasons. The safety of students and teachers is a primary concern, but the nature and frequency of school crime have other important implications, as well. Safety and discipline are necessary for effective education. In order to learn, students need a secure environment where they can concentrate on their studies. Dealing with school crime requires school resources. Gathering this information should help researchers and policymakers devise strategies to address these problems in our schools.

U. We're an elementary school, none of these crimes happen here. Why do we need to fill this out?

Even if your school has little to no crime, your responses are important. They aid us in creating an accurate picture of the incidences of school crime in all levels of instruction across the nation. Without your responses, the crime level will appear greater than it actually is. We need to describe the policies and practices of ALL kinds of schools, rather than just large secondary schools where these types of crimes may occur.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix J: Reminder and Non-Response Follow-UP Operation Interviewer Self Study Guide

SCHOOL SURVEY ON CRIME AND SAFETY (SSOCS)

REMINDER AND NON-RESPONSE FOLLOW-UP OPERATION

INTERVIEWER SELF STUDY GUIDE

I. INTRODUCTION 3
Purpose of the School Survey on Crime & Safety (SSOCS) 3
Survey Design and Sample Size 3
SSOCS Telephone Operations 3
II. CONCEPTS 5
Challenges Collecting Data from Schools 5
Special Permission Districts 5
Late Mail Returns (LMRs) 5
III. NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND AND EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT 6
SSOCS, NCLB and ESSA 6
Confidentiality 6
Benefits of Participating 7
IV. REFUSAL AVERSION AND CONVERSION 7
Aversion vs. Conversion 7
Keys to Success 7
V. COMPLETING THE SSOCS-26 10
Materials 10
Form Overview 11
Call Guidelines 13
Making the Call 13
VI. THE SSOCS-1 INTERVIEW COMPLETED VIA THE TELEPHONE 16
VII. SETTING OUTCOME CODES 16
VIII. CALL OUTCOMES 18
IX. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS & REFUSAL RESPONSES 20
X. FINAL REVIEW EXERCISES 26

NOTE: If you worked on the SSOCS Incoming Calls Operation, you do not need to thoroughly read sections I through IV as this information was covered in the SSOCS Incoming Calls Operation Self Study Guide. Instead, you should skim this information to refresh your memory. You may also need to refer to these sections when completing the Final Review Exercises.

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the School Survey on Crime & Safety (SSOCS)

The SSOCS is the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) primary source of school-level data on crime and safety. SSOCS was previously administered in 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010. We anticipate a collection every two years. SSOCS provides estimates of school crime, discipline, disorder, and programs and policies that the school implements to promote a safe environment. The SSOCS questionnaire asks principals to report on a variety of topics related to crime and safety, including the following:

- Characteristics of school policies and procedures;
- School violence prevention programs and practices;
- Use of law enforcement or security staff;
- Frequency of criminal incidents at schools;
- Frequency of incidents reported to police or law enforcement;
- Frequency of hate-related incidents;
- Disciplinary problems and disciplinary actions;
- Mental health services available to students at school; and
- Other school characteristics related to school crime.

Survey Design and Sample Size

The SSOCS is a nationally representative cross-sectional survey of about 3,550 public elementary and secondary schools. The SSOCS sample is large enough to provide national estimates of all public schools, while taking into account the level of instruction, type of location, and size of the student enrollment.

The SSOCS is a self-administered survey. Paper questionnaires are mailed to school principals and a follow-up of non-respondents is conducted by telephone. The SSOCS is administered towards the end of the school year to allow principals to report the most complete information possible.

For the 2016 SSOCS, an advance e-mail, as well as several e-mail reminders, will be sent to school principals. Therefore, you may receive incoming calls in response to e-mails as well as in response to mailings.

SSOCS Telephone Operations

Incoming calls

Principals or other school staff may call in response to receiving the advance letter, the initial questionnaire package, the advance email, or reminder e-mail.

Reminder Calls

The purpose is to remind schools to return their completed SSOCS questionnaire. You may complete the questionnaire over the phone at the respondent's request. Do not offer this option. We would prefer that the respondent complete and return the questionnaire by mail.

Non-response Follow-up Calls

The purpose of Non-response Follow-up (NRFU) is to complete the questionnaire over the phone with the respondent.

Failed Edit Follow-up Calls

The purpose of Failed Edit Follow-up (FEFU) is to call schools that have returned the SSOCS questionnaire to verify that their answers to critical questions are correct. This is done when the answer provided falls outside of the expected range or is inconsistent with other answers. During these callbacks, you may also be asking the respondent questions that he/she left blank.

Data collection schedule

Data collection activity	Date
Mail advance letter to school principals	2/16
Send advance e-mail to principals	2/22
Fedex initial package containing a letter, questionnaire, brochure, and pen to schools	2/22
Follow-up e-mail to all principals	3/9
Reminder operation phase 1	3/14 - 4/1
E-mail reminder	3/23
E-mail reminder and thank you email to responding schools	4/6
Second mailout to nonresponding schools not reached during phase 1 of the Reminder	4/18
Reminder operation phase 2	4/18 - 4/22
E-mail reminder	4/27
Failed edit follow-up	5/3 - 6/13
Non-response follow-up	5/9 - 6/10
E-mail reminder	5/18
E-mail reminder	6/6

II. CONCEPTS

Challenges Collecting Data from Schools

- Principals have many responsibilities and are pressed for time to take surveys.
- Schools are a heavily studied population – this survey may be one of several that the principal has on his or her desk.
- Schools in many areas have faced budget cuts and have had to reduce personnel. Therefore, school staff members may have more responsibilities than they used to and less time to complete "extra" tasks.
- Schools may link the SSOCS to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) legislation. See Section III and Frequently Asked Question O for more information on NCLB and ESSA.
- Information may be perceived as sensitive, since some respondents may think it reflects negatively on the school.
- Principals often have office staff to screen their calls.

Special Permission Districts

Some school districts must approve the research project before data can be collected at their school(s). Some "special permission" districts were already identified and research applications were completed in the fall of 2015; however, some additional schools you talk to may notify you that they require "special permission."

If a school staff member tells you that their Local Education Agency (LEA) or school district requires that permission be received to complete the SSOCS, ask who should be contacted at the school district to apply to conduct the SSOCS. Probe for as much information as possible, including contact name, contact phone number, and the type of approval process (e.g., written or verbal application). Note that if we are already aware that this school is part of a special district, that information will be provided on the cover page of the SSOCS-26 form.

Late Mail Returns (LMRs)

Your supervisor will receive a list of completed questionnaires daily. SSOCS-26 forms for schools that have returned a completed questionnaire will be pulled from the workload. You may still receive incoming calls from respondents who wish to verify that their completed questionnaire was received. Use the list of completed questionnaires to verify that their questionnaire was received. If it was not received, let the respondent know that sometimes it takes longer than expected to receive a questionnaire, and that we should receive it soon. Some respondents may wish to be alerted when their questionnaire is received. Take their information so that you or another interviewer can contact them when the questionnaire is received. Be sure to thank the respondent for completing and returning the questionnaire.

III. NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND AND EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), was replaced by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) on December 10, 2015. You may be asked how the SSOCS relates to either or both of these acts. Below you will find background information on both acts so you are better prepared to answer respondent questions about either act.

SSOCS, NCLB and ESSA

The passage of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994 gave the Department of Education the ability to support drug and violence prevention programs. It also included an impact evaluation component and provision for NCES to collect data on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence in elementary and secondary schools. Even with this provision, NCES only collected this data on an ad-hoc basis. It wasn't until the perceived increase in school shootings, including the Columbine shooting in 1999, that it was determined a recurring survey collecting crime and safety data was imperative to inform policy-makers on appropriate policies and programs to implement in schools. In addition to the aforementioned legislation, NCES is authorized to collect this data by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002.

However, while these two acts are the authoritative legislation that provide NCES the ability to collect these data, it is important to know this does not mean the SSOCS collection is a mandatory data collection. There may be an assumption that all data collections sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education are mandatory. While some are, especially those under the umbrella of NCLB and the newly reauthorized ESSA, SSOCS is not under this umbrella. SSOCS does continue to inform the Office of Safe and Healthy Students on the frequency, seriousness, and incidence of violence in schools but is no way a part of any mandatory collection.

Participating principals may object to filling out the survey because they feel as though they are repeating data reported under the former NCLB mandatory collections sponsored by other offices within the Department of Education, such as the Civil Rights Data Collection. While we are sympathetic to their frustration, the fact remains that we are not privy to these data, and these data are collected on a later schedule than SSOCS, which does not meet the needs of researchers using this data to inform program evaluations and policy-related decisions.

It is important to stress to responding principals that not only is the SSOCS an important survey, it is the only national survey of its kind. Rather than relying on states to define certain crimes, the SSOCS uses common definitions across states to produce national estimates of school crime.

Confidentiality

Information gathered in the SSOCS is confidential and is reported in aggregate to protect the identity of participating schools. Principals can be rest assured that this is also how

the data are shared with program offices within the U. S. Department of Education, outside of NCES.

In addition, schools were not selected to participate in the SSOCS because they were deemed "persistently dangerous" as defined under NCLB. Furthermore, the results of the SSOCS 2016 will not flag participating schools as being "persistently dangerous" as determined by ESSA.

Benefits of Participating

Principals participating in the 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010 administrations reported that they found the survey to be helpful because it allowed them to reflect upon incidents of crime and safety at their school and to direct policies and programs designed to prevent them. We realize that principals may see our survey as another nuisance in this era of standards and evaluation, but we believe good research can drive good policy. The SSOCS is therefore in the best interest of participating schools because it allows their particular experiences to be recorded, in aggregate, for researchers and policy-makers who will determine the next generation of education legislation.

IV. REFUSAL AVERSION AND CONVERSION

Aversion vs. Conversion

Refusal Aversion is the process by which the general interviewing staff AVOIDS refusals with a respondent by practicing good interviewing skills and exhibiting a high degree of professionalism.

Refusal Conversion involves contacting cases we have already had contact with who have refused to participate in the study. When we contact these cases, we will be attempting to complete interviews with them and "convert" their refusal through persuasion, active listening techniques, or addressing concerns they may have about participation in the study.

Studies have shown that the longer an interviewer can keep a respondent on the phone, the higher the chances of obtaining a complete interview.

Keys to Success

There are many reasons that a respondent may refuse to participate. They may not understand what we are doing or how important the survey is, we may have caught them at a 'bad time' when they are unable or unwilling to speak, or maybe they are simply exercising their right to refuse. If you can determine why they are reluctant to participate you will increase your chance at conversion.

- **The first key to success is strong communication skills.** Pretend you're having a conversation with the respondent. Maintain a tone of confidence in your work

and good will towards the person. Watch your delivery and avoid sounding mechanical at all costs.

Vary your tone to match the demeanor of the respondent. Listen carefully for the respondent's tone, mood, and disposition, and try to vary your tone accordingly.

- If the person sounds abrupt and cold, use a calm but business like tone.
- If the person sounds timid and unsure, use a relaxed, friendly, warm tone.
- If the person sounds rushed, speed up a little.
- If the person sounds like they are taking their time, slow down a little.

You will have fewer refusals and more completes if you can work with the respondent.

Refusal converters who can vary their tone to match the demeanor of the respondent obtain a higher number of completes and fewer refusals. Without the ability to think quickly and respond with a well-thought-out, professional response that is warm and courteous, you will not convince the respondent to participate. Have confidence! Be sincere! Listen! You cannot fake these skills. Believe in your ability to convert, and you will be surprised at your success rate.

- **The second key to success is <u>project knowledge</u>.** Possession of <u>thorough</u> and <u>complete</u> knowledge of the study's goals and objectives is vital. Without it, you will be ill prepared to alleviate your respondents' fears and answer their questions.

- **The third key to success is <u>knowledge of the case history</u>.** Prior to calling a case, develop a strategy based upon the information contained in the Call Record and Comments Section. If appropriate, acknowledge that we've called before with, "Recently we called you about this study. . ." If the comments indicate a specific reason for the refusal, be prepared to address this issue before you dial the case. If the respondent was concerned about solicitations, say "We are not selling anything." in the introduction. If necessary, review the Frequently Asked Questions and Refusal Responses to determine which answers you are likely to need to convert the case.

- **The fourth key to success is <u>the ability to 'think on your feet'</u>.** Averting a respondent's refusal during the initial call is more effective than attempting to convert the respondent later. During refusal conversion, respondents may feel pressured because we are calling back to try to gain their cooperation. Because of this, they may throw out comments and questions from all directions, and you have to gracefully field every one, while staying relaxed and confident. Stay focused and be prepared to think quickly and clearly of the most important thing to say to that respondent on the issues they have raised. Avoid the habit of saying the same thing to every respondent.

- **Respond only to issues the respondent has raised.** This is a very easy rule to remember, but often difficult to follow. If you respond to issues that have not been raised, you are giving your respondent additional ammunition. For example, if the respondent states that they do not have time, it will not help to explain that answers will be kept in confidence.

- **As with customer service, the respondent is always right.** Do not argue with a respondent or lose your composure. Know when to accept a refusal. Never hang up on respondents, even if they are being abusive, without first thanking them for their time. Always conduct yourself in a professional, courteous manner regardless of how the respondent is treating you. There are no exceptions to this rule.

- **Know when it's over**. If the respondent understands the reason for the call and insists that they do not want to participate and you have given your best effort at a strong conversion attempt, let it go. Do not force the issue and anger the respondent. Always remember that participation is voluntary. Refusal converters do not make respondents feel coerced into providing information. Every respondent has a right to refuse to participate in the study or to refuse to answer any question in the study.

- **Persuasion is a must.** Remind yourself on every call to focus on what each respondent may need to know about the study in order to feel good about participating. Conversion is most effective when you believe you can persuade the respondent to participate. Make conversion a conversation as often as possible—you and the respondent discussing a worthwhile goal you can only accomplish if you work together.

    - You need to convince the respondent that they want to do the survey. Don't tell them that it is an important study; you should already be conveying this in your tone and demeanor. Tell them why the study is important and what they will gain from participating (see FAQ H, T, and U). Tell them what the problem is that the study is addressing and how they will be part of the solution. Tell them many people find the survey interesting and enjoy doing it.

    - Pay attention to which bits of information are most effective at converting respondents. With practice you will find what works best for you, but don't be afraid to try a new tactic.

- **Countering refusals requires calm and understanding.** As you listen to your respondent, be aware of not only the words, but also the intensity of voice, pace of words, and tonal expression. Rather than jumping in with your rebuttal and appearing aggressive or rude, take it slowly and calmly. Let respondents say what they have to say without interrupting them, then retreat with a positive tone,

recognizing the respondent's objections. Warmth and courtesy go a very long way!

- **Be ready to probe for the reason they refused.** The most difficult refusal is the respondent who 'just doesn't want to.' Perhaps this person cannot think of a good reason to decline, or maybe the respondent understands that participation is voluntary and is exercising the right to refuse. It is nearly impossible to counter a 'no reason' with a reasonable reply. Don't be afraid to speak to your respondent conversationally. They are only human and the worst that can happen is they will say no. Talk to them and find out why they do not want to participate.

- **Be prepared to listen.** Good listening skills are important for conducting good interviews. It is doubly important that these skills are used when gaining respondent cooperation. Actively listen to what the respondent is saying in words and in tone. Active listening means that you hear and remember what the respondent said in such detail you could write it down or repeat it back if necessary. Listen carefully to everything the respondent has to say, acknowledge that the respondent raised many issues, then start with the one that seems most important.

  To let the respondent know you are sincerely listening, an effective measure is to rephrase and repeat back what you heard. For example, you might say the following:

  - "I understand that you are busy; we could call you back at another time when it is more convenient for you, or we can start the interview now. I'll move through the questions as quickly as possible."
  - "I understand that you are concerned about confidentiality, however, I can assure you that confidentiality is mandated by law."

- **Use the resources available to you.** We have numerous ways in which a respondent can verify that the study is legitimate and an important survey; for example, the respondent may call headquarters at 1-800-221-1204 or visit the survey website at **http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs/**. A respondent who is reluctant to participate may change their mind when they can confirm legitimacy. Sometimes, just offering all the sources of legitimacy is enough to convince them that we are!

- **Leave good comments.** Writing detailed, accurate comments on each call informs and prepares other interviewers who may deal with that case next, and it properly documents what happened when you called.

V. COMPLETING THE SSOCS-26

Materials

- SSOCS-26 Form

    - You will receive a preprinted SSOCS-26 form for each school. To make the form easier to use, the school name, principal name (if available), and address information are printed within the text of the questions. Each form provides the script and GO TO instructions you will need for contacting the school, interviewing a knowledgeable respondent, and documenting the call outcome.

    - A copy of the SSOCS-26 is included in your training packet.

- Copies of the correspondence sent to schools (SSOCS-10(L), SSOCS-11(L), SSOCS-12(L)/SSOCS-12(L)S, SSOCS-13(L), and SSOCS-13(I)) were provided as part of the training package for the Incoming Call Operation. Request copies of the correspondence if you do not have copies. The text that was used in the advance e-mail, as well as dates and planned text of the follow-up e-mails and letters that will be sent to nonrespondents, will be provided for your reference.

- Pencils

- Frequently Asked Questions and Refusal Responses (see Section IX, beginning on page 20; this will also be provided as a Job Aid)

- Call Outcome Codes (see Section VIII, beginning on page 18; this will also be provided as a Job Aid)

- Call Log from the Incoming Calls Operation – a call log may be attached to some of the SSOCS-26 forms OR notes may have been copied from the Call Log to the notes section of the SSOCS-26.

Form Overview

The SSOCS-26 form will be used for the Reminder and Non-response Follow-up (NRFU) operations. This will enable you to always have the most up-to-date information for the case.

During the first phase of the Reminder operation, you will complete section A and either section B, C, or D. You may also complete section H or section I if the respondent refuses or tells you that they need their school district's/local education agency's (LEA) approval prior to completing the survey.

- In section A, you will verify you have reached the correct school, verify the school's physical address, and introduce the survey. If we do NOT have the principal's name and e-mail address, you will ask for this information.

You will also verify that the school received the questionnaire (questionnaires were FedExed on 2/22/16). If the principal tells you he/she has the questionnaire, probe for the status of the questionnaire. We requested the completed form by March 17th. The status of the questionnaire determines the path you will take in the form.

- If the respondent isn't sure whether they received the questionnaire, but offers to check with other staff members, you will go to item A12, and tell the respondent you will call him/her the next day to follow-up.

- If the respondent tells you that he/she (or the principal) completed and mailed the questionnaire, you will go to section B. In section B, you will ask when the questionnaire was mailed and thank the respondent for their participation.

- If the respondent tells you that he/she (or the principal) is working on the questionnaire or received it, but hasn't started working on it yet, you will go to section C. In section C, you will encourage the respondent to participate and ask for an estimated mailing date.

- If the respondent did not receive the questionnaire, or if it was received but later misplaced, you will go to section D. In section D, you will let the respondent know that we will send them a replacement questionnaire, find out to whose attention we should address the replacement questionnaire, and ask for an estimated mailing date (based on receiving the questionnaire the following week).

- If the respondent refuses to participate in the survey, you will go to section H and attempt to convince the respondent to participate.

- If at any point in the interview the respondent says that their district requires approval prior to their completing the questionnaire, you will go to section I and follow the appropriate path for their district's approval status. The district approval status is printed on the cover of the SSOCS-26 form.

During phase 2 of the Reminder operation, you will use the outcome of phase 1 of the Reminder operation to determine which section of the SSOCS-26 to use (section E, F, or G). You may also use sections D, H, or I if the respondent needs a replacement questionnaire, refuses, or tells you that they need their district's/LEA's approval.

- If you completed section *B. Completed and Mailed* during phase 1 of the Reminder operation, you will go to section E in phase 2. In section E, you will ask whether the respondent has a copy of the form he/she mailed. If he/she does, you will try to collect the survey information via phone or fax. If he/she does not, we will allow a little more time for the questionnaire to be received prior to attempting to complete it with the respondent.

- If you completed section *C. Working on Questionnaire* during phase 1, you will go to section F during the Reminder operation. In section F, you will determine whether the questionnaire was mailed, and when it was or will be mailed.

- If you completed section *D. Needs New Questionnaire* during phase 1, you will go to section G during the Reminder operation. In section G, you will verify that the questionnaire was received and determine when it was or will be mailed.

During the NRFU operation, you will use section J.

Call Guidelines

- Acceptable calling times are Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (respondent time), unless the respondent requests an appointment before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. Be sure to notify your supervisor of the request so he/she can assign it to another interviewer if necessary. Please note that it may be difficult to reach people at the schools after 3:00 p.m.

- If you or a previous interviewer left an answering machine message, wait one day before contacting the school again.

- Do not make more than two call attempts to a school per day.

- Do not make more than 10 attempts to contact a school during phase 1 of the Reminder. Do not make more than 5 attempts to contact a school during phase 2 of the Reminder. Do not make more than 10 attempts to contact a school during NRFU.

- If you get a Busy Signal, FAX Signal, Number Could Not Be Completed As Dialed, No Signal, Bad Connection, or Temporarily Not In Service, retry the number 15 minutes later. If it is still unavailable, then code the case as such (see section VIII for Outcome Codes and Descriptions). It is considered one attempt after the retry has been made.

Making the Call

- **Read and become very familiar with the SSOCS-26 <u>before</u> calling any school.**

- Review the preprinted label and Call Record information on the cover page before contacting the school. If the principal's name or e-mail address are not printed on the cover page, or are printed but crossed-out, you will need to ask for this information during the call (items A9 and A10).

- If you or a previous interviewer has reached the school before, look through the form before you begin so that you know the contact history. This is especially

important for phase 2 of the Reminder operation as your path in the SSOCS-26 is determined by the outcome of the previous call.

- Enter the date, call start time, and your Interviewer ID in the Call Record (begin with line "1"). If you are retrying the case because you originally got a Busy, FAX, etc., then erase the start time and record the retry start time in its place.

- Make sure you mark (X) all applicable boxes and write legibly as the information will be used for future mailings and follow-up phone calls. Verify the spelling of any new address information, the respondent's name, and the principal's name and e-mail address (if appropriate).

- If it is a Busy, FAX, etc. after the retry, enter the time you hung up the phone in the End time and enter the appropriate Outcome Code and abbreviated description in the Outcome Code and Outcome Notes columns.

- If you reach a recording with a new phone number or area code (Outcome Code 91), record the new number in the space provided next to "Corrected telephone number" on the cover page of the SSOCS-26. For all future contact, use the corrected number.

- If someone answers, continue with item A1. "Hello, this is…" on page 3 and follow the appropriate GO TO instructions. If no GO TO instruction is present, you should continue with the next item.

- If the school name is different than what is printed in item A1, record the new name on the line beneath item A2. If the new name is not similar to what is printed, you will need to confirm with the respondent that the name changed (i.e., respondent says the school name used to be what is printed on the form but changed to a new name) so that we know we have contacted the correct school. If the name change is not confirmed, continue with the call; refer the case to your supervisor when the call is complete.

- If you need to make any corrections to the address mark (X) "No" for item A3 - "Is your school located at:" and write the correct address on the lines next to the preprinted address.

- Please try to speak with the **principal**, or with the person whom the principal designated to complete the questionnaire (possibly a Vice Principal or Disciplinarian). In some cases, you may only be able to reach the secretary or the principal's secretary. If the secretary confirms that the principal mailed the questionnaire, or is working on the questionnaire and will mail it, you may accept this. However, in cases where the school is refusing to participate, you should try to speak with the principal so that you can attempt to convert the refusal.

- After you record the principal or other respondent's e-mail address, read it back to the respondent to ensure that it is spelled correctly and includes the correct punctuation/special characters, for example, dot (.), "@" symbol, and possibly slash (/) or backslash (\). It is CRUCIAL that you verify the e-mail address, as it will be used for additional follow-up efforts. Many school staff member's e-mail addresses follow a general format of name@district.k12.stateabbreviation.us; for example, if you are interviewing Bob Roe in the Citizen School District in MD, his e-mail address may be similar to: broe@citizen.k12.md.us.

- If you are making an appointment with the respondent, be sure to enter the Outcome Code in the Outcome Code column and the date and time of the appointment in the Outcome Notes column. If you have an appointment with someone other than the person with whom you spoke with, enter the name of the person you have an appointment with in the Outcome Notes column. The person in the Contact Name column is not necessarily the person the appointment is with. In some cases, you may have spoken with the school secretary, and he/she may have made an appointment for you to call the principal.

  For example:

Call	Date	Start Time	End Time	Int. ID	Contact Name	Outcome Code	Outcome Notes
1	3/19	9:02	9:07	Doe00001	Ms. Zoe	30	APPT for 3/24/16 @ 1:15 PM with Principal Sean Citizen

- Refusal – If a respondent refuses to participate in the SSOCS, go to item H. Mark the reason that the respondent is refusing. Use the refusal aversion response provided in items H1 – H4 along with all your knowledge of the SSOCS survey and your interviewing skills to try to convince the respondent to participate. For additional help, see the Refusal Conversion Training in section IV beginning on page 7. If the respondent still refuses, code the case as a refusal and record any additional information about the case in Item H5 or the notes section on the cover page of the SSOCS-26.

- Please note that items H1 and H2 in the SSOCS-26 are similar and only one should be read. If the respondent requests more information, or you think more information will be helpful in converting the respondent, refer to the Frequently Asked Questions and Refusal Responses job aid.

- After you have completed your call, be sure to enter the end time and the call outcome in the Call Record section on page 2 the SSOCS-26.

- Mark any applicable boxes in the table on the cover page (correct school not reached, school closed, different school name, district approval necessary, refusal, re-mail requested).

- If you collected the principal's name and/or e-mail address, or another school staff member's e-mail address, write it in the row labeled e-mail address on the cover page.

VI. THE SSOCS-1 INTERVIEW COMPLETED VIA THE TELEPHONE

- **It is critical that you ask each question exactly as it is written in the questionnaire**. Asking the question using different wording could change the way the respondent interprets it and may cause bias in the data.

- If you complete a questionnaire over the phone with the respondent, it is CRUCIAL that AT LEAST questions 11, 12, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45 are completed. **Although these items are the critical items, do not resort to completing only these items and do not inform the respondent that these are the critical items. It is important that the entire questionnaire be completed.** If any of these items are not completed during the initial interview, you should call the respondent back and attempt to complete the remainder of the critical items.

- In addition to the critical items listed above, at least **69 other subitems** (e.g., items 1a, 1b, 1c) must be answered for an interview to be considered complete.

    - If you sense that the respondent is short-on-time or is getting bored, it may be helpful to let him know his progress, for example, that he's completed half of the questionnaire or is almost done. If the respondent sounds hesitant, tell her a little more about why her school's responses are important. A few words of encouragement will go a long way.

    - Either way, immediately return to reading the survey questions. YOU are in control of the interview and it is more effective to assertively move forward than to passively wait for an indication that it is okay to continue.

- Use pencil when making any entries on the SSOCS-1 questionnaire.

- Never lead the respondent.

- Copy the school control number, case ID, and school name from the SSOCS-26 form to the label area on the cover of the SSOCS questionnaire. Paperclip the SSOCS-26 form to the completed SSOCS-1 questionnaire.

- On page 5, you will verify the school's grade range. The grade range is printed in the top right corner of the SSOCS-26 label.

Sometimes, however, it is helpful to be proactive in sharing information with a respondent.

VII. SETTING OUTCOME CODES

Many of the Outcome Codes are standard; however, there are a few that require explanation.

01 – LMR Received: A completed questionnaire was checked-in at NPC for the school.

02 – SSOCS-1 completed over the phone: Use this outcome if you completed the SSOCS questionnaire over the phone.

04 – Hard Refusal: Use this outcome after attempting refusal aversion or conversion on a case where the PRINCIPAL ADAMANTLY REFUSED (even if it was the first refusal) with your supervisor's permission.

05 – School Closed: Use this outcome if you marked the box for "School Closed" in item A1 on page 3. This only applies to schools that are permanently closed or temporarily closed (for an extended period due to unusual circumstances, e.g., natural disaster, no enrollment, etc.) This does not apply to schools that are closed for holidays, scheduled breaks, or inclement weather.

06 – Not a School: If you reach an institution that does not seem to be a school, refer the case to your supervisor. Your supervisor will refer the case to HQ, and it will be researched. Only use this outcome after HQ has researched the case to ensure that the school does not exist.

07 – Out of Scope – School Wrongly Classified: Use this outcome if the school reports that they are any of the following types of school:

- "Private"
- "Home School"
- "Department of Defense"
- "Bureau of Indian Affairs"
- "Special Education"
- "Juvenile Justice"
- "Alternative"
- "Vocational/Career and Technical"
- "Other"

08 – Requires LEA Approval – Refer to Supervisor: Look at the cover page next to "Special district approval." If "School district approval was received," do not assign an outcome code of 08; assign an outcome code based on the status of the questionnaire.

VIII. CALL OUTCOMES

CODE	DESCRIPTION
Completed Resolved	
01	LMR Received
02	SSOCS-1 completed over the phone
03	SSOCS-1 Received via FAX
Other Resolved	
04	Hard Refusal
05	Out-of-scope, School Permanently Closed or Closed for the Remainder of the School Year – Refer to Supervisor
06	Out-of-scope, Not a School – Refer to Supervisor
07	Out of Scope, School Wrongly Classified – Refer to Supervisor
10	Second Refusal, Second Hostile Breakoff, or Third Immediate Hang-up.
11	Unconvertible Language or Hearing Barrier after attempting to reach other staff and maximum number of call attempts have been made
12	Only Available Number(s) Incorrect for School after research (*such as: Wrong Number Reached – verified number and No Listing of New Telephone Number*)
13	Could not reach school after maximum number of callback attempts (set at closeout)
14	Other Non-interview (*describe the situation in problem/notes section of the SSOCS-26)*
Reminded – Case on hold until Phase 2/NRFU	
08	Requires LEA Approval – Refer to Supervisor
15	Principal/Designated Respondent Reminded – Have Mailed Questionnaire – No Remail Necessary
16	Principal/Designated Respondent Reminded – Will Mail Questionnaire – No Remail Necessary
17	Principal/Designated Respondent Reminded – Need New Questionnaire – Remail Questionnaire
ACTIVE CASES	
20	Refer to Supervisor
25	Send to Research
30	Appointment Set
35	Respondent will FAX copy of their completed SSOCS-1
40	First Refusal, First Hostile Break-off, or Second Immediate Hang-up
50	Bilingual Interview Required
60	Answering Machine, Message Left (AMML) (*After a message has been left, wait a day before calling the case again*.)
70	FAX Machine Reached (FAX) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 Fax (with retry) attempts
80	Ring No Answer (RNA) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 4 RNA (w/retry) attempt.
81	Normal Busy Signal/Circuits Busy (BUSY) - *after retry attempt*
82	Fast or WATTS/FTS Busy – not a regular busy signal (FBUSY) - *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 FBUSY (w/retry) attempts.

83	Number Could Not be Completed as Dialed (NCD)– *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 NCD (w/retry) attempts.
84	No Signal or Funny Signal (NS/FS)– *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 NS/FS (w/retry) attempts.
85	Bad Connection (Bad C)– *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 Bad C (w/retry) attempts.
86	Temporarily Not In Service (TNIS)– *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 TNIS (w/retry) attempts.
91	New Number/New Area Code From Recording
92	Number Not In Service – *after retry attempt* – send to research
93	Circuits Busy – *after retry attempt* - – send to research after 4 Circuits Busy (w/retry) attempts.

IX. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS & REFUSAL RESPONSES

A. Why did our school get selected?

From all the public schools in the United States, we selected a random stratified sample of about 3,550 schools that represent the nation for the 2016 School Survey on Crime and Safety. Your school happened to be one of those selected. Your responses will represent schools with similar demographics that were not selected for the survey.

B. What kinds of questions does the School Survey on Crime & Safety ask?

- Description of school policies and programs concerning crime and safety;
- Frequency and types of disciplinary actions such as removals, transfers, and suspensions for selected offenses;
- Frequency and types of crimes at schools, including homicide, rape, sexual assault, attacks with or without weapons, robbery, theft, and vandalism;
- Perceptions of other disciplinary problems such as bullying, verbal abuse, and disorder in the classroom;
- Description of the pervasiveness of student and teacher involvement in efforts that are intended to prevent or reduce school violence;
- Mental health services available to students at school; and
- General school characteristics.

C. What is the purpose of this survey?

The SSOCS is the primary source of school-level data on crime and safety for the U.S. Department of Education. This study collects information on school crime and safety from school principals in primary, middle, high, and combined schools across the United States. As an ongoing survey, the SSOCS measures changes over time on key issues.

Gathering this information will help schools compare their policies and programs to schools nationwide. It will also help researchers and policymakers identify trends in crime and safety issues across time and identify emerging problems or issues.

D. Why should I participate in this survey?

Although this is a voluntary survey, your cooperation is essential to make the results of this survey comprehensive, accurate, and timely. Policymakers and educational leaders rely on data from this survey to inform their decisions concerning school programs and policies to reduce crime. Since it is a sample survey, your responses represent the responses of many schools that serve similar student populations. Higher response rates give us confidence that the findings are accurate.

E. Who is conducting this survey?

The U.S. Census Bureau is collecting data on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), part of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), within the United States Department of Education. NCES is authorized to conduct this survey by the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA; 20 U.S.C., section 9543). Participation is voluntary. The U.S. Census Bureau performs the work under the authority of Title 15, United States Code, Section 1525.

As part of the Department of Education, the National Center for Education Statistics fulfills a Congressional mandate to:

- Collect, collate, analyze and report complete statistics on the condition of American education;
- Conduct and publish reports; and
- Review and report on education activities internationally.

F. Will my responses be kept confidential?

I can assure you that no identifying information will be used by anyone besides those working on the School Survey on Crime and Safety project. The results from the survey will only be reported as combined totals across the thousands of schools who answer the survey, never as individual results.

Your answers may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose except as required by law [Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA 2002) 20 U.S.C., § 9573]. Reports of the findings from the survey will not identify participating districts, schools, or staff. Individual responses will be combined with those from other participants to produce summary statistics and reports.

G. How will my information be reported?

The information you provide will be combined with the information provided by others in statistical reports. No individual data that links your name, address, or telephone number will be included in the statistical reports.

H. How will these data be used?

These data are being collected for the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Results from the study will be used to increase knowledge of policies and programs schools use to address school crime and safety. Results will also show comparisons on crime and safety data across time from the 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010 surveys.

Summary data from the study will be placed into a public-use dataset for researchers and policy-makers. The dataset is rigorously tested prior to release to ensure no individual schools can be identified.

Reports will be published based on the SSOCS data. You will be able to compare your school's problems and policies with those of schools that are similar to yours.

I. How often is the SSOCS administered?

The SSOCS was administered in the spring of the 1999–2000, 2003–04, 2005–06, 2007–08 and 2009–10 school years. The SSOCS will now be administered every two years.

J. Where can I see the results of the SSOCS?

Downloadable reports from the 1999–2000, 2003–04, 2005–06, 2007–08 and 2009–10 collections of the SSOCS such as *Crime and Safety in America's Public Schools: Selected Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety* are available at http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs. Also included on the website is a table library with hundreds of tables that provide estimates on school crime and violence by selected school and student characteristics.

K. How do I know this survey is legitimate?

I understand your concern. I am collecting data in this survey on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

Did you receive a letter from the NCES? An advance letter and the questionnaire were sent to explain the survey. We can send you another questionnaire package if you didn't receive it.

You can verify the legitimacy of our survey or find out more information on the survey's website at www.nces.ed.gov/surveys/ssocs.

L. Has the survey been endorsed by any professional organizations?

Yes! The School Survey on Crime and Safety has been endorsed by:

- The National PTA
- The Council of Chief State School Officers
- The National Association of School Resource Officers

As well as:

- The American Association of School Administrators
- The American Federation of Teachers
- The American School Counselors Association
- The Association of Middle Level Education
- The Association of American Educators
- Education Northwest (formerly the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory)
- The National Association of Elementary School Principals
- The National Association of Secondary School Principals
- The National Association of State Boards of Education
- The National School Safety Center
- The School Safety Advocacy Council
- UCLA Center for Mental Health in Schools
- National Association of School Psychologists
- School Social Work Association of America

M. How long will the survey take to complete?

The length of the survey will depend on the characteristics of your school, but for most people it will take about 52 minutes to complete. That time includes time spent filling out the survey itself, as well as referring to additional information sources for the information requested.

N. What information was sent to us?

- On February 16th, your school was mailed an advance letter describing the study.
- On February 22nd, the questionnaire was sent via FedEx, addressed to the Principal.
- A packet of information about the study was mailed to your District Superintendent and the Chief State School Officer.

O. What is the relationship between the SSOCS and the former No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) or the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)?

The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) is NOT related to former No Child Left Behind of 2001 (NCLB) or to the new Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Each state decides how information will be organized for NCLB/ESSA and states may define terms differently. Therefore, it would be impossible to compare these data at a national level. SSOCS, on the other hand, uses standard definitions across states to create national estimates of school crime and the programs aimed at reducing school crime. Further, since SSOCS is a sample survey, and not a survey of all schools in the nation, it is imperative for us to obtain this information from as many schools as possible in our sample to ensure accuracy in how we report out estimates.

The information your school reports will NOT be given to your school district or your state board of education.

P. Can I complete the questionnaire over the phone?

Yes, we can complete the interview now.

Q. I don't want to buy anything.

I assure you we are not trying to sell anything. We are conducting a survey to help the National Center for Education Statistics gather information about school crime and safety across the United States. No information that identifies you or your school will ever be given to any company that is trying to sell products or services to you.

In fact, no information about you will be given to anyone besides the National Center for Education Statistics.

R. This is not a good time!

I apologize for the inconvenience. We can schedule a better time to call you back. When would be a more convenient day and time for us to reach you?

Is there a direct line I can reach you at?

S. I'm not interested / I'm too busy. / We do not want to participate we are too busy/we take part in so many other studies!

We understand how overloaded schools are and that you probably get a lot of surveys in the mail. However, this is the sixth round of a national study to collect data on school crime and safety. The data from this study will help us in developing a national understanding of crime and safety issues, which rank among the most critical issues faced by U.S. schools.

Because providing a safe, disciplined environment is a key responsibility of our school systems, researchers and policy-makers need an accurate picture of crime and safety issues at public schools across the country.

I understand that your time is limited. However, the data you provide represents other schools in the nation that serve similar student populations, and your participation ensures we get an accurate picture for schools like yours across the country.

T. I don't see the importance of this survey!

Measuring the extent of school crime is important for many reasons. The safety of students and teachers is a primary concern, but the nature and frequency of school crime have other important implications, as well. Safety and discipline are necessary for effective education. In order to learn, students need a secure environment where they can concentrate on their studies. Dealing with school crime requires school resources. Gathering this information should help researchers and policy-makers devise strategies to address these problems in our schools.

U. We're an elementary school; none of these crimes happen here. Why do we need to fill this out?

Even if your school has little to no crime, your responses are important. They aid us in creating an accurate picture of the incidences of school crime in all levels of instruction across the nation. Without your responses, the crime level will appear greater than it actually is. We need to describe the policies and practices of ALL kinds of schools, rather than just large secondary schools where these types of crimes may occur.

X. FINAL REVIEW EXERCISES

Question 1: What is the purpose of the School Survey on Crime and Safety?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 2: What are some of the challenges you will face when trying to collect data from schools?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 3: What should you do if the principal/school staff member says that he/she needs the school district's approval to participate in the study?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 4: How does the SSOCS relate to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) or the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 5: What is the difference between refusal aversion and refusal conversion?

Question 6: What are 4 keys to success for averting and converting refusals?

Question 7: What do you need to do before calling any school?

Question 8: Whom do you need to speak with during the Reminder and NRFU operations?

Question 9: If, during the first phase of the Reminder operation, the respondent told the interviewer that he/she (or the principal) completed and mailed the questionnaire, where should you begin in the SSOCS-26 for the second phase of the Reminder operation?

Question 10: If, during the first phase of the Reminder operation, the respondent told the interviewer that he/she (or the principal) was working on the questionnaire, or received it but hadn't started working on it yet, where should you begin in the SSOCS-26 for the second phase of the Reminder operation?

Question 11: If, during the first phase of the Reminder operation, the respondent requested a replacement questionnaire, where should you begin in the SSOCS-26 for the second phase of the Reminder operation?

Question 12: What should you do if a respondent refuses to participate in the SSOCS?

Question 13: Why is it critical that you ask each question exactly as it is written in the SSOCS questionnaire?

Question 14: What items MUST be completed in the SSOCS-1?

Question 15: Is this survey mandatory or voluntary?

Appendix K: Failed Edit Follow-Up Operation Interviewer Self Study Guide

School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS)

Failed Edit Follow-up Operation
Using Form SSOCS-27 and SSOCS-1

Interviewer Self Study Guide

Project 8042016

Table of Contents

Introduction to Failed Edit Follow-up 2
Completing the SSOCS-27 2
A. Materials 2
B. Form Overview 2
C. Call Guidelines 3
D. Before You Call 4
E. Completing the Call Log 4
F. Making the Call 5
G. Understanding the List of Items 6
Conducting the SSOCS-1 Interview 7
Call Outcome Codes 9
Final Review Exercise 10

You may charge up to 1 hour to read this guide, review the SSOCS-27 and SSOCS-1 forms, and complete the Final Review Exercise. Charge to Project 8042016. Your supervisor will give you the task code.

Introduction to Failed Edit Follow-up

The purpose of Failed Edit Follow-up (FEFU) is to call respondents for schools that have returned the SSOCS questionnaire to verify that the answers given for critical items are correct. A school is included in the FEFU operation if the answer(s) provided to critical items are outside of the expected range, inconsistent with other answers, or if the question was left blank.

Participation in this survey is voluntary. There are no penalties for not answering questions. However, it is very important to have the respondent's cooperation to ensure the quality of the data.

Completing the SSOCS-27

A. Materials

- SSOCS-27
    - You will receive a preprinted SSOCS-27 for each school. Each form provides the script and GO TO instructions you will need for contacting the school, interviewing a knowledgeable respondent, and documenting the call outcome.
    - A copy of the SSOCS-27 is included in your training packet.
- SSOCS-1
    - You will receive the SSOCS-1 questionnaire that the principal or other school staff member completed and returned.
- GREEN pencils for use on the SSOCS-1 questionnaire.
- Regular pencils for use on the SSOCS-27 form.
- Call Outcome Codes (see page 9; this will also be provided as a Job Aid).
- Post-it flags.

B. Form Overview

The SSOCS-27 FEFU form has 2 parts. The numbered items, 1-8, include the introduction and the appropriate GO TO instructions.

The List of Items on page 4 contains the question number and the page number of each question that you will need to ask the respondent in the SSOCS-1

questionnaire. When reviewing the list of items, it is important to remember the following:

- You may be calling for a variety of reasons:
  - Response(s) to item(s) did not fall within the expected range.
  - Illogical relationships between items (e.g., item 36a. should be greater than or equal to the sum of entries in item 35, column 2 – if the answers don't meet that criteria, the item will be listed for FEFU.)
  - Too many critical items or total items were left blank.
- There is 1 item that is critical during follow-up. If item 37 (school's total enrollment) is on the List of Items, use all of your interviewing skills to try to convince the respondent to provide an answer. If the respondent is reluctant, try to convince him/her to answer at least item 37 (if applicable). After item 37 is answered, continue with the remainder of the items on the list if the respondent seems willing to cooperate.
- Although the items are not listed in numerical order, **they are listed in the order that they should be asked!** Do not deviate from the order of the items on the list.

C. Call Guidelines

- Acceptable calling times are Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. (respondent time), unless the respondent requests an appointment before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. Be sure to notify your supervisor of the request so he/she can assign it to another interviewer if necessary. Please note that it may be difficult to reach people at the schools after 3:00 p.m.
- If you or a previous interviewer left an answering machine message, wait two business days before contacting the school again.
- Do not make more than two call attempts to a school per day.
- Do not make more than 8 attempts to contact a school.
- If you get a Busy Signal, FAX Signal, Number Could Not Be Completed As Dialed, No Signal, Bad Connection, or Temporarily Not In Service, retry the number 15 minutes later. If it is still unavailable, then code the case as such (see the Outcome Codes and Descriptions on page 9). It is considered one attempt after the retry has been made.

D. Before You Call

- **Read and become very familiar with the SSOCS-27 and SSOCS-1.**

- Review the preprinted label, Call Record, and notes section on the cover page of the SSOCS-27. The contact information printed on the label of the SSOCS-27 form is the contact information provided by the person who completed the SSOCS-1 questionnaire.

- If either you or a previous interviewer has reached the school before, look through the SSOCS-27 and the SSOCS-1 before you begin so that you know the contact history and what questions may have been completed.

- Review the List of Items (page 4 of the SSOCS-27) along with the relevant questions in the SSOCS-1 questionnaire **before** contacting the school.

- **Mark the pages of the SSOCS-1 questionnaire that you need to turn to during the interview with post-it flags.**

E. Completing the Call Log

- Enter the date, call start time, and your Interviewer ID in the Call Record (begin with line "1") on the cover of the SSOCS-27. If you are retrying the case because you originally got a busy signal, fax machine, etc., then erase the start time and record the retry start time in its place.

- If it is a busy signal, fax machine, etc. after the retry, enter the time you hung up the phone in the 'End Time' column and enter the appropriate outcome code and abbreviated description in the 'Outcome Code' and 'Outcome Notes' columns in the Call Record.

- If the telephone number on the label of the SSOCS-27 is not a good number (outcomes 70, 80 – 86, 92, 93), try calling the number printed on page 5 of the SSOCS-1. If, after the required attempts, you are still unable to reach the school (multiple outcomes of 70, 80-86, and 93, or one outcome of 92 - Not In Service), enter the outcome code 70, 80-86, 92, or 93 in the 'Outcome Code' column of the Call Record, but also enter an outcome code of 25. For example: 92/25. Researchers will attempt to find another number for the school.

- If the researcher is:

    - Unable to locate a new telephone number, he/she will assign outcome code 12 in the next call outcome line.

    - Able to locate a new number, he/she will line through (e.g., ~~cross-out~~) the existing telephone number and enter the new number in the 'Telephone

Number' field on the cover of the SSOCS-27 and enter the outcome code 91 next to outcome code 25. For example: 82/25/91.

- If you make an appointment with the respondent, be sure to enter the outcome code in the 'Outcome Code' column and the date and time of the appointment in the 'Outcome Notes' column on the SSOCS-27. Enter the name of the person you have an appointment with in the 'Outcome Notes' column; this should be the person whose name is printed on the SSOCS-27. However, there may be cases where you will need to speak with someone else (e.g., the SSOCS-1 was filled out by more than 1 person, the person who completed it no longer works at the school, etc.)

  For example:

Call	Date	Start time	End time	Interviewer ID	Contact Name	Outcome Code	Outcome Notes
1	5/14/16	9:00	9:07	Doe00001	Ms. Citizen	30	APPT for 5/17/16 @ 1:15 PM w/Bob Coe

- After you have completed your call, be sure to enter the end time and the call outcome in the Call Record section on the SSOCS-27.

F. Making the Call

- If someone answers, begin with item 1. "Hello, this is…" on page 2 of the SSOCS-27 and follow the appropriate GO TO instructions. If no GO TO instruction is present, you should continue with the next item.

- Make sure you mark (X) all applicable boxes and write legibly.

- If the respondent does not have a copy of his/her completed SSOCS-1 form, offer to fax a blank questionnaire so that the respondent can follow along in the interview. Make an appointment with the respondent or ask the respondent to call you back after he/she receives the fax. Provide your supervisor or a control clerk with the school case ID, the respondent's name, and the fax number. The supervisor or control clerk will complete a fax cover sheet and fax the questionnaire to the respondent.

G. Understanding the List of Items

- In some cases, you will not need to ask all of the items on the 'List of Items' (page 4 of the SSOCS-27). Instructions for which items to ask are included on the List of Items.

  Some items are on the list because they were higher than expected given the size of the school. If q 37 (enrollment) is on the 'List of Items,' it will include instructions for the other items that depend on the new response to question 37.

  Ex. "If q 37 enrollment exceeds 900, then don't ask q 26 range violations."

  Look next to the items for q26 on the 'List of Items.' If the item says "(range violation)," you DO NOT need to ask the respondent that item.

- Some of the question numbers on the 'List of Items' are complex. You will need to understand what each component stands for in order to have a successful interview.

  In all cases, the parts of the question number go from general to specific.

  Open your copy of the SSOCS-1 questionnaire to question 26 on page 16 to look at the following example.

  Ex. Q26c1_1 page 16

  - "q26" is the question number.

  - Since question 26 is broken down into items 26a – 26l, the "c" in the example indicates that you need to ask the "Robbery" item in question 26.

  - Since q26c is broken down into "i. With a weapon" and "ii. Without a weapon," the first number after "c" tells which part of 26c you need to ask. The "i" and "ii" are lowercase Roman numerals. On the SSOCS-27 list of items, i = 1 and ii = 2. Since the example above is q26c1, you will ask about "Robbery, with a weapon."

  - For items that have multiple columns, the number after the underscore indicates which column you need to ask about. In the example above, you need to ask about the first column "Total number of recorded incidents."

- For items that are not broken down into a "i." and "ii.," the number after the question number and letter indicates which column you should ask (e.g., q34n2 – You will ask if the school used "Loss of student privileges" as a disciplinary action during the 2015-16 school year).

- For questions with multiple columns, it is acceptable to ask the respondent about the item in the first column before asking about the second item (e.g., q34n2 – You may ask if the school allows for use of the disciplinary action before you ask if they used it during the school year).

- If item q26a1 page 16 is on the list of items, you will need to ask a follow-up question if the new answer provided is greater than 0. The follow-up question will be printed next to the item number on the list of items. Example:

  Q26a1 page 16 How many of the victims were male?

  Write the number of male victims next to the question in green pencil. If none of the victims were male, write "0." If the respondent doesn't know, write "DK." If the respondent refuses, write "RF." Example:

  Q26a1 page 16 How many of the victims were male? ***1***
  Q26a1 page 16 How many of the victims were male? ***0***
  Q26a1 page 16 How many of the victims were male? ***DK***
  Q26a1 page 16 How many of the victims were male? ***RF***

  Background information: we are asking this follow-up question because the definition of rape was changed for the 2010 SSOCS to specify that both male and female students can be victims of rape. If the estimates of incidents of rape are higher than in previous administrations (through 2008) of the SSOCS, NCES is interested in whether it is because of an increase in the number of rapes or if it is because of the new explicit inclusion of males in the definition of rape.

Conducting the SSOCS-1 Interview

- **It is critical that you ask each question exactly as it is written in the questionnaire**. Asking the question using different wording could change the way the respondent interprets it and may cause bias in the data.

- Many questions include examples or other information in parentheses. You should read the parenthetical text to the respondent when asking the question. For examples, replace "e.g." with "for example" when reading the question.

- Many questions include instructions indicated with apple bullet points. When the instructions contain information about what to include or exclude when answering the item, you should read them to the respondent or ask the respondent to review them if he/she has a copy of the questionnaire. In cases where the instructions are repeated for a series of items that are included on the List of Items, you may read it for the first question and let the respondent know that it applies to a group of questions (for example, questions 11-18).

- You do not need to read instructions such as "Check one response on each line," "Check "Yes" or "No" on each line," or "If none, please place an "X" in the None box." If the response options are not Yes/No or a quantity (for example, "Limits in major way," "Limits in minor way," and "Does not limit"), read the response options to the respondent.

- Use green pencil when making any entries on the SSOCS-1 questionnaire.

- Definitions are available on pages 2 and 3 for words or phrases that are followed by an asterisk (*). Inform the respondent that definition's are available for certain terms if they would like clarification during the interview. Offer the definition if the respondent asks for clarification or seems confused about any question. If item 20 is on the list of items, provide the definitions for mental health professional, mental health disorder, diagnostic assessment, and treatment prior to asking the items. Alternatively, if the respondent has a copy of the questionnaire, you may ask him or her to review these definitions prior to answering the question.

- DO NOT prompt the respondent to give the same answer as provided on the form. For example: when asking item 37, you should **not** say, "**As of October 1, 2015, what was your school's total enrollment? You answered 652 students – is that correct?**" Ask the question as worded and record his/her response. Never lead the respondent as it could cause bias.

- If the question was blank, record the answer in the space provided.

- For questions where the respondent is instructed to mark a box: mark the box of the response given to you in green pencil, even if the respondent gave the same response in the original questionnaire. The green pencil will distinguish the new response from the original response and indicate that the question was asked during FEFU. Do not erase the respondent's original response!

- For questions where the respondent was instructed to write in the response:

    - If the respondent DID NOT answer the question in the original questionnaire, write the response in the space provided.

    - If the respondent DID answer the question in the original questionnaire, write the new response as close to the original response as possible.

Call Outcome Codes

CODE	DESCRIPTION
COMPLETED Resolved	
01	FEFU Interview Complete – all items answered
02	FEFU Interview Partially Complete – at least 1 item answered
OTHER Resolved	
05	School Closed
10	First Refusal, First Hostile Breakoff, or Second Immediate Hang-up
11	Unconvertible Language or Hearing Barrier after attempting to reach other staff 8 times
12	Only Available Number(s) Incorrect for School After Research or at Closeout
13	Could not reach school after 8 Callback attempts (set at closeout)
14	Other Non-interview (*describe the situation in problem/notes section of the SSOCS-27) (set at closeout)*
ACTIVE CASES	
20	Refer to Supervisor
25	Send to Research
30	Appointment Set
50	Bilingual Interview Required
60	Answering Machine, Message Left (AMML) (*After a message has been left, wait a day before calling the case again*.)
65	Faxed questionnaire to respondent; respondent will call back.
70	FAX Machine Reached (FAX) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 Fax (with retry) attempts
80	Ring No Answer (RNA) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 4 RNA (w/retry) attempt.
81	Normal Busy Signal/Circuits Busy (BUSY) – *after retry attempt*
82	Fast or WATTS/FTS Busy – not a regular busy signal (FBUSY) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 FBUSY (w/retry) attempts.
83	Number Could Not be Completed as Dialed (NCD) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 NCD (w/retry) attempts.
84	No Signal or Funny Signal (NS/FS) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 NS/FS (w/retry) attempts.
85	Bad Connection (Bad C) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 Bad C (w/retry) attempts.
86	Temporarily Not In Service (TNIS) – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 2 TNIS (w/retry) attempts.
91	New Number/New Area Code From Recording
92	Number Not In Service – *after retry attempt* – send to research
93	Circuits Busy – *after retry attempt* – send to research after 4 Circuits Busy (w/retry) attempts.

Final Review Exercise

Question 1: What writing utensil should you use when completing the SSOCS-1 questionnaire? What writing utensil should you use when completing the SSOCS-27 form?

Question 2: What are the three reasons you may need to contact the respondent during Failed Edit Follow-up?

Question 3: What do you need to do before calling any school?

Question 4: Which item is critical during Failed Edit Follow-up?

Question 5: In what cases will you not need to ask all of the items on the List of Items?

Question 6: What item requires a follow-up question if it is on the list of items? What is the follow-up question and why is it being asked? Where should you record the answer to the follow-up question?

Question 7: Why shouldn't you prompt the respondent with his or her original answers?

Question 8: Where should you record answers on the SSOCS-1 questionnaire?

Question 9: Is this survey mandatory or voluntary?

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix L: Reminder E-mails to Pricipals

Subject line: U.S. Census Bureau Survey will arrive soon!

Dear (name):

I am writing to invite you to participate in the 2016 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) and provide information about your school in a brief questionnaire. Data collection for this survey is being carried out by the U.S. Census Bureau on behalf of the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education. SSOCS is a recurring survey that focuses on the frequency of crime and violence in public schools and the programs and practices schools have developed to provide a safe school environment. It provides a unique opportunity to collect national data on crime and safety from the school's perspective. **SSOCS is the only survey of its kind!**

Please expect to receive the SSOCS questionnaire within the next week. If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332. Staff will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this important survey!

Sincerely,

Rachel Hansen
Project Director
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4012
Washington, DC 20202
Email: school.crime@ed.gov

Subject line: U.S. Census Bureau Survey Reminder

Dear (name):

Recently, we sent you the **2016 School Survey on Crime and Safety** (SSOCS) questionnaire. If you have already completed SSOCS, thank you!

If not, **please complete and return your questionnaire as soon as possible**. We will contact you shortly to determine the status of your questionnaire. If you have not received the questionnaire, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau to request a replacement copy by sending an e-mail to addp.education.surveys@census.gov or by calling 1–888–595–1332 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions you have on the survey.

Your participation is critical to the success of our survey because your school was selected to represent hundreds of similar schools and cannot be replaced. Schools will not be identified by name in any reports. Please contact me if there is anything I can do to help you complete the questionnaire. We appreciate your participation in this valuable survey!

Sincerely,

Rachel Hansen
Project Director
National Center for Education Statistics
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4012
Washington, DC 20202
Email: school.crime@ed.gov

Subject line: U.S. Census Bureau Survey Reminder

Dear (name):

Did you know that during the 2009-10 school year, the rate of violent incidents (rape, sexual battery other than rape, physical attack or fight with or without a weapon, threat of physical attack with or without a weapon, and robbery with or without a weapon) per 1,000 students was higher in middle schools than in primary schools or high schools?

We need your help to gather statistics on the frequency of both violent and nonviolent incidents that occur in schools today, along with the policies and practices educators have instituted to provide a safer environment for students.

The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) collects these valuable data. If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire, thank you very much for your participation. If not, I encourage you to take the time to do so. Your participation is critical to the success of our survey because your school was selected to represent hundreds of similar schools. Please note that schools will not be identified by name in any reports.

If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332. Staff will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Sincerely,

Rachel Hansen
Project Director
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4012
Washington, DC 20202
Email: school.crime@ed.gov

Subject line: U.S. Census Bureau Survey Reminder

Dear (name):

We know that you are very busy, but we need your help!

The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) collects valuable information on the frequency of crime and violence in public schools and the programs and practices schools have developed to provide a safe school environment.

The greater the level of participation, the better our survey data can provide a current picture of our nation's schools. The data you provide are combined with the information provided by others in statistical reports to present estimates of school crime, discipline, disorder, programs, and policies for schools nationwide. Schools will not be identified by name in any reports.
If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire, thank you! If not, please complete and return your questionnaire as soon as possible.

If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332. Staff will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Sincerely,

Rachel Hansen
Project Director
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4012
Washington, DC 20202
Email: school.crime@ed.gov

Subject line: U.S. Census Bureau Survey - selected findings

Dear (name):

The School Survey on Crime and Safety produces valuable data on crime and safety in public schools. Findings from the 2009-10 survey included:

- A greater percentage of schools reported at least one student threat of physical attack without a weapon than with a weapon.

- A higher percentage of middle schools reported that student bullying occurred at school daily or at least once a week than did high schools or primary schools.

- A higher percentage of suburban schools drilled students on a written plan describing procedures to be performed during a shooting than did city schools or rural schools.

Your completed questionnaire will help us to produce statistics for the 2015-16 school year. If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your assistance and please disregard this email. If you haven't had the opportunity to complete and return the survey yet, we encourage you to do so. You may call with any questions or may complete the survey over the phone by calling the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov. Please note that schools will not be identified by name in any reports.

Sincerely,

Rachel Hansen
Project Director
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4012
Washington, DC 20202
Email: school.crime@ed.gov

Subject Line: U.S. Census Bureau Survey Reminder

Dear (name):

Time is running out for your school to participate in the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS)!

If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire, thank you! If not, please complete and return it as soon as possible. You may call with any questions or may complete the survey over the phone by calling the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332. An interviewer will be available to assist you between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov. Please note that schools will not be identified by name in any reports.

Sincerely,

Rachel Hansen
Project Director
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4012
Washington, DC 20202
Email: school.crime@ed.gov

Subject line: U.S. Census Bureau Survey - last chance!

Dear (name):

We need your help! Data collection for the School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) is coming to a close. Don't miss your opportunity to contribute to data that are used for making and changing policies. If you have not already done so, please complete and return your SSOCS questionnaire. Schools will not be identified by name in any reports. We appreciate your help in this important data collection effort!

If you have any general questions about the study, please contact the U.S. Census Bureau at 1–888–595–1332. Staff will be available to take your call Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. (Eastern Time). The U.S. Census Bureau is also available to answer your questions via e-mail at addp.education.surveys@census.gov.

Sincerely,

Rachel Hansen
Project Director
National Center for Education Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW, Room 4012
Washington, DC 20202
Email: school.crime@ed.gov

Appendix M: Detailed Analysis of Unit Nonresponse Bias

In its statistical standards, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) requires that any survey stage of data collection with a base-weighted (weighted) unit response rate of less than 85 percent be evaluated for the potential magnitude of nonresponse bias before the data or any analysis using the data may be released (U.S. Department of Education 2012). This appendix summarizes the results of the unit-level nonresponse bias analysis performed on the 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2016). Unless noted otherwise, estimates were produced for this appendix using the base weights.

Nonresponse can greatly affect the strength and application of survey data by leading to an increase in variance as a result of a reduction in the actual size of the sample. It can also produce bias if the nonrespondents have characteristics of interest that are different from those of the respondents (Statistics Canada 2009). There are two types of nonresponse: unit nonresponse and item nonresponse. Unit nonresponse refers to sampled units, schools in this instance, that do not have completed interviews. The SSOCS:2016 sample consists of 3,553 schools, of which 19 were ineligible for the survey and 2,092 completed the survey. Item nonresponse refers to survey questions with missing responses for interviewed schools. The analysis of item nonresponse bias in SSOCS:2016 is located in appendix O.

Two sources of information are used in the SSOCS nonresponse bias analysis: the sampling frame and the SSOCS survey. The sampling frame contains auxiliary information (called school characteristics in this document) about the sample, and therefore this information is known for both respondents and nonrespondents. The SSOCS survey contains responses to survey questions (called survey variables in this document), and therefore the information is only obtained from the respondents.

In this appendix, we first compare the distributions of the SSOCS sample and the target population across eight school-level frame characteristics[33] to ensure that the sample is representative of the target population. Next, we compare respondent and nonrespondent distributions on these eight school-level characteristics. We used logistic regression to model a school's response propensity, allowing us to calculate the *R* indicator to suggest how representative the respondents are compared to the original sample. We compared key survey estimates between low-response-propensity schools and the balance of the respondent sample. Finally, we evaluate the effect of the nonresponse weighing adjustment. For this evaluation, we present the differences in response propensity across the nonresponse adjustment cells created using chi-square automatic interaction detection (CHAID), which identifies the school characteristics that are the best predictors of response. Then, we compare the distributions of the eight school characteristics using the full sample (using base weights) and respondents (using both base weights and the final weights adjusted for nonresponse).

Comparison of the Sample and Population

Before examining nonresponse to the SSOCS survey, we first examine the appropriateness of the SSOCS sample design in representing the target population. This is done by comparing distributions across the selected school characteristic variables in the SSOCS sample to the corresponding

[33] Five characteristics were used in the sampling design (enrollment size; school level; locale; percentage of White, non-Hispanic enrollment; and region) and the other three characteristics were derived from continuous variables available in the sampling frame (number of FTE teaching staff, student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio, and the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch).

distributions in the sampling frame. The sampling frame for SSOCS:2016 was derived from the 2013–14 Common Core of Data (CCD) Public Elementary/Secondary School Universe data File. The SSOCS sample was chosen by stratifying the subset of schools from the CCD population by enrollment size, school level, and type of locale. Within each stratum, schools were first sorted by the percentage of White enrollment and region and then a systematic random sample was drawn.[34]

Table M-1 displays the distributions of the SSOCS:2016 sample (including the schools that were later determined to be ineligible) and compares it to the sampling frame across the selected eight school characteristic variables. A chi-square likelihood ratio test, which tests for independence between two distributions, was used to examine whether there were any differences between the distribution of the selected sample and the target population based on the school characteristic variable examined. Independence of the row and column variables implies that the distributions across row variable subgroups will be the same across the SSOCS sample and target population columns. For example, when examining school level, the SSOCS sample and target population distributions were compared to see if they were independent of school level. If they were, it could be argued that the distribution of the sample is the same as the target population across the categories of school level. The larger the chi-square statistic, the less likely it is that the two distributions are independent of the key statistic examined.

The results show, with 95 percent confidence, that the SSOCS sample and the target population are independent across the eight frame variables examined (i.e., *p* values are greater than .05). This means that for all of the frame variables examined, the sample has the same distribution as the target population, and there is no potential selection bias in the sample selection design.

[34] See chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation of the sampling process.

Table M-1. Comparison of sample and target population, by school characteristics, SSOCS:2016

Item description	Base-weighted sample (percent)	Target population (percent)	Likelihood ratio	*p* value[1]
Enrollment size				
Less than 300	22.0	22.0		
300-499	29.8	29.8		
500-999	37.8	37.8		
1,000 or more	10.3	10.3	0.02	0.9994
School level				
Primary	58.7	58.7		
Middle	18.5	18.5		
High school	15.2	15.3		
Combined	7.5	7.5	0.03	0.9985
Type of Locale				
City	27.3	27.3		
Suburb	32.6	32.6		
Town	13.2	13.1		
Rural	27.0	27.0	0.01	0.9998
Percent White enrollment				
95 to 100 percent	6.4	6.7		
80 to less than 95 percent	24.7	24.3		
More than 50 to less than 80 percent	26.7	27.0		
50 percent or less	42.3	42.1	0.44	0.9308
Region				
Northeast	16.7	16.7		
Midwest	24.9	24.7		
South	35.4	35.3		
West	23.0	23.3	0.09	0.9927
Number of full-time-equivalent teaching staff				
Less than 29	48.6	47.9		
29 to less than 45	29.0	29.7		
45 to less than 70	15.2	15.1		
70 or more	7.3	7.3	1.18	0.7588
Student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio				
Less than 12	12.7	12.7		
12 through 16	38.4	39.0		
More than 16 to less than 20	29.2	29.2		
20 or more	19.6	19.0	0.55	0.9072
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch				
Less than 10 percent	5.6	6.6		
10 through 20 percent	7.0	7.4		
20 through 50 percent	32.9	31.2		
More than 50 percent	54.5	54.9	5.93	0.1150

[1]Based on a chi-square distribution with *df* = 3, using the significance level α = .05.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Response Rate

The first component of nonresponse bias is the unit response rate, which measures the percentage of responding units out of the total units sampled in each study. Unit response rates can be either unweighted or base weighted. The unweighted rate, computed by dividing the raw number of respondents by the eligible sample size, provides a useful description of the success of the operational aspects of the survey. The base-weighted response rate, which is the inverse of the selection probability, is computed by summing the base weights for the respondents and dividing by the sum of the base weights for all eligible sample schools. The base weights give a better description of the success of the survey with respect to the population sampled because they allow for inference of the sample data, including response status, to the population level. For the SSOCS:2016 unit nonresponse bias analysis, the base weight was used.

The magnitude of unit nonresponse bias is determined by the level of response and is reflected in the differences between respondents and nonrespondents on key survey variables. As with most surveys, the values of key survey variables are not known for the nonrespondents. However, the SSOCS sampling frame (the CCD) includes a number of school-related characteristic variables that are known for both responding and nonresponding schools; eight of these variables are used to analyze unit nonresponse bias in SSOCS:2016. Five variables (enrollment size, school level, locale, percentage White, non-Hispanic enrollment, and region) were used in the sampling design, and the other three variables (number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) teaching staff, student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch) were derived from continuous variables available in the sampling frame. For SSOCS:2016, the continuous variables student-to-teacher ratio and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch were collapsed into the categories in which they are typically presented in NCES tables. Since there were no corresponding table categories for the number of FTE teachers, the categorical definitions were kept consistent with those used for the SSOCS:2006, SSOCS:2008, and SSOCS:2010 nonresponse bias analyses.

The overall base-weighted response rate for SSOCS:2016 was 62.9 percent, and the overall unweighted response rate was 59.2 percent. Table M-2 provides descriptive statistics on the base-weighted and unweighted response rates for the school-level characteristic variables used in the unit-level bias analysis. In general, schools with 1,000 or more students enrolled, city schools, schools with 50 percent or less White enrollment, schools with 45 or more FTE teaching staff, schools with a student-to-FTE teacher ratio between 16 and 20, and schools with 50 percent or more of students eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch were less likely to respond to the SSOCS:2016 survey.

Table M-2. Response rates by school characteristics: SSOCS:2016

Item description	Unweighted response rate	Base-weighted response rate	Difference from overall weighted rate	*t* diff[1]	*p* value[2]	
Overall	59.2	62.9				
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	68.6	73.0	10.1	5.46	<.0001	*
300-499	60.9	62.3	-0.6	-0.37	0.7162	
500-999	60.3	60.2	-2.7	-1.97	0.0549	
1,000 or more	53.8	53.8	-9.2	-4.57	<.0001	*
School level						
Primary	61.4	63.6	0.7	0.74	0.4640	
Middle	58.6	60.4	-2.5	-1.31	0.1967	
High school	57.7	60.2	-2.8	-1.93	0.0598	
Combined	66.4	69.7	6.7	1.30	0.1989	
Type of locale						
City	51.9	52.2	-10.8	-6.97	<.0001	*
Suburb	57.6	60.7	-2.3	-1.35	0.1829	
Town	69.4	68.6	5.7	1.82	0.0748	
Rural	67.7	73.9	10.9	5.88	<.0001	*
Percent White enrollment						
95 to 100 percent	73.5	74.1	11.1	2.50	0.0159	*
80 to less than 95 percent	68	71.5	8.5	5.19	<.0001	*
50 to less than 80 percent	59.4	63.0	0.1	0.04	0.9679	
50 percent or less	53.2	56.2	-6.8	-5.19	<.0001	*
Region						
Northeast	56.3	61.6	-1.4	-0.65	0.5169	
Midwest	63.9	66.3	3.3	1.76	0.0852	
South	57.1	61.6	-1.4	-0.96	0.3432	
West	60.2	62.5	-0.5	-0.21	0.8339	
Number of full-time-equivalent teaching staff						
Less than 29	64.7	67.7	4.8	4.00	0.0002	*
29 to less than 45	60.9	60.2	-2.8	-1.50	0.1387	
45 to less than 70	57.2	58.5	-4.5	-2.12	0.0386	*
70 or more	52.8	51.9	-11.1	-4.06	0.0002	*
Student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio						
Less than 12	65.2	71.0	8.1	2.65	0.0109	*
12 through 16	59.1	63.7	0.7	0.48	0.6345	
More than 16 to less than 20	56.8	58.6	-4.4	-2.42	0.0191	*
20 or more	60.6	62.9	-0.1	-0.04	0.9693	
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch						
Less than 10 percent	56.4	59.1	-3.8	-0.76	0.4520	
10 through 20 percent	59.6	69.1	6.1	1.80	0.0787	
20 through 50 percent	63.3	65.9	2.9	2.07	0.0437	*
More than 50 percent	56.6	60.8	-2.2	-2.18	0.0341	*

* $p < .05$.
[1]The *t* statistic tests the difference between the group-specific weighted response rate and the overall weighted response rate.
[2]Based on a two-tailed *t* distribution with 50 df, $\alpha = .05$.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Frequency distributions were compared between 76 key survey variables collected with the survey instrument and the eight frame characteristics given above to assess areas where there may be potential bias. The prior analysis showed that most of the frame characteristics are related to response status, and this analysis showed whether those differences may be meaningful in terms of causing bias in key survey estimates. If key survey variables are related to characteristics that we know are biased, then the estimates themselves are also likely to be biased prior to adjustment. Tables M-3 and M-4 provide marginal summaries of the analysis. Table M-3 summarizes the results from likelihood ratio tests of independence between each frame characteristic and the 76 key variables, while table M-4 summarizes the number of key survey variables by the number of frame characteristics with significant differences. Tests were conducted at the 5 percent significance level. If a significant difference was detected, there is evidence to suggest that distributions of the key variable vary across the levels of the frame characteristic. In several instances, the test was not conducted because at least one cell had zero observations.

Table M-3. Summary of chi-square test of independence between school characteristics and 76 key survey variables: SSOCS:2016

Frame variable	Number of significant[1] relationships with key survey variables	Number of non-significant[1] relationships with key survey variables	Not evaluated[2]
Enrollment size	45	29	2
School level	45	24	7
Type of locale	30	45	1
Percent White enrollment	21	46	9
Region	26	50	0
Number of full-time-equivalent teaching staff	40	36	0
Student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio	22	54	0
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch	28	41	7

[1]Based on a chi-square distribution with df = 3, using the significance level α = .05.

[2] Chi-square test was not performed due to insufficient observations in one or more cells.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Table M-4. Summary of frame characteristics for which key survey variable distributions differed significantly: SSOCS:2016

Number of frame characteristics for which key survey variable distributions differed significantly[1]	Number of key survey variables
0	1
1	8
2	11
3	13
4	18
5	12
6	10
7	2
8	1

[1]Based on a chi-square distribution with df = 3, using the significance level α = .05.

Over half of the key survey variables have significant relationships with at least four frame characteristics, providing reason to believe that that differences in response rates attributed to the frame characteristics are indicative of potential bias in key estimates. The following list summarizes

the key survey variables whose distributions varied significantly across the levels of a frame variable for at least seven of those frame variables: at least one physical attack or fight without a weapon; at least one occurrence of inappropriate distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs; and at least one occurrence of vandalism.[35]

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

The second component of nonresponse bias relates to the differences between respondents and nonrespondents across frame characteristics. Table M-5 compares respondents and nonrespondents on the eight school characteristic variables for which data are available from the sampling frame. Base-weighted distributions and the differences in the distributions between respondents and nonrespondents are shown.

The largest differences in distributions were found for city schools (-12.6 percent), rural schools (12.6 percent), schools with 50 percent or less White enrollment (-12.2 percent), schools with 80 to less than 95 percent White enrollment (9.0 percent), schools with less than 29 FTE teaching staff (9.9 percent), and schools with less than 300 students enrolled (9.4 percent).[36] The likelihood-ratio test statistic for independence in each two-way table is shown in table M-5, along with its *p* value. The null hypothesis that the response status is independent of the school characteristic is rejected for enrollment size, locale, percentage White enrollment, number of FTE teaching staff, school-to-FTE teaching staff ratio, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Therefore, there is a statistically significant relationship between each of these six school characteristic variables and the likelihood of responding to the SSOCS:2016 survey.

[35] These differences represent only some of the statistically significant relationships that resulted from this analysis. To avoid unnecessarily reporting too much detail, this paragraph discusses only those variables with significant relationships with at least seven characteristics,.

[36] These differences represent only some of the statistically significant relationships that resulted from this analysis. To avoid unnecessarily reporting too much detail, this paragraph discusses only those differences greater than the absolute value of eight (see table M-5 for a complete list). A negative difference means the respondent proportion is lower than the nonrespondent proportion.

Table M-5. Comparison of respondents and nonrespondents, by school characteristics: SSOCS:2016

Item description	Respondents (base-weighted percent)	Nonrespondents (base-weighted percent)	Difference (percent)	Likelihood ratio	*p* value[1]	
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	25.2	15.8	9.4	35.68	<.0001	*
300-499	29.6	30.5	-0.8			
500-999	36.3	40.7	-4.5			
1,000 or more	8.9	13.0	-4.1			
School level						
Primary	59.3	57.6	1.7	4.97	0.1738	
Middle	17.9	19.9	-2.0			
High school	14.6	16.4	-1.8			
Combined	8.2	6.1	2.1			
Type of locale						
City	22.6	35.2	-12.6	52.34	<.0001	*
Suburb	31.5	34.7	-3.2			
Town	14.3	11.2	3.2			
Rural	31.6	19.0	12.6			
Percent White enrollment						
95 to 100 percent	7.6	4.5	3.1	36.24	<.0001	*
80 to less than 95 percent	28.2	19.1	9.0			
50 to less than 80 percent	26.6	26.5	0.1			
50 percent or less	37.6	49.8	-12.2			
Region						
Northeast	16.4	17.4	-1.0	3.28	0.3501	
Midwest	26.1	22.6	3.6			
South	34.7	36.8	-2.1			
West	22.8	23.2	-0.5			
Number of full-time-equivalent teaching staff						
Less than 29	51.9	42.0	9.9	26.31	<.0001	*
29 to less than 45	27.8	31.3	-3.5			
45 to less than 70	14.2	17.2	-2.9			
70 or more	6.0	9.5	-3.5			
Student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio						
Less than 12	14.3	9.9	4.4	10.24	0.0166	*
12 through 16	38.9	37.7	1.2			
More than 16 to less than 20	27.2	32.7	-5.5			
20 or more	19.6	19.7	-0.1			
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch						
Less than 10 percent	5.2	6.1	-0.9	7.92	0.0478	*
10 through 20 percent	7.8	5.9	1.9			
20 through 50 percent	34.3	30.2	4.1			
More than 50 percent	52.7	57.8	-5.1			

* $p < .05$.
[1]Based on a chi-square distribution with df = 3, using the significance level $\alpha = .05$.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Modeling Response Propensity

Across the population, one subgroup may be more likely to respond to SSOCS:2016 than another subgroup. Using a regression model, we can simultaneously examine relationships between multiple population characteristics and response propensity. The advantage of using regression (relative to the analyses that have already been discussed) is that the eight characteristics being examined are likely to be correlated with each other. Regression allows the key drivers of differences between respondents and nonrespondents to be isolated. Using the frame characteristics of enrollment size, school level, locale, percentage White enrollment, census region, number of FTE teaching staff, student-to-FTE teacher ratio, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, we fit a logistic model to identify the categories within each school characteristic variable where significant differences in response propensity exist. PROC SURVEYLOGISTIC in SAS was used to perform a logistic regression, which compares the odds[37] of responding to the SSOCS:2016 survey across the subgroups of the frame characteristic. For this analysis, the dependent variable was defined as whether the school responded to the survey (yes/no). The first category of each school-level characteristic variable was taken as the reference group.

In table M-6, the odds ratios of responding, given a particular school-level characteristic, are reported. For example, the odds ratio estimate for *town* schools is 1.7, which means these schools have 1.7 times the odds of responding than *city* schools (the reference category). An odds ratio of "1.0" indicates that there is no difference in response propensities between the school characteristic variable category being examined and the reference category of that school characteristic. An odds ratio of "less than 1.0" indicates that schools within the characteristic category of interest are less likely to respond than the schools in the reference category. To determine if a coefficient is significantly different from the reference category, the lower and upper 95 percent confidence limits of the odds ratio were examined and are also reported in table M-6. At the significance level of .05, when the value 1.0 falls between these two limits, the response rate of the school characteristic category is not significantly different from that of the reference category.

The results of the analysis confirm that city schools have a significantly lower response propensity than suburban, town, and rural schools. No other significant differences in response propensity were identified among the remaining frame variables. This suggests that low response rates among city schools are a major driver of the other differences that were observed in the bivariate analysis.

[37] The term "odds" refers to the likelihood of an event occurring in relation to the likelihood of the event not occurring. An odds ratio is the comparison of odds between two sets of population subgroups.

Table M-6. Comparison of odds ratios, by school characteristics: SSOCS:2016

Item description	Odds ratio	Lower 95% confidence limit of odds ratio[1]	Upper 95% confidence limit of odds ratio[1]
Enrollment size			
Less than 300	*Reference group*		
300-499	0.777	0.563	1.072
500-999	0.904	0.594	1.378
1,000 or more	0.937	0.555	1.583
School level			
Primary	*Reference group*		
Middle	0.867	0.673	1.118
High school	0.899	0.683	1.183
Combined	0.933	0.521	1.674
Type of locale			
City	*Reference group*		
Suburb	1.345	1.056	1.714[2]
Town	1.741	1.136	2.668[2]
Rural	1.957	1.384	2.768[2]
Percent White enrollment			
95 to 100 percent	*Reference group*		
80 to less than 95 percent	1.061	0.603	1.868
50 to less than 80 percent	0.882	0.481	1.617
50 percent or less	0.759	0.41	1.404
Region			
Northeast	*Reference group*		
Midwest	1.067	0.791	1.439
South	1.07	0.824	1.388
West	1.06	0.677	1.658
Number of full-time-equivalent teaching staff			
Less than 29	*Reference group*		
29 to less than 45	0.812	0.574	1.149
45 to less than 70	0.774	0.511	1.172
70 or more	0.606	0.344	1.066
Student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio			
Less than 12	*Reference group*		
12 through 16	0.883	0.606	1.286
More than 16 to less than 20	0.748	0.497	1.124
20 or more	0.934	0.561	1.554
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch			
Less than 10 percent	*Reference group*		
10 through 20 percent	1.67	0.952	2.93
20 through 50 percent	1.274	0.748	2.171
More than 50 percent	1.209	0.701	2.087

[1]Based on exponentiating the log-odds standard error from jackknife replication with df = 50, α = .05.
[2]Denotes the confidence interval did not contain the value 1.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

The logistic regression coefficients shown in table M-6 were used to assign each sampled school a response propensity score, which is interpreted as the school's predicted probability of responding to SSOCS:2016 based on its unique combination of frame characteristics. Using the estimated response propensities from the logistic regression model, we calculated the *R* indicator. The *R* indicator measures how representative the respondents are of the original sample or population with respect to the frame characteristics included in the model.[38] The standard deviation of the response propensities is obtained from the model, and the *R* indicator is estimated by the following equation:

$$\hat{R} = 1 - 2S_{\hat{\rho}} = 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i - 1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i\left(\hat{\rho}_i - \bar{\hat{\rho}}\right)^2},$$

Where:

$S_{\hat{\rho}}$ = the standard deviation of the response propensities
w_i = the base weight for school i
$\hat{\rho}_i$ = the estimated response propensity for school i
$\bar{\hat{\rho}}$ = the mean of the estimated response propensities, $\hat{\rho}_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$
n = the number of eligible schools in the sample.

Values of the *R* indicator that are close to 1 indicate that respondents are more likely to be representative of the sample or population. The *R* indicator based on our logistic model is approximately 0.79. This can be interpreted as signifying a moderate representativeness. Lastly, we split the respondents into two independent samples based on estimated response propensity and calculated estimates of 76 key statistics using each sample. The group in the lowest response propensity quintile (20 percent) was the first sample and was used as a proxy for nonrespondents. Respondents with a low propensity to respond share similar frame characteristics as nonresponding schools. The second sample was composed of the balance of the respondents. We performed *t* tests to compare the estimates of the 76 key statistics calculated from both samples. Of the 76 key statistics, 43 significant differences were detected between the estimates calculated with the two samples. All of the significant differences are positive, meaning that the schools in the low-propensity group reported more crime and other disciplinary problems than the balance of the schools. This suggests that prior to nonresponse adjustments, SSOCS may be underestimating the prevalence of crime and other characteristics of interest. The results are provided in table M-7.

[38] For more information on *R* indicators, see Witt, M.B. (2010). *Estimating the R-indicator, Its Standard Error and Other Related Statistics With SAS and SUDAAN*. Paper presented at JSM Proceedings, Section on Survey Research Methods. American Statistical Association.

Table M-7. Comparison of key estimates for low-propensity quintile and balance of interviewed sample

Key estimate	Low-propensity quintile estimate	Balance of sample estimate	Difference	*p* value	
Percent of public schools reporting at least one occurrence of the following incidents during the 2015–16 school year:					
Rape or attempted rape (C0310)	1.3	0.8	0.5	0.2949	
Sexual assault other than rape (C0314)	5.8	2.8	3.0	0.0085	*
Robbery with a weapon (C0318)	1.7	0.3	1.4	0.0953	
Robbery without a weapon (C0322)	7.3	1.9	5.4	0.0001	*
Physical attack or fight with a weapon (C0326)	5.5	1.9	3.6	0.0162	*
Physical attack or fight without a weapon (C0330)	82.3	56.5	25.8	<.0001	*
Threats of a physical attack with a weapon (C0334)	12.7	8.0	4.7	0.0271	*
Threat of a physical attack without a weapon (C0338)	55.3	36.4	18.9	<.0001	*
Theft/larceny (C0342)	52.5	35.9	16.5	<.0001	*
Possession of a firearm or explosive device (C0346)	3.9	2.1	1.8	0.0249	*
Possession of a knife or sharp object (C0350)	51.8	35.5	16.3	<.0001	*
The distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (C0354)	44.2	19.9	24.3	<.0001	*
The inappropriate distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs (C0355)	15.1	8.5	6.6	0.0008	*
The distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (C0358)	20.6	11.3	9.4	<.0001	*
Vandalism (C0362)	47.8	30.4	17.4	<.0001	*
Hate crime (C0690)	1.2	0.8	0.4	0.3306	
Percent of public schools reporting a daily or at least once per week occurrence of the following problems during the 2015–16 school year:					
Student racial/ethnic tensions (C0374)	2.4	1.5	0.8	0.4755	
Student bullying (C0376)	19.6	10.6	9.0	0.0006	*
Student sexual harassment of other students (C0378)	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.5182	
Student harassment of other students based on sexual orientation (C0381)	1.3	0.5	0.8	0.1952	
Student harassment of other students based on gender identity (C0383)	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.7199	
Widespread disorder in classrooms (C0382)	7.4	1.4	6.0	0.0010	*
Student verbal abuse of teachers (C0380)	14.2	3.1	11.1	0.0001	*
Student acts of disrespect for teachers other than verbal abuse (C0384)	23.8	8.0	15.8	<.0001	*
Gang activities (C0386)	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.2002	
Cyberbullying among students (C0389)	18.1	11.0	7.1	0.0018	*
School environment is affected by cyberbullying (C0391)	12.1	5.9	6.2	0.0010	*
Staff resources are used to deal with cyberbullying (C0393)	12.9	4.8	8.2	0.0001	*

Table M-7. Comparison of key estimates for low-propensity quintile and balance of interviewed sample—Continued

Key estimate	Low-propensity quintile estimate	Balance of sample estimate	Difference	*p* value	
Percent of students in public schools given the following disciplinary actions for being involved in the use or possession of a weapon other than a firearm or explosive device at school during the 2015–16 school year:					
Removals without continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year (C0470)	1.67	1.0	0.7	0.3018	
Transfers to specialized schools (C0472)	7.1	3.1	4.0	0.0015	*
Out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days, but less than the remainder of the school year (C0474)	15.0	6.1	8.9	0.0004	*
Other disciplinary action (C0476)	12.2	7.3	4.9	0.0315	*
Percentage of public schools reporting the use of the following violence prevention program components during the 2015–16 school year:					
Prevention curriculum, instruction, or training for students (C0174)	92.2	90.1	2.2	0.3186	
Behavioral or behavior modification intervention for students (C0176)	96.5	94.0	2.4	0.0482	*
Counseling, social work, psychological, or therapeutic activity for students (C0178)	94.7	94.5	0.2	0.9232	
Individual attention, mentoring, tutoring, or coaching of students by students (C0180)	70.3	57.4	13.0	0.0010	*
Individual attention, mentoring, tutoring, or coaching of students by adults (C0181)	94.6	91.7	2.9	0.1487	
Recreational, enrichment, or leisure activities for students (C0182)	92.0	87.5	4.5	0.0555	
Student involvement in peer meditation (C0175)	48.7	33.8	14.9	0.0003	*
Student court to address student conduct problems or minor offenses (C0177)	11.7	7.4	4.3	0.0753	
Student involvement in restorative circles (C0179)	43.2	30.5	12.6	0.0013	*
Social emotional learning (SEL) training for students (C0183)	73.7	64.1	9.6	0.0041	*
Programs to promote a sense of community or social integration among students (C0186)	86.7	79.1	7.6	0.0085	*
Percentage of public schools with a written plan for the following crisis situations during the 2015–16 school year:					
Active shooter (C0155)	93.2	92.3	0.9	0.6441	
Natural disasters (C0158)	95.7	95.9	-0.2	0.9238	
Hostages (C0162)	67.7	59.4	8.3	0.0349	*
Bomb threats or incidents (C0166)	97.3	93.5	3.8	0.0326	*
Chemical, biological, or radiological threats or incidents (C0170)	76.4	72.7	3.7	0.2595	
Suicide threat or incident (C0169)	93.2	83.0	10.2	0.0001	*
Pandemic flu (C0173)	52.1	50.7	1.5	0.6916	
Post-crisis reunification of students with their families (C0157)	88.3	85.4	3.0	0.2612	
Percentage of public schools that drilled students on the following emergency procedures during the 2015–16 school year:					
Evacuation (C0163)	96.1	90.6	5.5	0.0018	*
Lockdown (C0165)	96.6	94.1	2.5	0.1341	
Shelter-in-place (C0167)	79.8	74.4	5.4	0.1163	

Table M-7. Comparison of key estimates for low-propensity quintile and balance of interviewed sample—Continued

Key estimate	Low-propensity quintile estimate	Balance of sample estimate	Difference	*p* value	
*Percentage of public schools reporting that their efforts to reduce or prevent crime at school were limited in a **major** way by the following factors during the 2015–16 school year*:					
Lack of or inadequate teacher training in classroom management (C0280)	7.7	5.5	2.2	0.2138	
Lack of or inadequate alternative placements or programs for disruptive students (C0282)	37.9	29.5	8.4	0.0371	*
Likelihood of complaints from parents (C0284)	7.8	5.5	2.4	0.2465	
Lack of teacher support for school policies (C0286)	7.7	1.8	5.9	0.0099	*
Lack of parental support for school policies (C0288)	12.4	6.8	5.6	0.0308	*
Teachers' fear of student retaliation (C0290)	2.8	1.8	1.0	0.4057	
Fear of litigation (C0292)	6.6	6.7	-0.1	0.9617	
Inadequate funds (C0294)	33.0	27.0	6.0	0.0866	
Inconsistent application of school policies by faculty or staff (C0296)	12.9	5.7	7.2	0.0029	*
Fear of district or state reprisal (C0298)	4.7	2.6	2.0	0.2068	
Federal, state, or district policies on disciplining special education students (C0300)	22.3	15.7	6.6	0.0348	*
Federal policies on discipline and safety other than those for special education students (C0302)	10.9	6.8	4.2	0.0355	*
State or district policies on discipline and safety other than those for special education students (C0304)	12.4	7.4	5.0	0.0279	*
Percentage of public schools where a mental health professional was available to students for the following services during the 2015–16 school year:					
Diagnostic assessment for mental health disorders (C0662, C0664, or C0666)	81.3	68.6	12.7	0.0001	*
Treatment for mental health disorders (C0668, C0670, or C0672)	73.0	61.8	11.2	0.0048	*
*Percentage of public schools reporting that their efforts to provide mental health services to students were limited in a **major** way by the following factors during the 2015–16 school year*:					
Inadequate access to licensed mental health professionals (C0674)	29.1	30.8	-1.7	0.6594	
Inadequate funding (C0676)	49.1	46.1	3.0	0.5151	
Potential legal issues for school or district (C0678)	17.6	10.6	7.0	0.0228	*
Lack of parental support in addressing their children's mental health disorders (C0680)	30.0	23.4	6.6	0.0667	
Lack of community support for providing mental health services to students (C0682)	16.6	12.0	4.6	0.1206	
Written or unwritten policies regarding the school's requirement to pay for the diagnostics assessment or treatment of students (C0684)	15.9	14.0	1.9	0.4998	
Reluctance to label students with mental health disorders to avoid stigmatizing the child (C0686)	10.1	9.6	0.6	0.8028	

* $p < .05$.
[1] Based on a two-tailed *t* distribution with 50 df, $\alpha = .05$.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Nonresponse Weighting Adjustment

Unit nonresponse bias may be mitigated through statistical adjustments that take advantage of relationships between auxiliary variables and the probability of response. To identify characteristics associated with unit nonresponse, a multivariate analysis was performed using CHAID analysis. Within the levels of a particular characteristic, CHAID identifies the next best predictor(s) of response, until a tree is formed with all of the response predictors that were identified at each step. CHAID can be particularly useful for picking up interactions between characteristics, which would not be captured in the main-effects logistic regression used above. The final result is a division of the entire dataset into cells that have the greatest discrimination with respect to the unit response rates. In other words, CHAID divides the dataset into groups within which the unit response rate is as constant as possible and between which the unit response rate is as different as possible. These cells are called nonresponse adjustment cells.

Several school-level frame characteristics were found to be related to the propensity to respond in section 3.6. These include locale, number of FTE teaching staff, school level, Census region, percentage of White, non-Hispanic students, enrollment size, student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Variables that are predictive of response are likely to be sources of nonresponse bias. These variables were therefore selected as the auxiliary variables for the CHAID analysis.

In the CHAID analysis, the multiple combinations of the auxiliary variables were grouped into 17 nonresponse adjustment cells, which minimize the variance in response rates within a cell and maximize the variance in response rates between cells. The response rates for these cells, as well as the sample sizes, are shown in table M-8. The weighted unit response rates vary among adjustment cells from 40.7 to 87.6 percent, and the unweighted response rates vary from 43.2 to 88.4 percent. The resulting cell definitions from the CHAID analysis were used to create the nonresponse adjustment cells that are used to produce the SSOCS:2016 final weights, which are the weights given in the SSOCS data file and should be used in data analysis.

Table M-8. Nonresponse adjustment cells, weighted and unweighted response rates of cells, and number of respondents: SSOCS:2016

Cell	Response rate (percent)		Number of respondents
	Weighted	Unweighted	
1	87.6	88.4	38
2	77.3	78.3	36
3	72.7	72.4	139
4	71.4	69.0	129
5	59.8	55.5	116
6	73.6	77.7	136
7	61.5	63.6	159
8	75.8	73.2	60
9	62.4	59.3	102
10	58.5	61.1	184
11	60.3	57.0	270
12	48.7	50.3	165
13	61.9	61.1	201
14	48.3	43.2	79
15	40.7	44.6	79
16	47.3	46.0	57
17	56.8	54.2	142

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

To evaluate the effect of the nonresponse weighting adjustment, a comparison analysis was conducted of the eligible sample (3,534 cases with sample selection base weights) and the respondents only (2,092 completed questionnaires with the post-raking final weight, which is adjusted for nonresponse) to look for differences between these two groups. The weighting adjustment should minimize any differences originally found between the eligible sample and respondents only, with respect to the frame characteristics used to define the adjustment cells.

This analysis evaluates the sample distributions. For all categories of the eight frame characteristic categories, the nonresponse bias is estimated as

$$\hat{B}(p_r) = \hat{p}_r - \hat{p}_t$$

Where:

$\hat{p}_t$ = the estimated percentage based on all eligible sample cases (base weighted); and

$\hat{p}_r$ = the estimated percentage based on respondent cases (base weighted or final weighted).

The relative bias for an estimated proportion using only the respondent data, $\hat{p}_r$, is calculated using the following formula:

$$RelB(\hat{p}_r) = \frac{\hat{B}(p_r)}{\hat{p}_r}$$

The mean and median estimated relative bias across all frame variables is calculated as a summary measure.

Tables M-9 and M-10 contain summary statistics of the findings. Table M-9 provides the comparisons between respondents and the eligible sample on the frame characteristics. Base-weighted distributions were used to describe differences between the respondents and eligible sample before the noninterview adjustment, and final weights were used to describe differences after the adjustment. Table M-10 demonstrates that the adjustments were effective at removing the observed bias in the frame characteristics. According to the table, estimates of frame characteristics that were significantly biased before adjustments were no longer significantly biased after adjustments.

Table M-9. Summary of unit nonresponse bias before and after noninterview adjustment

Nonresponse bias statistics	Total
Before noninterview adjustment	
Mean estimated percent relative bias (absolute value)	7.41
Median estimated percent relative bias (absolute value)	5.75
Percent of variable categories significantly biased[1]	43.75
After noninterview adjustment	
Mean estimated percent relative bias (absolute value)	1.50
Median estimated percent relative bias (absolute value)	0.47
Percent of variable categories significantly biased[1]	0

[1]Based on a two-tailed t distribution with 50 df, α=0.05.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Table M-10. Effects of nonresponse adjustment on bias reduction in frame characteristics

Significance in bias before nonresponse adjustment	Change in absolute bias due to noninterview adjustment	Significance in bias after nonresponse adjustment	Number of characteristics
Not significant	Reduction	Not significant	13
	Increase in difference	Not significant	5
		Significant	0
Significant	> 50 percent reduction	Not significant	13
		Significant	0
	10–50 percent reduction	Not significant	1
		Significant	0
	< 10 percent reduction	Not significant	0
		Significant	0
	Increase in difference	Not significant	0
		Significant	0

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Summary

This appendix documents the unit-level nonresponse bias analysis for SSOCS:2016. When the sample was first compared to the target population, similar distributions were found across all eight school characteristic variables and, therefore, no selection bias was found in the survey sample design.

The overall weighted response rate was 62.9 percent. In general, larger schools, city schools, schools with 50 percent or less White enrollment, schools with large FTE teaching staff, schools with a student-to-FTE teacher ratio between 16 and 20, and schools with 50 percent or more of students eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch were less likely to respond to the SSOCS:2016 survey. Over half of the 76 key survey estimates are significantly related to enrollment size, school level, and number of FTE teaching staff.

Significant relationships were detected between respondent and nonrespondent distributions for enrollment size, locale, percent White enrollment, number of FTE teaching staff, student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The largest differences in distributions between respondents and nonrespondents were found for city schools (-12.6 percent), rural schools (12.6 percent), schools with 50 percent or less White enrollment (-12.2 percent), schools with 80 to less than 95 percent White enrollment (9.0 percent), schools with less than 29 FTE teaching staff (9.9 percent), and schools with less than 300 students enrolled (9.4 percent). Since frame variables were found to be related to both response rates and survey estimates, these findings are indicative of a risk of bias in the survey estimates.

A logistic regression examination of the odds of responding among the categories of the eight school characteristic variables found that city schools were less likely to respond to the SSOCS than were suburban, town, or rural schools. This implies that, controlling for the eight given frame characteristics, differences in response rates by locale are a key driver of the previously observed differences between the respondent and nonrespondent distributions.

Over half of the estimates for key survey variables calculated for cases with a low response propensity are significantly different from estimates calculated for the balance of the sample. This suggests that nonrespondents respond differently from respondents for over half of the key characteristics. Additionally, estimates calculated for the low-propensity group are higher than the estimates calculated for the balance of the sample. This suggests that cases similar to nonrespondents are more likely to report crimes and other disciplinary problems.

Among the 76 key survey variables, there are 3 variables where (1) distributions significantly varied across the levels of a frame variable for at least seven of the frame variables and (2) low-propensity respondents (used as proxies for nonrespondents) differ from the rest of the respondents on responses to these items: at least one physical attack or fight without a weapon; at least one occurrence of inappropriate distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs; and at least one occurrence of vandalism.

Finally, the full sample (with base weights) was compared to the respondents (with base weights and final weights) in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the nonresponse weighting

adjustment. The results show that before the nonresponse adjustment, approximately 44 percent of the 32 categories from the eight frame characteristics were significantly biased. After the adjustment, none of the categories were significantly biased. Therefore, the adjustments were effective in removing the observed bias in the eight frame characteristics.

We cannot evaluate post-adjustment bias in the survey estimates because we do not have survey data for nonrespondents. Some survey estimates may be subject to nonresponse bias that is not related to the observable characteristics used to create nonresponse-adjusted weights. This type of bias would not be removed by weighting adjustments. Therefore, data users are cautioned that, because survey variables are not observed for nonrespondents, the exact amount of nonresponse bias remaining in key estimates cannot be known with certainty and is likely to vary between estimates. However, the strong relationships between frame variables and survey estimates observed in the prior analysis provide reason to expect that the adjustments removed some of the nonresponse bias in the survey estimates.

Appendix N: Base-Weighted Item Response Rates

Table N-1. Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16

Variable name	Variable label	Number eligible to respond	Percent who responded	Imputation method
c0110	School practice require visitor check in and badges	2092	99.42	Hot deck
c0112	Building access controlled locked/monitored doors	2092	99.62	Hot deck
c0114	Grounds access controlled locked/monitored gates	2092	99.58	Hot deck
c0116	Students pass through metal detectors	2092	99.66	Hot deck
c0120	Have random metal detector checks on students	2092	99.45	Hot deck
c0121	Equip classrooms with locks so that doors are locked from inside	2092	99.11	Hot deck
c0122	Practice to close campus for lunch	2092	98.86	Hot deck
c0124	Practice random dog sniffs for drugs	2092	99.61	Hot deck
c0126	Random sweeps for contraband not including dog sniffs	2092	99.32	Hot deck
c0128	Require drug testing for athletes	2092	99.12	Hot deck
c0130	Require drug testing for students in extra-curricular activities	2092	99.31	Hot deck
c0134	Require students to wear uniforms	2092	99.53	Hot deck
c0136	Practice to enforce a strict dress code	2092	99.11	Hot deck
c0138	Provide school lockers to students	2092	99.16	Hot deck
c0139	Silent alarms directly connected to law enforcement	2092	99.51	Hot deck
c0140	Require clear book bags or ban book bags	2092	99.65	Hot deck
c0141	Provide an electronic notification system that automatically notifies parents in case of a school-wide emergency	2092	99.27	Hot deck
c0142	Require students to wear badge or photo ID	2092	99.48	Hot deck
c0143	Provide a structured anonymous threat reporting system	2092	98.51	Hot deck
c0144	Require faculty/staff to wear badge or photo ID	2092	99.53	Hot deck
c0146	Security camera(s) monitor the school	2092	99.65	Hot deck
c0148	Provide telephones in most classrooms	2092	99.62	Hot deck
c0150	Provide two-way radios to any staff	2092	99.54	Hot deck
c0151	Limit access to social networking sites	2092	99.55	Hot deck
c0153	Prohibit use of cell phones and text messaging devices	2092	99.49	Hot deck
c0155	Written plan for active shooter scenario	2092	98.99	Hot deck
c0157	Written plan for post-crisis reunification of students with their families	2092	99.40	Hot deck
c0158	Written plan for natural disasters	2092	99.35	Hot deck
c0162	Written plan for hostages	2092	99.00	Hot deck
c0163	Drilled students on plan for evacuation	2092	99.65	Hot deck
c0165	Drilled students on plan for lockdown	2092	99.66	Hot deck
c0166	Written plan for bomb threats	2092	99.35	Hot deck
c0167	Drilled students on plan for shelter-in-place	2092	99.66	Hot deck
c0169	Written plan for suicide threat or incident	2092	99.35	Hot deck
c0170	Written plan for chemical, biological, or radiological threats	2092	99.45	Hot deck
c0173	Written plan for pandemic flu	2092	99.36	Hot deck
c0174	Prevention curriculum/instruction/training	2092	99.46	Hot deck
c0175	Student involvement in peer mediation	2092	99.10	Hot deck
c0176	Behavioral modification for students	2092	99.49	Hot deck
c0177	Student court to address student conduct problems or minor offenses	2092	99.4	Hot deck
c0178	Student counseling/social work	2092	99.48	Hot deck
c0179	Student involvement in restorative circles	2092	99.55	Hot deck
c0180	Individual mentoring/tutoring by students	2092	99.35	Hot deck
c0181	Individual mentoring/tutoring by adults	2092	99.27	Hot deck
c0182	Recreation/enrichment student activities	2092	99.21	Hot deck
c0183	Social emotional learning training for students	2092	99.39	Hot deck
c0186	Promote sense of community/integration	2092	99.26	Hot deck
c0190	Formal process to obtain parental input	2092	99.5	Hot deck
c0192	Provide training/assistance to parents	2092	99.51	Hot deck

Table N-1. Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16

Variable name	Variable label	Number eligible to respond	Percent who responded	Imputation method
c0194	Program involves parents at school	2092	99.42	Hot deck
c0196	Parent participates in open house or back to school night	2092	99.47	Hot deck
c0198	Parent participates in parent-teacher conference	2092	99.40	Hot deck
c0200	Parent participates in subject-area events	2092	99.38	Hot deck
c0202	Parent volunteers at school	2092	99.51	Hot deck
c0204	Community involvement - parent groups	2092	99.38	Hot deck
c0206	Community involvement - social services	2092	99.47	Hot deck
c0208	Community involvement - juvenile justice	2092	99.43	Hot deck
c0210	Community involvement - law enforcement	2092	99.49	Hot deck
c0212	Community involvement - mental health	2092	99.43	Hot deck
c0214	Community involvement - civic organizations	2092	99.47	Hot deck
c0216	Community involvement - business	2092	99.40	Hot deck
c0218	Community involvement - religious organizations	2092	99.27	Hot deck
c0232	# of full-time security guards	2092	98.95	Ratio
c0234	# of part-time security guards	2092	99.06	Ratio
c0236	# of full-time School Resource Officers	1360	95.17	Ratio
c0238	# of part-time School Resource Officers	1360	93.91	Ratio
c0240	# of full-time sworn law enforcement officers-not SROs	1360	94.07	Ratio
c0242	# of part-time sworn law enforcement officers-not SROs	1360	93.59	Ratio
c0265	Teacher training - discipline policies related to cyberbullying	2092	99.30	Hot deck
c0266	Teacher training - classroom management	2092	99.23	Hot deck
c0267	Teacher training - discipline policies related to bullying	2092	99.18	Hot deck
c0268	Teacher training - discipline policies related to violence	2092	98.90	Hot deck
c0269	Teacher training - alcohol or drug discipline policy	2092	99.14	Hot deck
c0270	Teacher training - safety procedures	2092	99.30	Hot deck
c0271	Teacher training - intervention and referral strategies	2092	99.30	Hot deck
c0272	Teacher training - early warning signs for violent behavior	2092	99.21	Hot deck
c0273	Teacher training - recognize bullying behavior	2092	99.33	Hot deck
c0274	Teacher training - student alcohol/drug abuse	2092	99.11	Hot deck
c0276	Teacher training - positive behavioral intervention	2092	99.21	Hot deck
c0277	Teacher training - crisis prevention and intervention	2092	98.98	Hot deck
c0280	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of teacher training	2092	98.75	Hot deck
c0282	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of alternative placement	2092	99.04	Hot deck
c0284	Efforts limited by parental complaints	2092	99.02	Hot deck
c0286	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of teacher support	2092	99.00	Hot deck
c0288	Efforts limited by inadequate/lack of parent support	2092	98.94	Hot deck
c0290	Efforts limited by fear of student retaliation	2092	98.98	Hot deck
c0292	Efforts limited by fear of litigation	2092	99.00	Hot deck
c0294	Efforts limited by inadequate funds	2092	98.88	Hot deck
c0296	Efforts limited by inconsistent application of policies	2092	99.00	Hot deck
c0298	Efforts limited by fear of district or state reprisal	2092	98.75	Hot deck
c0300	Efforts limited by fed policies/special ed	2092	98.49	Hot deck
c0302	Efforts limited by other federal policies-not special ed	2092	98.84	Hot deck
c0304	Efforts limited by other state/district policies-not special ed	2092	98.84	Hot deck
c0306	Any school deaths from homicides	2092	99.26	Hot deck
c0308	School shooting incidents	2092	99.15	Hot deck
c0310	# of rapes/attempted rapes - total	2092	99.81	Ratio
c0312	# of rapes reported to police	2092	99.99	Ratio
c0314	# of sexual assaults other than rape - total	2092	98.88	Ratio

Table N-1. Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16

Variable name	Variable label	Number eligible to respond	Percent who responded	Imputation method
c0316	# of sexual assaults other than rape reported to police	2092	99.25	Ratio
c0318	# of robberies with weapon - total	2092	99.66	Ratio
c0320	# of robberies with weapon reported to police	2092	99.78	Ratio
c0322	# of robberies without weapon - total	2092	97.59	Ratio
c0324	# of robberies without weapon reported to police	2092	98.29	Ratio
c0326	# of attacks with weapon - total	2092	83.95	Ratio
c0328	# of attacks with weapon reported to police	2092	97.66	Ratio
c0330	# of attacks without weapon - total	2092	82.24	Ratio
c0332	# of attacks without weapon reported to police	2092	88.86	Ratio
c0334	# of threats of attack with weapon - total	2092	98.76	Ratio
c0336	# of threats of attack with weapon reported to police	2092	99.03	Ratio
c0338	# of threats of attack without weapon - total	2092	95.52	Ratio
c0340	# of threats of attack without weapon reported to police	2092	94.57	Ratio
c0342	# of incidents theft/larceny - total	2092	98.53	Ratio
c0344	# of incidents theft/larceny reported to police	2092	97.72	Ratio
c0346	# of possession of firearms - total	2092	98.18	Ratio
c0348	# of possession of firearms reported to police	2092	99.53	Ratio
c0350	# of possession knife/sharp object - total	2092	97.55	Ratio
c0352	# of possession knife/sharp object reported to police	2092	96.15	Ratio
c0354	# of distribution, possession, or use of drugs - total	2092	97.97	Ratio
c0355	# of distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs - total	2092	99.68	Ratio
c0356	# of distribution, possession, or use of drugs reported to police	2092	98.53	Ratio
c0357	# of distribution, possession, or use of prescription drugs reported to police	2092	99.37	Ratio
c0358	# of distribution, possession, or use of alcohol - total	2092	98.51	Ratio
c0360	# of distribution, possession, or use of alcohol reported to police	2092	99.19	Ratio
c0362	# of incidents of vandalism - total	2092	98.07	Ratio
c0364	# of incidents of vandalism reported to police	2092	97.74	Ratio
c0370	# of times school disrupted due to unplanned fire alarms	2092	99.77	Ratio
c0372	# of times school disrupted (e.g. bomb, chemical, radiological, death threats)	2092	99.40	Ratio
c0374	How often student racial/ethnic tensions	2092	99.47	Hot deck
c0376	How often student bullying occurs	2092	99.28	Hot deck
c0378	How often student sexual harassment of students	2092	99.30	Hot deck
c0380	How often student verbal abuse of teachers	2092	99.85	Hot deck
c0381	How often student harassment based on sexual orientation	2092	99.70	Hot deck
c0382	How often widespread disorder in classrooms	2092	99.67	Hot deck
c0383	How often student harassment based on gender identity	2092	99.84	Hot deck
c0384	How often student acts of disrespect for teachers-not verbal abuse	2092	99.76	Hot deck
c0386	How often student gang activities	2092	99.47	Hot deck
c0389	How often cyberbullying among students	2092	99.73	Hot deck
c0390	Removal with no services available	2092	99.76	Hot deck
c0391	How often school environment affected by cyberbullying	2092	99.84	Hot deck
c0392	Removal with no services available-action used	896	99.57	Hot deck
c0393	How often staff resources used to deal with cyberbullying	2092	99.81	Hot deck
c0394	Removal with tutoring/at-home instruction available	2092	98.87	Hot deck
c0396	Removal with tutoring/at-home instruction available - action used	1074	97.51	Hot deck

Table N-1. Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16

Variable name	Variable label	Number eligible to respond	Percent who responded	Imputation method
c0398	Transfer to specialized school available	2092	99.25	Hot deck
c0400	Transfer to specialized school available - action used	1453	99.52	Hot deck
c0402	Transfer to regular school available	2092	98.45	Hot deck
c0404	Transfer to regular school available - action used	757	96.14	Hot deck
c0406	Outside suspension/no services available	2092	96.17	Hot deck
c0408	Outside suspension/no services available - action used	1033	91.59	Hot deck
c0410	Outside suspension with services available	2092	96.88	Hot deck
c0412	Outside suspension with services available - action used	1679	90.91	Hot deck
c0414	In-school suspension/no services available	2092	96.91	Hot deck
c0416	In-school suspension/no services available - action used	376	92.85	Hot deck
c0418	In-school suspension with services available	2092	98.65	Hot deck
c0420	In-school suspension with services available - action used	1704	94.05	Hot deck
c0422	Referral to school counselor available	2092	99.39	Hot deck
c0424	Referral to school counselor available - action used	2006	94.07	Hot deck
c0426	In-school disciplinary plan available	2092	98.64	Hot deck
c0428	In-school disciplinary plan available - action used	1158	95.94	Hot deck
c0430	Outside school disciplinary plan available	2092	98.16	Hot deck
c0432	Outside school disciplinary plan available - action used	696	93.88	Hot deck
c0434	Loss of bus privileges for misbehavior available	2092	99.32	Hot deck
c0436	Loss of bus privileges for misbehavior available - action used	1757	95.82	Hot deck
c0438	Corporal punishment available	2092	99.20	Hot deck
c0440	Corporal punishment available - action used	182	97.23	Hot deck
c0442	School probation available	2092	98.19	Hot deck
c0444	School probation available - action used	1208	94.34	Hot deck
c0446	Detention/Saturday school available	2092	99.09	Hot deck
c0448	Detention/Saturday school available - action used	1609	96.20	Hot deck
c0450	Loss of student privileges available	2092	99.30	Hot deck
c0452	Loss of student privileges available - action used	1991	95.29	Hot deck
c0454	Require community service available	2092	99.24	Hot deck
c0456	Require community service available - action used	731	96.09	Hot deck
c0458	# students involved in use/possession firearm/explosive device - total	2092	99.95	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0460	# of removals for firearm use/possession	2092	99.95	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0462	# of transfers for firearm use/possession	2092	99.98	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0464	# of suspensions for firearm use/possession	2092	99.96	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0466	# of other actions for firearm use/possession	2092	99.90	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0468	# of students involved in use/possession weapon (other than firearm/explosive device) - total	2092	98.92	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0470	# of removals for weapon use	2092	99.80	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)

Table N-1. Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16

Variable name	Variable label	Number eligible to respond	Percent who responded	Imputation method
c0472	# of transfers for weapon use	2092	99.57	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0474	# of suspensions for weapon use	2092	98.47	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0476	# of other actions for weapon use	2092	98.19	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0478	# students involved in distribution/possession/use illegal drugs - total	2092	99.30	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0480	# of removals for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs	2092	99.61	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0482	# of transfers for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs	2092	99.36	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0484	# of suspensions for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs	2092	98.95	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0486	# of other actions for distribution/possession/use - illegal drugs	2092	98.56	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0488	# of students involved in distribution/possession/use alcohol - total	2092	99.72	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0490	# of removals for distribution/possession/use - alcohol	2092	99.90	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0492	# of transfers for distribution/possession/use - alcohol	2092	99.65	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0494	# of suspensions for distribution/possession/use - alcohol	2092	99.41	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0496	# of other actions for distribution/possession/use - alcohol	2092	99.32	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0498	# students involved in attacks/fights - total	2092	98.11	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0500	# of removals for attacks/fights	2092	99.65	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0502	# of transfers for attacks/fights	2092	98.20	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0504	# of suspensions for attacks/fights	2092	95.79	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0506	# of other actions for attacks/fights	2092	93.87	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0518	# of removals with no service - total	2092	98.28	Ratio (Aggregatep roportion)

Table N-1. Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16

Variable name	Variable label	Number eligible to respond	Percent who responded	Imputation method
c0520	# of transfers to specialized schools - total	2092	97.08	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0522	Total students	2092	100.00	From Frame
c0524	Percent eligible for free or reduced-price lunch	2092	100.00	From Frame
c0526	Percent students limited English proficient	2092	97.98	Hot deck
c0528	Percent special education students	2092	98.25	Hot deck
c0530	Percent male	2092	100.00	From Frame
c0532	Percent students below 15th percentile standardized tests	2092	93.36	Hot deck
c0534	Percent students likely to go to college	2092	96.66	Hot deck
c0536	Percent students academic achievement important	2092	97.32	Hot deck
c0538	Typical number of classroom changes	2092	98.87	Hot deck
c0560	Crime where students live	2092	99.58	Hot deck
c0562	Crime where school located	2092	99.56	Hot deck
c0564	School type	2092	100.00	From Frame
c0565	Verbatim responses-school type	29	100.00	None
c0568	Average percent daily attendance	2092	98.73	Hot deck
c0570	# of students transferred to school	2092	94.57	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0572	# of students transferred from school	2092	93.19	Ratio (Aggregate proportion)
c0600	Have a threat assessment team	2092	99.19	Hot deck
c0602	Threat assessment team formal meetings	996	95.78	Hot deck
c0604	LGBTQ acceptance group	2092	99.08	Hot deck
c0606	Disability acceptance group	2092	99.08	Hot deck
c0608	Cultural diversity acceptance group	2092	99.08	Hot deck
c0610	Sworn law enforcement officers at school	2092	99.91	Hot deck
c0612	Sworn law enforcement officers present during school	1360	95.25	Hot deck
c0614	Sworn law enforcement officers while students arriving or leaving	1360	95.25	Hot deck
c0616	Sworn law enforcement officers present at school activities	1360	95.25	Hot deck
c0618	Sworn law enforcement officers present at other times	1360	95.14	Hot deck
c0620	Sworn law enforcement officers with stun gun	1360	96.53	Hot deck
c0622	Sworn law enforcement officers with chemical sprays	1360	96.46	Hot deck
c0624	Sworn law enforcement officers with firearms	1360	96.31	Hot deck
c0626	Sworn law enforcement officers wear a body camera	1360	96.62	Hot deck
c0628	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in traffic control	1360	96.7	Hot deck
c0630	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in patrol	1360	96.71	Hot deck
c0632	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in discipline	1360	97.04	Hot deck
c0634	Sworn law enforcement officers participate with emergency personnel	1360	97.00	Hot deck
c0636	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in solving school problems	1360	97.24	Hot deck
c0638	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in prevention training	1360	97.14	Hot deck
c0640	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in student mentoring	1360	96.98	Hot deck
c0642	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in teaching law-related courses	1360	96.95	Hot deck
c0644	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in recording or reporting discipline problems	1360	97.18	Hot deck

Table N-1. Detailed base-weighted item response rates: School year 2015–16

Variable name	Variable label	Number eligible to respond	Percent who responded	Imputation method
c0646	Sworn law enforcement officers participate in providing legal definitions	1360	97.18	Hot deck
c0648	Sworn law enforcement officer present for all instructional hours	1360	96.60	Hot deck
c0650	Formalized policies for sworn law enforcement officers	1360	95.72	Hot deck
c0652	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include student discipline	973	95.83	Hot deck
c0654	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include use of restraints	973	96.40	Hot deck
c0656	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include use of firearms	973	96.42	Hot deck
c0658	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include making arrests	973	96.50	Hot deck
c0660	Policies for sworn law enforcement officers include reporting of offenses	973	96.72	Hot deck
c0662	Diagnostic assessment at school by school-employed mental health professional	2092	94.99	Hot deck
c0664	Diagnostic assessment at school by school-funded mental health professional	2092	94.43	Hot deck
c0666	Diagnostic assessment outside of school by school-funded mental health professional	2092	93.81	Hot deck
c0668	Treatment at school by school-employed mental health professional	2092	93.58	Hot deck
c0670	Treatment at school by school-funded mental health professional	2092	93.86	Hot deck
c0672	Treatment outside of school by school-funded mental health professional	2092	93.16	Hot deck
c0674	Inadequate access to professionals limits mental health efforts	2092	98.61	Hot deck
c0676	Inadequate funding limits mental health efforts	2092	98.06	Hot deck
c0678	Potential legal issues limit mental health efforts	2092	97.58	Hot deck
c0680	Lack of parental support limits mental health efforts	2092	97.82	Hot deck
c0682	Lack of community support limits mental health efforts	2092	98.38	Hot deck
c0684	Payment policies limit mental health efforts	2092	98.08	Hot deck
c0686	Reluctance to label students limits mental health efforts	2092	98.21	Hot deck
c0688	Number of arrests at school	2092	99.38	Ratio
c0690	Number of hate crimes	2092	99.77	Ratio
c0692	Hate crimes motivated by bias against race or color	43	96.41	Hot deck
c0694	Hate crimes motivated by bias against national origin or ethnicity	43	96.41	Hot deck
c0696	Hate crimes motivated by bias against gender	43	96.41	Hot deck
c0698	Hate crimes motivated by bias against religion	43	96.41	Hot deck
c0700	Hate crimes motivated by bias against disability	43	96.41	Hot deck
c0702	Hate crimes motivated by bias against sexual orientation	43	96.41	Hot deck
c0704	Hate crimes motivated by bias against gender identity	43	96.41	Hot deck

Appendix O: Detailed Analysis of Item Nonresponse Bias

In its statistical standards, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) requires that any survey item with a weighted item response rate of less than 85 percent be evaluated for potential nonresponse bias before the data or any analysis using the data may be released (U.S. Department of Education 2012). This appendix serves to supplement the unit-level nonresponse bias analysis for the 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS:2016), summarizing the results of the item-level nonresponse bias analysis. Unless noted otherwise, estimates were produced for this appendix using the final weights.

The SSOCS:2016 sample consists of 3,553 schools, of which 19 were ineligible for the survey and 2,092 completed the survey (62.9 percent weighted response rate; 59.2 percent unweighted response rate). Analysis of the unit-level nonresponse found that adjustments to the weights of the sample yielded distributions statistically similar to the eligible sample. As in most surveys, responses to some items in the SSOCS:2016 questionnaire were not obtained for all interviewed respondents, which can lead to nonresponse bias at the item level. There are numerous reasons for item nonresponse. Some respondents may not know the answer to an item or may not want to respond for other reasons, or the interview may have been interrupted and not completed. Item nonresponse can also occur when inconsistencies among interrelated items are discovered after the interview. In such circumstances, these item values must be set to missing and then imputed.

The majority of items in SSOCS:2016 had high response rates. The mean item response rate for SSOCS:2016 was 98 percent and, therefore, there is little potential for item nonresponse bias for most items in the survey. However, for the items with weighted response rates lower than 85 percent, the potential for nonresponse bias must be examined. There were two such items in SSOCS:2016. This appendix first describes the two items that were included in the nonresponse bias analysis and then examines the sensitivity of the items to potential bias by imposing extreme assumptions on the item nonrespondents. Further analysis was performed by comparing item respondents and nonrespondents with respect to the distributions of school characteristics available from the sampling frame and other SSOCS survey variables to determine whether cases were missing completely at random. The potential for item nonresponse bias is deemed negligible if no statistically significant differences are detected between the nonrespondents and respondents.

Key Survey Items in the Item-level Nonresponse Bias Analysis

Since the mean item response rate for SSOCS:2016 survey items was 98 percent, even if the item nonrespondents differ considerably from the respondents, the item nonresponse bias will be negligible for most items. Per NCES standards, only items with a response rate of less than 85 percent were considered for this analysis.

Of the 273 survey variables examined in the SSOCS restricted-use file, two had a weighted item response rate lower than 85 percent. Table O-1 contains the name and description of the variables included in the bias analysis, the number of eligible respondents for each variable, and their weighted and unweighted response rates. Weighted results are shown with final weights and base weights.[39] Final weights, rather than base weights, were used for the analyses in this appendix to most accurately reflect the item responses of respondents.

[39] A base weight is calculated as the inverse of a school's sampling probability, while the final weight is the base weight adjusted for unit nonresponse and is adjusted to match to externally provided totals.

Table O-1. Item details for items with response rates less than 85 percent: SSOCS:2016

Variable name	Variable description	Eligible respondents	Item-level response rates (percent) Weighted with final weights	Weighted with base weights	Unweighted
C0326	Number of physical attacks or fights with a weapon	2,092	83.8	84.0	86.6
C0330	Number of physical attacks or fights without a weapon	2,092	82.1	82.2	85.7

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Using Extreme Assumptions to Assess the Potential for Item Nonresponse Bias

To assess possible nonresponse bias, sets of imputed values were generated by imposing extreme assumptions on the item nonrespondents. This provides an estimate of bias that would result under a "worst-case" scenario in which all item nonrespondents have the highest or lowest value from the original distribution. Two new sets of imputed values, one based on a "low" assumption and one based on a "high" assumption, were created for each variable. A "low" imputed value variable was created by resetting imputed values to the minimum value of the original distribution, and a "high" imputed value variable was created by resetting imputed values to the maximum value of the original distribution.[40] Both the "low" imputed value variable distributions and the "high" imputed value variable means were compared to the original means, and the results are presented in table O-2.

For items C0326 and C0330, the potential for bias exists for both low and high imputed values because the mean with low imputed values and the mean with high imputed values differ significantly from the original mean. In other words, if the missing responses tend to be low values for these items, then the SSOCS:2016 item estimate will be biased upward, whereas if the missing responses tend to be high values for these items, then the SSOCS:2016 item estimate will be biased downward.

Table O-2. Comparison of original and extreme imputed value item mean estimates for items with low and high extreme imputed value estimates

Variable	Minimum observed value	Low imputed value estimate		s.e.[1]	Original estimate	s.e.[1]	Maxiumum observed value	High imputed value estimate		s.e.[1]
C0326	0	0.055	*	0.015	0.066	0.018	23	3.792	*	0.297
C0330	0	5.157	*	0.339	6.279	0.429	216	43.76	*	2.631

* $p < .05$, using a t test of the difference between the low/high value and the original value.
[1] s.e. is standard error.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

There appears to be a greater risk of noticeable downward bias than of noticeable upward bias because the difference between the high estimate and the original estimate is much larger than the difference between the low estimate and the original estimate.

[40] The two analysis items are discrete count data and were treated as ordinal data when executing the analysis plan.

However, this is primarily a function of the highly skewed nature of these variables, for which a small number of schools reported a very large number of incidents. While this table shows a worst-case scenario, in practice it is highly unlikely that all item nonrespondents would have reported the highest value for these variables. Indeed, even if item nonrespondents on average are more likely to provide higher responses, it is likely that many would still be reporting 0 or close to 0. Thus, even if item nonrespondents do tend on average toward higher values of these variables, any downward bias is likely to be far smaller in magnitude than is implied by these results.

Item Nonresponse Bias

Comparison of item respondents and item nonrespondents across frame characteristics. Measuring the magnitude of nonresponse bias at an item level can be problematic, since we do not know how item nonrespondents' answers differ from item respondents' answers. We can, however, examine how the level of item response differs across frame characteristics. The SSOCS sampling frame has data available for eight school-level characteristic variables for the entire sample. Five categorical variables (enrollment size, school level, locale, percentage White enrollment, and region) were used directly in the sampling design, while the remaining three variables (number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) teaching staff, student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch) were derived from continuous variables available in the sampling frame. For SSOCS:2016, the categorical definitions for the student-to-teacher ratio and the percentage eligible for free or reduced-price lunch variables were collapsed into the categories used in NCES table stubs. Since there were no corresponding NCES table stubs for the number of FTE teachers, the categorical definitions were kept consistent with those used for the SSOCS:2010 nonresponse bias analysis.

Comparison of item respondents and item nonrespondents across survey variables with high item response rates. Two survey subitems—C0560 (perceived level of crime in students' neighborhood) and C0562 (perceived level of crime in the school's neighborhood)—both had weighted item response rates above 99 percent and are likely to be correlated with responses to critical items. Distributions of these variables were also compared between respondents and nonrespondents to C0326 and C0330. Item C0560 has four discrete response values, while C0562 has three values.

<u>Number of attacks with a weapon (C0326)</u>

The results of the likelihood-ratio chi-square tests for independence, based on each two-way comparison in table O-3, indicate that for item C0326 (total number of attacks with a weapon), statistically significant relationships exist between the propensity to respond and (1) enrollment size, (2) school level, (3) number of FTE teaching staff, and (4) perceived level of crime in the school's neighborhood. Primary schools, schools with 29 to less than 45 FTE teaching staff, and schools with a high perceived level of crime in the school's neighborhood were less likely to respond to item C0326, while high schools and schools with enrollment less than 300 were more likely to respond.

There appears to be a relationship between these four variables and responses to item C0326, suggesting at least a moderate risk of item nonresponse bias. However, C0326 has highly skewed responses. About 97 percent of the responses are zero, and over 99 percent of the responses are 2

or less. If there is no discernible difference in the way schools are responding to item C0326 across the school-level characteristic variables, then the impact of such a relationship is probably not going to be as severe as it appears to be in the extreme value analysis for item C0326. This provides some reason to expect that the "extreme" scenario is unrealistic.

Table O-3. Comparison of item respondents and nonrespondents for the variable number of attacks with a weapon (C0326): SSOCS:2016

	Percent					
Item description	Respondents *n* = 1,812	Nonrespondents *n* = 280	Difference	Likelihood ratio	*p value*	
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	22.8	16.4	6.4	7.83	<.05	*
300-499	29.5	32.4	-2.9			
500-999	36.8	44.2	-7.4			
1,000 or more	11.0	7.1	4.0			
School level						
Primary	56.2	71.7	-15.5	29.23	<.01	*
Middle	19.0	16.8	2.2			
High school	16.7	8.1	8.5			
Combined	8.1	3.4	4.8			
Type of locale						
City	26.4	31.4	-4.9	3.79	0.29	
Suburb	33.6	28.1	5.5			
Town	12.7	15.2	-2.5			
Rural	27.2	25.3	1.9			
Percent White enrollment						
95 to 100 percent	6.6	5.0	1.6	2.55	0.47	
80 to less than 95 percent	25.3	26.7	-1.4			
More than 50 to less than 80 percent	26.9	22.2	4.7			
50 percent or less	41.2	46.0	-4.8			
Student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio						
Less than 12	13.9	7.8	6.1	5.53	0.14	
12 through 16	38.3	40.5	-2.1			
More than 16 to less than 20	27.0	32.0	-5.1			
20 or more	20.8	19.7	1.1			
Number of full-time-equivalent teaching staff						
Less than 29	48.8	45.6	3.2	8.12	0.04	*
29 to less than 45	27.9	35.7	-7.9			
45 to less than 70	15.8	14.1	1.7			
70 or more	7.6	4.5	3.0			

See notes at end of table.

Table O-3. Comparison of item respondents and nonrespondents for the variable number of attacks with a weapon (C0326): SSOCS:2016—Continued

Item description	Percent: Respondents *n* = 1,812	Percent: Nonrespondents *n* = 280	Difference	Likelihood ratio	*p value*	
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch						
Less than 10 percent	4.7	7.3	-2.6	3.58	0.31	
10 through 20 percent	7.7	7.4	0.3			
21 through 50 percent	33.5	27.6	5.9			
More than 50 percent	54.1	57.7	-3.6			
Region						
Northeast	17.0	13.6	3.3	2.11	0.55	
Midwest	24.6	27.1	-2.5			
South	34.9	37.5	-2.6			
West	23.5	21.7	1.8			
Perceived level of crime in students' neighborhood						
High	8.0	13.2	-5.2	7.20	0.07	
Moderate	20.5	23.1	-2.6			
Low	58.3	55.4	2.9			
Students come from areas with very different levels	13.2	8.4	4.8			
Perceived level of crime in schools' neighborhood						
High	5.9	12.5	-6.6	7.31	0.03	*
Moderate	19.6	19.3	0.3			
Low	74.5	68.1	6.3			

* $p < .05$.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Number of attacks without a weapon (C0330)

The results of the likelihood-ratio chi-square test for independence in table O-4 indicate that for item C0330 (total number of attacks without a weapon), statistically significant relationships exist between the propensity to respond and (1) enrollment size, (2) school level, (3) number of FTE teaching staff, and (4) perceived level of crime in the school's neighborhood. Primary schools, schools with enrollment between 500 and 999, and schools with 29 to less than 45 FTE teaching staff were less likely to respond to item C0330, while high schools and schools with a low perceived level of crime in the school's neighborhood were more likely to respond.

There appears to be a relationship between these four variables and responses to item C0330, suggesting at least a moderate risk of item nonresponse bias. However, C0330 has highly skewed responses. About 23 percent of the responses are zero, about 50 percent of the responses are 4 or less, and over 75 percent of the responses are 10 or less. If there is no discernible difference in the way schools are responding to item C0330 across the school-level characteristic variables, then the impact of such a relationship is probably not going to be as severe as it appears to be in the extreme value analysis. This provides some reason to expect that the "extreme" scenario is unrealistic.

Table O-4. Comparison of item respondents and nonrespondents for the variable number of attacks without a weapon (C0330): SSOCS:2016

Item description	Percent: Respondents *n* = 1,792	Percent: Nonrespondents *n* = 300	Difference	Likelihood ratio	*p value*	
Enrollment size						
Less than 300	22.5	17.9	4.6	8.51	0.04	*
300-499	29.7	31.0	-1.3			
500-999	36.5	44.6	-8.0			
1,000 or more	11.2	6.5	4.7			
School level						
Primary	55.8	72.1	-16.4	30.12	<.01	*
Middle	19.2	16.4	2.8			
High school	16.9	7.7	9.3			
Combined	8.1	3.8	4.3			
Type of locale						
City	26.5	30.7	-4.3	1.94	0.59	
Suburb	33.4	29.5	3.9			
Town	13.0	13.8	-0.9			
Rural	27.1	25.9	1.2			
Percent White enrollment						
95 to 100 percent	6.7	4.7	2.0	1.14	0.77	
80 to less than 95 percent	25.5	25.4	0.1			
More than 50 to less than 80 percent	26.2	26.1	0.1			
50 percent or less	41.6	43.9	-2.3			
Student-to-FTE teaching staff ratio						
Less than 12	14.0	8.0	5.9	6.40	0.09	
12 through 16	38.4	40.2	-1.9			
More than 16 to less than 20	26.8	32.3	-5.4			
20 or more	20.8	19.5	1.3			
Number of full-time-equivalent teaching staff						
Less than 29	48.5	47.0	1.5	10.38	0.02	*
29 to less than 45	27.8	35.4	-7.6			
45 to less than 70	15.9	13.6	2.3			
70 or more	7.8	3.9	3.8			
Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch						
Less than 10 percent	4.5	7.8	-3.3	4.09	0.25	
10 through 20 percent	7.8	6.9	0.9			
21 through 50 percent	33.4	28.7	4.7			
More than 50 percent	54.3	56.6	-2.3			
Region						
Northeast	17.0	13.9	3.0	1.50	0.68	
Midwest	24.5	27.3	-2.8			
South	35.3	35.6	-0.3			
West	23.2	23.2	0.0			

See notes at end of table.

Table O-4. Comparison of item respondents and nonrespondents for the variable number of attacks without a weapon (C0330): SSOCS:2016—Continued

Item description	Percent: Respondents *n* = 1,792	Percent: Nonrespondents *n* = 300	Percent: Difference	Likelihood ratio	*p value*	
Perceived level of crime in students' neighborhood						
High	8.1	12.5	-4.4	4.69	0.20	
Moderate	20.6	22.2	-1.6			
Low	58.5	54.7	3.8			
Students come from areas with very different levels	12.8	10.6	2.2			
Perceived level of crime in schools' neighborhood						
High	6.0	11.9	-5.9	7.25	0.03	*
Moderate	19.5	19.7	-0.2			
Low	74.5	68.4	6.2			

* $p < .05$.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2015–16 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS), 2016.

Summary

The mean item response rate for SSOCS:2016 was about 98 percent. However, two survey items (C0326 and C0330)—out of the 273 items examined in this analysis—had a weighted item response rate lower than 85 percent. These items were examined for potential bias per NCES standards. Using extreme assumptions for imputation, both were found to be sensitive to the potential effects of nonresponse bias. The biggest risk appears to be in the scenario in which item nonrespondents report substantially higher values in these variables. The likelihood-ratio chi-square test statistics for independence suggested that the missing cases for variables C0326 and C0330 have at least a moderate risk of item nonresponse bias in four of the school characteristic variables considered. Analyses also showed that distributions for C0326 and C0330 were highly skewed. This leads to the conclusion that if there is no discernible difference in the way schools are responding to the two items across the school-level characteristic variables, then the impact of such relationships is probably not going to be as severe as it appears to be in each item's extreme value analysis. This provides some reason to expect that the "extreme" scenario is unrealistic. The combination of these analyses led to the determination that the potential for bias was not enough to warrant the exclusion of these items from the data file.

The total response rate was not measured against any standard in this analysis. Given the unit response rate (62.9 percent) and the lowest item response rate (82.1 percent, corresponding with item C0330), the lowest total response rate for an item is 51.6 percent.

Appendix P: Detailed Editing Procedures, by Item

Consistency Edits and Rectification Procedures for Correcting Data Inconsistencies

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
Grade Range	A respondent indicating the correct grade level by choosing "Yes" should not have chosen any grades offered in the school.	If the respondent left the grade range in the grades item blank and selected at least one of the grade levels, mark c0022 "No."
Grade Range	A respondent that did not choose any grade level should have selected the correct grade range by choosing "Yes."	If the respondent selected "No" or left the grade range blank, but did not select any of the grade levels (c0024-c0052), then mark the grade range "Yes."
5	A respondent indicating that his/her school does not have a threat assessment team (item 5=2) should have skipped item 6.	If the school has a threat assessment team is marked "No" or left blank but the respondent indicated in item 6 that this group meets formally by marking 1, 2, or 3, then change item 5 to "Yes."
11	All schools with no sworn law enforcement officers (including School Resource Officers) present on a regular basis (item 11=2) should have skipped all subsequent questions regarding the number and characteristics of school sworn law enforcement personnel. All components of items 12 through 15 and item 18 must equal "-1," which is the code for "legitimate skip."	If item 11 is not marked "Yes" and the respondent marked "Yes" for any part of items 12, 13, 14, or 15 or entered a non-zero value to any component of item 18, then mark item 11"Yes."
12	All schools with sworn law enforcement officers present for all instructional hours every day the school was in session (item 15=1) should have marked item 12(a) as a "Yes."	If Item 15 is marked "Yes" and item 12a is not marked "Yes," then mark item 12a "Yes."
16	All schools without any formalized policies or written documents outlining the roles and responsibilities of sworn law enforcement officers should have skipped item 17.	If Item 16 is not marked "Yes" but any part of item 17 is marked "Yes," then change item 16 to "Yes."

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
26	The number of recorded incidents of specified offenses in item 16 column 1 must be greater than or equal to the number of specified incidents reported to police or other law enforcement in item 26 column 2.	If the number of incidents reported to police or other law enforcement of a specific offense was larger than the number of specific offenses recorded, the number of specific offenses recorded (item 26 column 1) was deleted and imputed.
26	If any of the columns of item 35e is greater than zero, the total number of physical attacks or fights recorded (subitem 26d_i or subitem 26d_ii column 1) must also be greater than zero.	If there are any non-zero responses in any of the columns of item 35e (columns 1 through 5), and the respondent also indicated that there were no recorded incidents of physical attacks or fights with or without a weapon (subitem 26d_i column 1=0 and subitem 26d_ii column 1=0), both subitem 26d_i column 1 and subitem 26d_ii column 1 were deleted and a value was imputed.
26	If any of the columns of item 35a is greater than zero, the total number of recorded incidents of possession of a firearm/explosive device (subitem 26g column 1) must also be greater than zero.	If there are non-zero responses in any of the columns of item 35a (columns 1 through 5), and the respondent also indicated that there were no recorded incidents of possession of a firearm/explosive device (subitem 26g column 1=0), subitem 26g column 1 was deleted and imputed.
26	If the respondent indicated that there was at least one incident involving a shooting at the school (item 25=1) but there were not any possessions of a firearm or explosive device (subitem 26g), then one item was misreported.	If the respondent indicated that there was at least once incident involving a shooting at the school (item 25=1) but said there were not any possessions of a firearm or explosive device (subitem 26g), then subitem 26g was deleted and imputed at a later stage.

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
26	If any of the columns of item 35c are greater than zero, then the number of recorded incidents of the distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i column 1) must also be greater than zero.	If there are non-zero responses in any of the columns of item 35c (columns 1 through 5), and the number of recorded incidents of the distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i column 1) was zero, then subitem 26i column 1 was deleted and imputed.
26	If any of the columns of item 35d are greater than zero, then the number of recorded incidents of the distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 26k column 1) must also be greater than zero.	If there are non-zero responses in any of the columns of item 35d (columns 1 through 5), and the number of recorded incidents of the distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 26k column 1) was zero, then subitem 26k column 1 was deleted and imputed.
28	If the respondent indicated that no hate crimes occurred at his/her school, then none of the responses in item 29 should be marked "No."	If the response for item 28 is "None," but any of the items in 29 are marked "Yes," then delete and impute the entry in item 28.
34	A respondent indicating that his/her school has used specified disciplinary actions this year (item 34(a-o) column 2=1) should have also indicated that the school allows for the use of the specified disciplinary action (item 34(a-o) column 1=1).	If the respondent indicated that his/her school had used a specified disciplinary action this year but also indicated that the school does not allow for the use of the specified disciplinary action or this item was left blank, the "No" or missing response to allowing for the use of the specified disciplinary action was edited to a "yes."

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
34	If the respondent indicated that the total number of removals with no continuing service for at least the remainder of the school year for selected offenses (item 35 column 2) was greater than or equal to 1, then the school must have (1) allowed for removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year (subitem 34a column 1=1) and (2) used this action during this school year (subitem 34a column 2=1).	If the respondent indicated that students were removed with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year (item 35 column 2) but also indicated that either "no," the school does not use the disciplinary action of removal with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year (subitem 34a column 1=2) or that "no," the school has not used the disciplinary action of removal with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year in this school year (subitem 34a column 2=2), or the item was left blank (subitem 34a), the "No" or missing values in subitem 34a were changed to "yes."
34	If the respondent indicated that the total number of removals of students with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for all disciplinary reasons was greater than zero (subitem 36a), the school must have (1) allowed the use of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year (subitem 34a column 1=1) and (2) used this action during this school year (subitem 34a column 2=1).	If the respondent indicated that students were removed with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year (subitem 36a) but also indicated that the school does not allow for the use of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year (subitem 34a column 1=2) or that the school has not used the disciplinary action of removal with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year this year (subitem 34a column 2=2) or the item was left blank (subitem 34a), then the "No" or missing values in subitem 34a were changed to "yes."

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
34	If the total number of removals of students with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for all disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a) was zero and the number of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for selected offenses (item 35 column 2) is missing or equal to zero, then this action was not used in this school year (subitem 34a column 2).	If the respondent indicated that the number of students with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for all disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a) is zero and the number of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for selected offenses (item 35 column 2) is missing or equal to zero, then this action was not used in this school year and subitem 34a column 2 was edited to "no."
34	If the sum of transfers to specialized schools for selected offenses (item 35 column 3) is greater than or equal to 1, the school (1) must allow for the use of transfers to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 34c column 1=1) and (2) must have used this action in the past year (subitem 34c column 2=1).	If the respondent indicated that students were transferred to specialized schools for selected offenses (item 35 column 3) and also indicated that either "no," the school does not allow for the use of transfers to a specialized school for disciplinary reasons (subitem 34c column 1=2) or that the school has not used the disciplinary action of transfers to a specialized school for disciplinary reasons this school year (subitem 34c column 2=2), or the item was left blank (subitem 34c), then the values in subitem 34c were changed to "yes."
34	If the respondent indicated that the total number of transfers to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons was greater than zero (subitem 36b), the school (1) must allow for the use of transfers to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 34c column 1=1) and (2) must have used this action during this school year (subitem 34c column 2=1).	If the respondent indicated that students were transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b) and also indicated that the school does not allow for the use of transfers to specialized schools (subitem 34c column 1=2) or the school has not used the disciplinary action of transferring students to specialized schools this school year (subitem 34c column 2=2), or the item was left blank (subitem 34c), the "No" or missing values in subitem 34c were changed to "yes."

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
34	If the total number of students that transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b) is zero and the number of transfers to specialized schools for selected offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero, then this action was not used in this school year (subitem 34c column 2).	If the respondent indicated that the number of students that transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b) is zero and the number of transfers to specialized schools for each selected offense (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero, then this action was not used in this school year and subitem 34c column 2 was changed to "no."
34	If the total number of out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days, but less than the remainder of the school year for selected offenses (item 35 column 4) is greater than zero, the school must both (1) allow for out-of-school suspension or removal for less than the remainder of the school year with or without curriculum/services provided (subitem 34e_i column 1=1 or subitem 34e_ii column 1=1) and (2) have used this action during this school year (subitem 34e_i column 2=1 or subitem 34e_ii column 2=1).	If the total number of out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days, but less than the remainder of the school year for selected offenses (item 35 column 4) is greater than zero, and out-of-school suspensions with no curriculum/services provided were either reported to be not allowed or not used during this school year (subitem 34e_i column 1=2 or 34e_i column 2=2) and out-of-school suspensions with curriculum/services provided were reported to be not allowed or not used during this school year (subitem 34e_ii column 1=2 or 34e_ii column 2=2), then any values in item 34e(1-2) that were marked "No" were deleted and imputed.
34	If the total number of transfers from the school during the 2015–16 school year (subitem 45b) is zero, then the use of transfers to a specialized school for disciplinary reasons (subitem 34c column 2) or transfers to any other regular school for disciplinary reasons (subitem 34d column 2) must be "no."	If the total number of transfers from the school in the 2015–16 school year (subitem 45b) is zero but the use of transfers to a specialized school for disciplinary reasons (subitem 34c column 2) or transfers to any other regular school for disciplinary reasons (subitem 34d column 2) was "Yes" or was left blank, the "Yes" is edited to "no."

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
36	If item 36a is greater than or equal to zero, then it should be greater than the sum of the entries in column 2 of item 35.	If item 36a is greater than or equal to zero and is less than the sum of the entries in column 2 of item 35, delete and impute the entry in item 36a.
36	The school's enrollment (item 37) must be greater than the total number of transfers without continuing services for all disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a).	If item 36a is larger than the non-zero enrollment in item 37, delete and impute the entry in item 36a.
36	If item 36b is greater than or equal to zero, then it should be greater than the sum of the entries in column 3 of item 35.	If item 36b is greater than or equal to zero and is less than the sum of the entries in column 3 of item 35, delete and impute the entry in item 36b.
36	The school's enrollment (item 37) must be greater than the total number of transfers to specialized schools for all disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b).	If item 36b is larger than the non-zero enrollment in item 37, delete and impute the entry in item 36b.
40	If the number of classroom changes in a day exceeds 20 (item 40), then the number is deleted and a new value is imputed.	If a respondent indicated that there are more than 20 classroom changes in a day (item 40), then the value was deleted and imputed.
43	If the respondent did not select one of the school types listed (item 43) or selected one of the school types other than "Other" but supplied a response in the specify item (item 43e, "other - specify"), then the school type of "Other" should have been selected.	If none of the school types listed (item 43) was checked by the respondent, or the respondent selected one of the school types other than "Other," but the specify item (item 43e, "other - specify") is not blank, then the missing value for school type or any response recorded for school type other than "Other" (item 43) was edited to "Other" (item 43=5).

Survey item #	Consistency edit	Rectification procedure
45	The number of students who transferred from the school for all reasons (subitem 45b) must be greater than or equal to the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3) and greater than or equal to the total number of transfers to specialized schools (item 36b).	If the total transfers from the school in item 45b is less than item 36b or the sum of column 3 in item 35, delete the entry in item 45b.

Logic Edits and Rectification Procedures for Correcting Data Inconsistencies

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
1	If the respondent did not mark "No" to any of the school practices and programs and either five programs and practices are marked "Yes," or chooses at least one "Yes" to both the first half (parts a to l) and the second half (parts m to y) of item 1, then any missing data in item 1 will be "No."	If no parts of item 1 are marke "No" and either five parts of item 1 are marked "Yes" or both the first half (parts a to l) and the second half (parts m to y) of item 1 have at least one "Yes," then mark any unanswered parts of item 1 as "No." .
2	If the respondent marks at least 2 parts of item 2 as "Yes" and none of the responses is marked "No," then any missing data in item 2 will be "No."	If at least 2 parts (approx 20%) of item 2 are marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No."
3	If the respondent marks at least 1 part of item 3 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 3 will be "No."	If at least 1 part of item 3 is marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No." .
4	If the respondent marks at least 2 parts of item 4 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 4 will be "No."	If at least 2 parts (approx 20%) of item 4 are marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No."
7	If the respondent marks at least 1 part of item 7 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 7 will be "No."	If at least 1 part of item 7 is marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No." .

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
8	If the respondent marks at least 1 part of item 8 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 8 will be "No."	If at least 1 part of item 8 is marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No." .
10	If the respondent marks at least 2 parts of item 10 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 10 will be "No."	If at least 2 parts of item 10 are marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No."
12	If the respondent marks at least 1 part of item 12 as "Yes," and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 12 will be "No."	If the respondent marks at least 1 part of item 12 as "Yes," and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 12 will be "No."
12	A respondent who answers "Yes" to item 11 must answer "Yes" to at least one subitem of item 12, and at least one subitem of item 18 must not be zero.	If the respondent answers "Yes" to item 11, but answers "No" to each subitem of question 12 or "0" to each subitem of question 18, then one subitem of question 12 is imputed as "Yes" and one subitem of question 18 is imputed as "1." A random number was generated. One of the components of item 12 was changed to a value of "1" based on the value of the random number and known proportions from prior iterations of SSOCS.
13	If the respondent marks at least 1 part of item 13 as "Yes," and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 13 will be "No."	If at least 1 part of item 13 is marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No."

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
14	If the respondent marks at least 2 parts of item 14 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 14 will be "No."	If at least 2 parts of item 14 are marked "Yes," none are marked "No," and some are left unanswered, mark the unanswered items as "No."
18	If the respondent chooses a non-zero response to either parts of item 18a, and the other part is missing, then the missing part will be zero.	If either part of item 18a has a non-zero response and the other part is missing, mark the missing part as zero.
18	A respondent who answers "Yes" to item 11 must answer "Yes" to at least one subitem of item 12, and at least one subitem of item18 must not be zero.	If the respondent answers "Yes" to item 11, but answers "No" to each subitem of question 12 or "0" to each subitem of question 18, then one subitem of question 12 is imputed as "Yes" and one subitem of question 18 is imputed as "1." A random number was generated. One of the components of item 18 was changed to a value of "1" based on the value of the random number and known proportions from prior iterations of SSOCS.
18	If the respondent chooses a non-zero response to either parts of item 18b, and the other part is missing, then the missing part will be zero.	If either part of item 18b has a non-zero response and the other part is missing, mark the missing part as zero.
19	If the respondent chooses a non-zero response to either parts of item 19, and the other part is missing, then the missing part will be zero.	If either part of item 19 has a non-zero response and the other part is missing, mark the missing part as zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
21	If the respondent marks at least 2 responses of item 21 as "Limits in a major way" and/or "Limits in a minor way" and none of the responses is marked "Does not Limit," then any missing data in item 2 will be "Does not Limit."	If there are at least two responses in item 21 of "Limits in a major way" and/or "Limits in a minor way" and no responses for "Does not limit," then mark any unanswered parts of item 21 as "Does not Limit."
22	If the respondent marks at least 3 parts of item 22 as "Yes," and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 22 will be "No."	If at least 3 parts of item 22 are marked "Yes" and none are marked "No," then mark any unanswered parts of item 22 as "No."
23	If the respondent marks at least 3 responses of item 23 as "Limits in a major way" and/or "Limits in a minor way" and none of the responses are marked "Does not Limit," then any missing data in item 2 will be "Does not Limit."	If at least 3 parts of item 23 are marked "Limits in a major way and/or Limits in a minor way" and none are marked "Does not Limit," then mark any unanswered parts of item 23 as "Does not Limit."
23	If the percentage of special education students in your school (item 38C) is 0%, then the response for item 23k should be "Does not Limit."	If item 23k is missing, and the response for item 38c is 0%, then mark "Does not limit" for item 23k.
26	If the number of recorded incidents of specified offenses is equal to zero, then the number of incidents reported to police must also be equal to zero.	If the number of recorded incidents of specified offenses is equal to zero and the number of specified incidents reported to police was left blank, the blank response was edited to zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
29	If the respondent marks at least 1 part of item 29 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 29 will be "No."	If at least 1 part of item 29 is marked "Yes" and none are marked "No," then mark any unanswered parts of item 29 as "No."
34	If the respondent marks at least 4 parts of item 34 as "Yes" and none of the responses are marked "No," then any missing data in item 34 will be "No."	If at least 4 parts of item 34 are marked "Yes" and none are marked "No," then mark any unanswered parts of item 34 as "No."
35	If the sum of disciplinary actions used for a specified offense is greater than zero (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5), then there must be one or more students involved in the specified offense.	If the sum of disciplinary actions used for a specified offense is greater than zero (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5), and the respondent reported the total number of students as zero, then the total number of students involved (item 35 column 1) was blanked and imputed.
35	If the sum of disciplinary actions used for a specified offense is greater than zero (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5), then there must be one or more students involved in the specified offense.	If the sum of disciplinary actions used for a specified offense is greater than zero (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5), each item in columns 2-5 has an entry, and the respondent left the total number of students involved (item 35(a-e) column 1) blank, then the total number of students was set equal to the sum of disciplinary actions used (columns 2-5).
35	If the total number of students involved in a specified offense (item 35(a-e) column 1) is zero and the sum of disciplinary actions taken (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5) is missing or equal to zero, then any missing data in columns 2-5 will also be zero.	If zero students are recorded as being involved in a specified offense (item 35(a-e) column 1) and the sum of disciplinary actions taken for the specified offense (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5) is less than or equal to zero, then for any items in columns 2-5 that do not have a value, a zero was entered.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	The total number of students involved in a specified offense (item 35(a-e) column 1) must be greater than the sum of the number of removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year (item 35 (a-e) column 2) and the number of transfers to specialized schools (item 35(a-e) column 3).	If the respondent indicated that the total number of students involved in a specified offense (item 35(a-e) column 1) is less than the sum of the number of removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year (item 35 (a-e) column 2) and the number of transfers to specialized schools (item 35 (a-e) column 3), then the number of removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year (item 35 (a-e) column 2) was edited to zero.
35	If the total number students involved in a specified offense (item 35(a-e) column 1) is given and this number equals the sum of disciplinary actions taken for the offense (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5), then any missing data from columns 2-5 will also be zero.	If the total number of students involved in a specified offense (item 35(a-e) column 1) is given and the number equals the sum of disciplinary actions taken for the offense (item 35(a-e) columns 2-5), then for any items in columns 2-5 that do not have a value, a value of zero was entered.
35	If a respondent marked "No" to subitem 34a column 1, his/her school does not allow for removals with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year or "no," the action was not used in this school year (subitem 34a column 2) and the sum of removals with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year (item 35 column 2) is missing or equal to zero, then any missing data from column 2 will also be zero.	If a respondent marked "No" to subitem 34a column 1, his/her school does not allow for removals with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year or "no," the action was not used in this school year (subitem 34a column 2) and the sum of removals with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year (item 35 column 2) is missing or equal to zero, and any data are missing from column 2, the data were changed to zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	If there were no recorded incidents of the possession of a firearm/explosive device and no reported incidents to police (subitem 26g) and the number of students involved in, and disciplinary actions taken for, the possession or use of a firearm/explosive device are all zeros or blanks (subitem 35a), then any missing data in item 35a would also be zero.	If the total number of recorded incidents of possession of a firearm/explosive device (subitem 26g) is zero and the sum of disciplinary actions for use/possession of a firearm or explosive device and the number of students involved is missing or equal to zero (subitem 35a), then for any items in subitem 35a that do not have a value, a value of zero was entered.
35	If the sum of removals with no continuing service for at least the remainder of the school year for selected offenses (item 35 column 2) is equal to the number of students removed from the school without continuing services for at least the remainder of the year for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a), then any missing data from column 2 will also be zero.	If the respondent indicated that the sum of removals with no continuing service for at least the remainder of the school year for selected offenses (item 35 column 2) is equal to the number of students removed from the school without continuing services for at least the remainder of the year for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a) and the respondent left some data missing in item 35 column 2, then a zero was entered in the missing fields.
35	If a respondent indicated that zero students were removed from his/her school with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a) and the sum of removals with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year for specified offenses (item 35 column 2) is missing or equal to zero, then any missing data from column 2 will also be zero.	If a respondent indicated that zero students were removed from his/her school with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a) and the sum of removals with no continuing services for the remainder of the school year for specified offenses (item 35 column 2) is less than or equal to zero, and any data are missing from column 2, they were replaced with a zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	If the respondent indicated that zero students were transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b), and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero, any missing items in column 3 are zero.	If the total number of students transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b) is zero and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero and column 3 had missing data, the missing values were replaced with zero.
35	If the respondent indicated that transfers to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons are either not allowed (subitem 34c column 1) or not used (subitem 34c column 2) and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero, then any missing items in column 3 of item 35 should also be zero.	If the respondent indicated that "no," transfers to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons are not allowed (subitem 34c column 1) or the respondent indicated that "no," the action was not used this school year (subitem 34c column 2) and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses is missing or equal to zero (item 35 column 3), any items in column 3 of item 35 that do not have a value were filled with a zero.
35	If the total number of students transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b) equals the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3), then any missing items in column 3 are zero.	If the respondent indicated that the total number of students transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b) equals the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3) and some items in column 3 were left blank, then the missing items were replaced with zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	If the total number of students transferred from the school (subitem 45b) is zero and the total number of students transferred for disciplinary reasons (item 36b) is missing or equal to zero, and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for selected offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero, then any missing items in column 3 are zero.	If the respondent indicated that the total number of students transferred from the school (subitem 45b) is zero and the total number of students transferred for disciplinary reasons (item 36b) is missing or equal to zero, and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for selected offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero but some items in column 3 were left blank, then the missing items were set to zero.
35	If the respondent indicated that out-of-school suspension or removal for the remainder of the school year with or without curriculum/services provided is either not allowed (item 34(e_i-e_ii) column 1) or not used (item 34(e_i-e_ii) column 2), and the sum of out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days, but less than the remainder of the school year (item 35 column 4) is missing or equal to zero, then any missing items in column 4 of item 35 would also be zero.	If the respondent indicated that out-of-school suspension or removal for the remainder of the school year with or without curriculum/services provided is either not allowed (item 34(e_i-e_ii) column 1) or not used (item 34(e_i-e_ii) column 2), and the sum of out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days, but less than the remainder of the school year (item 35 column 4) is missing or equal to zero, then any missing items in column 4 of item 35 were also set to zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	If the sum of disciplinary actions for use/possession of a firearm/explosive device (subitem 35a columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for possession of a firearm or explosive device (subitem 26g column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35a column 1), then disciplinary actions need to be removed until the sum of disciplinary actions for use/possession of a firearm/explosive device (subitem 35a columns 2-5) equals the number of recorded incidents for possession of a firearm or explosive device (subitem 26g column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26g, subitem 35a column 1, sum of subitem 35a columns 2-5).	If the respondent indicates that the sum of disciplinary actions for use/possession of a firearm/explosive device (subitem 35a columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for possession of a firearm or explosive device (subitem 26g column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35a column 1), then disciplinary actions were removed one at a time starting with column 5 and ending at column 2 until the sum of disciplinary actions for use/possession of a firearm/explosive device (subitem 35a columns 2-5) equaled the number of recorded incidents for possession of a firearm or explosive device (subitem 26g column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26g, subitem 35a column 1, sum of subitem 35a columns 2-5).
35	If there were no recorded incidents of distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i) and the sum of disciplinary actions for and students involved in the distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs is less than or equal to zero (subitem 35c columns 2-5), then any missing data from row c were edited to zero.	If the respondent did not record any incidents of distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i) and the sum of disciplinary actions for and students involved in the distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs is less than or equal to zero (subitem 35c columns 2-5), then any missing values from row c were edited to zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	If the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 35c columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35c column 1), then disciplinary actions need to be removed until the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 35c columns 2-5) equals the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26i, subitem 35c column 1, sum of subitem 35c columns 2-5).	If the respondent indicates that the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 35c columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35c column 1), then disciplinary actions were removed one at a time starting with column 5 and ending at column 2 until the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 35c columns 2-5) equals the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs (subitem 26i column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26i, subitem 35c column 1, sum of subitem 35c columns 2-5).
35	If there were no recorded incidents of distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 26k) and the sum of disciplinary actions for and students involved in the distribution, possession, or use of alcohol is missing or equal to zero (subitem 35d columns 2-5), then any missing data from item 35 row d will also be zero.	If there were no recorded incidents of distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 26k) and the sum of disciplinary actions for and students involved in the distribution, possession, or use of alcohol is missing or equal to zero (subitem 35d columns 2-5), any missing values from item 35 row d were changed to zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	If the respondent indicated that the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 35d columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 26k column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35d column 1), then disciplinary actions need to be removed until the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 35d columns 2-5) equals the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 26k column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26k, subitem 35d column 1, sum of subitem 35d columns 2-5).	If the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 35d columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 16k column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35d column 1), then disciplinary actions were removed one at a time starting with column 5 and ending at column 2 until the sum of disciplinary actions for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 35d columns 2-5) equals the number of recorded incidents for distribution, possession, or use of alcohol (subitem 26k column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26k, subitem 35d column 1, sum of subitem 35d columns 2-5).
35	If there were no recorded incidents of physical attacks or fights with/without a weapon (subitem 26d(i-ii)) and the sum of disciplinary actions for and students involved in physical attacks or fights is missing or equal to zero (subitem 35e(2-5)), then any missing data from item 35 row e should also be zero.	If the respondent did not record any incidents of physical attacks or fights with/without a weapon (subitem 26d(i-ii)) and the sum of disciplinary actions for and students involved in physical attacks or fights is missing or equal to zero (subitem 35e(2-5)), then any missing data from item 35 row e were changed to a value of zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
35	If the respondent indicated that the sum of disciplinary actions for physical attacks or fights (subitem 35e columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for physical attacks or fights with (subitem 26d_i column 1) or without a weapon (subitem 26d_ii column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35e column 1), then disciplinary actions need to be removed so that the sum of disciplinary actions for physical attacks or fights (subitem 35e columns 2-5) equals the number of recorded incidents for physical attacks or fights (subitem 26d column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26d_i, subitem 26d_ii, subitem 34e column 1, sum of subitem 35e columns 2-5).	If the sum of disciplinary actions for physical attacks or fights (subitem 35e columns 2-5) is greater than the number of recorded incidents for physical attacks or fights with (subitem 26d_i column 1) or without a weapon (subitem 26d_ii column 1) times the total number of students involved (subitem 35e column 1), then disciplinary actions were removed one at a time starting with column 5 and ending at column 2 until the sum of disciplinary actions for physical attacks or fights (subitem 35e columns 2-5) equals the number of recorded incidents of physical attacks or fights (subitem 26d column 1) times the total number of students involved. Each component must be greater than zero (subitem 26d_i, subitem 26d_ii, subitem 35e column 1, sum of subitem 35e columns 2-5).
36	If removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year were either not allowed (subitem 34a column 1) or were not used in this school year (subitem 34a column 2) and the sum of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for specified offenses (item 35 column 2) is missing or equal to zero, then the number of students who were removed from school without continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for disciplinary reasons (subitem 36a) should also be zero.	If the respondent indicated that "no," the school does not allow for removals with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year (subitem 34a column 1=2) or "no," this action was not used in this school year (subitem 34a column 2=2) and the sum of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for specified offenses (item 35 column 2) is less than or equal to zero, and the total number of students removed for disciplinary reasons is missing (subitem 36a), then subitem 36a (the number of students who were removed from school without continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for disciplinary reasons) was changed to zero.

Survey item #	Logic edit	Rectification procedure
36	If the respondent indicated that transfers to specialized schools were either not allowed (subitem 22c column 1) or were not used in this school year (subitem 22c column 2) and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero, then the number of students who were transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary actions (subitem 24b) should also be zero.	If the respondent indicated that "no," the school does not allow transfers to specialized schools (subitem 22c column 1=2) or "no," this action was not used in this school year (subitem 22c column 2=2) and the sum of transfers to specialized schools for specified offenses (item 35 column 3) is missing or equal to zero, and the total number of students transferred for disciplinary reasons is missing (subitem 24b), then subitem 24b (the number of students who were transferred to specialized schools for disciplinary reasons) was changed to zero.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix Q: Detailed Imputation Procedures, by Item

Item 1: Components of item 1 have values imputed using a hot deck imputation approach. A donor is chosen by matching on the basis of two of the 2013–14 Common Core of Data (CCD) frame variables (school level [FR_LVEL] and urbanicity [FR_URBAN]), a categorized survey variable (Q37SIZE), and the three "wildcard" categorical survey variables that were most strongly associated with item 1. In a hot deck imputation approach, a donor can only be used five times. If there is no donor matching all three variables, then the matching variables are collapsed to widen the pool of available donors.

Item 2: The components of item 2 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 2 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 3: The components of item 3 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 3 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 4: The components of item 4 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 4 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 5: The imputation technique used for item 5 was similar to that described for item 1. However, items requiring this type of imputation have two parts. The first part is a simple imputation, where the initial missing item (usually an item with a yes/no response, referred to as a "screener" item) is imputed directly from that item in the donor record. Then, depending on the imputed response, the subsequent item(s) will either need to be imputed using simple imputation (if "yes" is imputed to the screener item) or will need to be blanked (if "no" is imputed to the screener item). This type of imputation occurs for items where there is a skip pattern present. For these items, there are *always* two donors. The first donor is used when both parts (the "screener" portion and the subsequent items) of the imputed item are missing. The second donor is used when the respondent has answered the screener item with a "yes" response, but the subsequent item(s) are missing and need to be imputed. The method of imputation for this second donor is simple imputation. If item 5 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry. If "No" is imputed, blank item 6.

Item 6: A simple imputation approach similar to that described for item 1 was performed on item 6, if the respondent had indicated that the school has a threat assessment team to identify students who might be a potential risk for violent or harmful behavior in item 5 (C0600="yes") or if a "yes" value was imputed for item 5. If item 6 is unanswered and item 5 is marked as "Yes," impute the donor's entry.

Item 7: The components of item 7 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 7 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 8: The components of item 8 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 8 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 9: The components of item 9 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 9 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 10: The components of item 10 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 10 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 11: The imputation technique used for item 11 was similar to that described for item 5. If item 11 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry. If "No" is imputed, blank items 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Item 12: The components of item 12 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 12 are unanswered, and item 11 is marked as "Yes" or imputed as "Yes," then impute the donor's entry.

Item 13: The components of item 13 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 13 are unanswered, and item 11 is marked as "Yes" or imputed as "Yes," then impute the donor's entry.

Item 14: The components of item 14 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 13 are unanswered, and item 11 is marked as "Yes" or imputed as "Yes," then impute the donor's entry.

Item 15: The components of item 15 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If item 15 is unanswered, and item 11 is marked as "Yes" or imputed as "Yes," then impute the donor's entry.

Item 16: The imputation technique used is similar to the one used for item 5. If item 16 is unanswered, and item 11 is marked as "yes" or imputed as "yes," then impute the donor's entry. If "No" is imputed for item 16 and item 11 is marked as "yes" or imputed as "yes," then blank item 17.

Item 17: The imputation technique used is similar to the one used for item 1. If any parts of item 17 are unanswered, and item 11 is marked or imputed as "yes" and if item 16 is marked or imputed as "Yes," then impute the donor's entry.

Item 18: A proportional or ratio imputation technique for multiple items was used for imputing values for item 18. A series of missing items is imputed using the donor's ratio of each of those items to some predetermined related item ("ratio variable") and applying these ratios to the same related item in the record being imputed. The ratio variable used is the total number of enrolled students in the school. If any part of item 18 is unanswered and item 11 is marked as "yes" or imputed as "yes," then use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the total number of enrolled students to impute a value. A donor is chosen by matching on the basis of two of the 2013–14 Common Core of Data (CCD) frame variables (school level [FR_LVEL] and urbanicity [FR_URBAN]), a categorized survey variable (Q37SIZE), and the three "wildcard" categorical survey variables that were most strongly associated with item 18. As in hot deck imputation, a

donor can only be used five times. If there is no donor matching all three variables, then the matching variables are collapsed to widen the pool of available donors.

Item 19: A proportional or ratio imputation similar to the one done for item 18 was used for item 19. If any part of item 19 is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the total number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Item 20: The components of item 20 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 20 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 21: The components of item 21 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 21 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry**.**

Item 22: The components of item 22 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 22 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 23: The components of item 23 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 23 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 24: Item 24 was imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If item 24 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 25: Item 25 was imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If item 25 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 26: Imputation on the item 26 components was performed using a ratio imputation technique similar to that used for item 18. Item 26 contains two columns: the total number of recorded incidents for the specified offense and the number of specified offenses reported to police. For each offense, the number of recorded incidents must be greater than or equal to the number of incidents reported to police. If any part of item 26 is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the total number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Item 27: In order to impute values for item 27, a ratio imputation technique similar to the one described for item 18 was used. If item 27 is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Item 28: In order to impute values for item 28, a ratio imputation technique similar to the one described for item 18 was used. If item 28 is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Item 29: The components of item 29 were imputed using simple imputation techniques for multiple items identical to the technique described for item 1. If any part of item 29 is unanswered, and item 28 is marked with a number greater than 0 or a number greater than 0 is imputed for item 28, then impute the donor's entry

Item 30: In order to impute values for item 30, a ratio imputation technique similar to the one described for item 18 was used. If item 30 is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Item 31: In order to impute values for item 31, a ratio imputation technique similar to the one described for item 18 was used. If item 27 is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Item 32: The components of item 32 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 32 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 33: The components of item 33 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 33 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 34: In general, a simple imputation approach similar to that described for item 1 was used for the item 34 imputation. In each row of item 34, a value for the first column was imputed before a value was imputed for the second column. If an item in the first column is unanswered, impute the donor's entry. If "No" is imputed, blank the item in the second column.

Certain item 34 data are directly related to data in items 35 and 36; therefore, item 34 rows a, c, and e were imputed using data from item 35. Column 2 of item 35 indicates the number of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year for specific offenses. If a respondent indicated a nonzero value for the total removals with no continuing services in subitem 36a, columns 1 and 2 of item 34 row a were both edited to "yes," indicating that the school both allows for and utilized removal with no continuing school services for at least the remainder of the school year. If the value at item 36a was greater than zero, and the respondent indicated that the school did not allow for the use of removals with no continuing services for at least the remainder of the school year in item 34a_1 (C0390=2) or that this action was not used during this school year in item 34a_2 (C0392=2), these "no" values were deleted and "yes" values were imputed. If no removals were reported in item 35 column 2, a hot deck approach similar to the technique described above for item 34 was used; however, in each item 34 row, the value of column 2 was imputed prior to the value of column 1. Similar imputation procedures were performed to ensure that item 35 column 3 and subitem 36b were consistent with item 34 row c and that item 35 column 4 was consistent with item 34 row e.

Item 35: Imputation for item 35 was performed using an aggregate proportion technique. Donor classes were composed of schools with nonimputed item 35 values in the row of interest that shared the same school level, urbanicity, and enrollment size categories as the recipient. Values were imputed on a row-by-row basis so that the total number of students involved in the specific offense (column 1) was greater than or equal to the number of disciplinary actions that were handed out for the specific offense (sum of columns 2–5). Although a student could theoretically be disciplined for the same offense several times, it was unlikely that there would be multiple disciplinary actions assigned for a single offense.

Within each row, three scenarios were determined, each warranting its own imputation approach:

Scenario 1: The first scenario occurred when the total number of students involved in a specific offense (column 1) was greater than zero and the items indicating the number of disciplinary actions taken for the specific offense (columns 2–5) were either blank or a mixture of blanks and nonzero values. An example of this scenario would be a respondent indicating that out of 30 students involved in the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device in subitem 35a_1 (C0458), four students were removed from the school in subitem 35a_2 (C0460), but failing to provide responses to subitems 35a_3 (C0462), 35a_4 (C0464), and 35a_5 (C0466).

To impute values for subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5, the ratio of the sum of all disciplinary actions taken for the specific offense (e.g., use/possession of a firearm/explosive device) to the sum of students involved in a specific offense within the school's donor class was calculated. This ratio (R_a) is illustrated by equation 1 below using the subitem 35a example. This ratio was then multiplied by the recipient's item 35 column 1 value (30, in the example) to predict a total number of disciplinary actions for the specific offense. Continuing the example with subitem 35a, if within the recipient's donor class, the sum of the various disciplinary actions in subitems 35a_2–35a_5 (C0460–C0466) equals 200 and the sum of the total students involved in the offenses in item 35a_1 (C0458) equals 600, the ratio (R_a) would be 1/3. The ratio, R_a, was then multiplied by the recipient's item 35 column 1 value for the particular offense (30) to predict the total disciplinary actions for the particular offense (1/3 x 30 = 10, in our example = the predicted sum of disciplinary actions for use/possession of a firearm/explosive device).

Equation 1:

$$\left(\frac{\sum_{m=2}^{5}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Q35a_{mi}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Q35a1_i}\right) = R_a$$

where $Q35a_{mi}$ is the subitem 35a value of donor school *i* in column *m*, $Q35a_1_i$ is the subitem 35a_1 value of donor school *i,* and *n* is the number of schools in the recipient's donor class.

The recipient's nonimputed disciplinary actions for the specific offense were then subtracted from the total disciplinary actions to determine the total number of disciplinary actions that must be distributed among the columns with missing values in each row (e.g., 10 total disciplinary actions – 4 known disciplinary actions = 6 disciplinary actions to be distributed among subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5). The distribution of the remaining disciplinary actions was determined by calculating within the recipient's donor class the ratios (R_m) of the sum of the disciplinary actions to the sum of total offenses for each disciplinary action missing a value (e.g., subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5). If it was determined in the example that the disciplinary actions were distributed equally among donors across subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5, a value of 2 would be imputed for each of the three missing column values.

Scenario 2: The second scenario occurred when the number of students involved in a particular offense (column 1) was unknown and the respondent indicated that at least one disciplinary action was taken for the offense (i.e., there was at least one nonzero value within columns 2–5).

For each disciplinary action within the row, a ratio (R_m) of the sum of that disciplinary action for the specific offense among donors to the sum of all disciplinary actions for the specific offense among donors was calculated. For example, assume that the donor class disciplinary actions for the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device are divided equally among removals in subitem 35a_2 (C0460), transfers to specialized schools in subitem 35a_3 (C0462), out-of-school suspensions lasting 5 or more days in subitem 35a_4 (C0464), and other disciplinary actions in subitem 35a_5 (C0466) and that the respondent indicated that there were two removals for the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device. The R_m values for subitems 35a_2, 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5 would be determined to all be 0.25.

Because the disciplinary actions for the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device are distributed equally among donor class schools, the values that would be imputed for subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5 are identical to the nonimputed subitem 35a_2 value. In this example, values of 2 would be imputed for subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5. If, among donor class schools, the subitem 35a_2 R_m value was determined to be 0.40, while the R_m values for subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5 are 0.20, values of 1 would be imputed for subitems 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5. To impute a value for subitem 35a_1, the donor ratio of the total number of students involved in the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device to the total number of all disciplinary actions taken for the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device ($1/R_a$) would first be calculated (see equation 1 above). This ratio was then multiplied by the recipient sum of disciplinary actions for the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device, *after any necessary imputations in columns 2–5 were performed*, to obtain the imputed subitem 35a_1 value (equation 2).

Equation 2:

$$\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Q35a1_i}{\sum_{m=2}^{5}\sum_{i=1}^{n} Q35a_{mi}}\right) * \sum_{m=2}^{5} Q35a_{m(R)} = Q35a1$$

where $Q35a_{mi}$ is the subitem 35a value of donor school *i* in column *m*, $Q35a_1_i$ is the subitem 35a_1 value of donor school *i*, $Q35a_{m(R)}$ is the subitem 35a recipient value for column *m,* and *n* is the number of schools in the recipient's donor class.

Scenario 3: The final scenario is one in which an entire row in item 35 was blank or a mixture of blanks and zeros. First, a value for the sum of item 35 columns 2 through 5 was imputed by calculating the mean of this sum among all schools in the recipient's donor class. The donor ratio of the sum of all disciplinary actions taken for the specific offense (use/possession of a firearm/explosive device, in this example) within the recipient's donor class to the sum of students involved in a specific offense (R_a) was then calculated (see equation 1). Among donors, the percentage distribution of disciplinary actions was calculated. For example, if eight disciplinary actions were determined to be distributed among subitems 35a_2, 35a_3, 35a_4, and 35a_5, and the disciplinary actions for the use/possession of a firearm/explosive device were distributed equally among the donor schools, values of 2 for each of these items would be imputed. If the respondent had placed values of zero in subitem 35a_2 and subitem 35a_3, the

imputed values would be 4 for subitem 35a_4 and subitem 35a_5. Subitem 35a_1 would be calculated using equation 2.

Item 36: Subitems 36a and 36b were imputed using an aggregate proportion imputation technique. Donors were matched with the recipients on school level, urbanicity, and enrollment size, and the item 35 column 2 values for all subitem 36a donors were nonimputed. The item 35 column 3 values for all subitem 36b donors were also nonimputed.

Subitem 36a was imputed by first calculating the ratio (sum of donor subitem 36a values) / (sum of donor subitem 35 column 2 values) within the recipient's donor class. This ratio was multiplied by the recipient's item 35 column 2 sum (after any necessary item 35 imputations), and the resulting number was the imputed subitem 36a value.

An identical imputation procedure was used for subitem 36b, with item 35 column 3 being used in place of item 35 column 2.

Item 37: For some schools, the percentage of total student membership was available in the 2013–14 CCD frame. Rather than having values imputed using a hot deck approach, values for these schools were taken directly from the 2013–14 CCD frame.

Item 38: The components of item 38 were imputed using a hot deck imputation technique identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 38 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry. For some schools, the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (item 38a) and percentage of male students (item 38d) were available in the 2013–14 CCD frame. The values for these schools for both 38a and 38d were taken directly from the 2013–14 CCD frame.

Item 39: The components of item 39 were imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If any parts of item 39 are unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 40: The imputation procedure used for item 40 was identical to the procedure used for item 1. If item 40 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 41: Item 41 was imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If item 41 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 42: Item 42 was imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If item 42 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Item 43: Item 43 was imputed from data in the 2013–14 CCD frame indicating whether a school was a magnet or a charter school. If the school was identified as neither a magnet nor a charter school in the 2013–2014 CCD frame, the school was imputed as "a regular public school."

Item 44: Item 44 was imputed using a hot deck imputation approach identical to the technique described for item 1. If item 44 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry

Item 45: The imputation for subitems 45a and 45b used the aggregate proportion or ratio imputation technique. However, the imputation for item 45 is unique because one component (subitem 45a) is independent of other data in the survey, and the other component (subitem 45b) must be greater than or equal to the subitem 36b value.

Subitem 45a was imputed first, and donor classes for subitem 45a were formed on the basis of school level, urbanicity, and enrollment size categories. Values of zero were imputed for subitem 45a by calculating the percentage of schools with values of zero in the donor class and randomly choosing recipients to receive imputed zeroes, such that the percentage of recipients with imputed zeroes in subitem 45a mimics the percentage of donors with values of zero in subitem 45a. If item 45a is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the total number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Because the subitem 45b values were directly related to the subitem 36b values, the item 45b values were imputed using aggregate proportions of donor class subitem 45b to donor class subitem 36b. Donor classes were formed by searching for schools with identical school level and enrollment size categories as the recipient. Donor classes were further refined by separation on the basis of subitem 36b values. Not surprisingly, schools reporting fewer transfers for all disciplinary reasons (subitem 36b) tended to be associated with larger ratios of subitem 45b to subitem 36b; therefore, donor separation based on subitem 36b values helped to ensure that unrealistically large subitem 45b values were not imputed. Subitem 33b values were imputed by finding the ratio of the aggregate subitem 45b values to the aggregate subitem 36b values for the entire donor class and multiplying this ratio by the recipient’s subitem 36b value (after any necessary subitem 36b imputation).

Donor Type Description

No Donor Edit (Type 0) – No Donor Used

Description: The missing item is imputed using responses from other items in the same questionnaire record. Similar edits may be run during the logic edit stage but due to manual review, it is possible that the prior logic edit would not have been triggered. This is called a "No Donor Edit," and it is run prior to the donor imputation. Both the description and SAS code are included in the column "NoDonor_Edit" within the Imputation Table of the processing databases. There are no Donor Type 0's initialized in SSOCS.

Donor Type 1 – Simple Imputation

Description: The missing item is imputed directly from that item in the donor record.

Example: Question 40

*If item 40 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Donor Type 2 – Simple Imputation for Multiple Items

Description: A series of missing items is imputed directly from those items in the donor record.

Example: Question 2

*If any part of item 2 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Donor Type 3 – Simple Imputation with Blanking Edit/Simple Imputation

Description: Items requiring this type of imputation have two parts. The first part is a simple imputation, where the initial missing item (usually an item with a yes/no response, referred to as a "screener" item) is imputed directly from that item in the donor record. Then, depending on the imputed response, the subsequent item(s) will either need to be imputed using simple imputation (when "yes" is imputed to the screener item) or will need to be blanked (if "no" is imputed to the screener item). This type of imputation occurs for items where there is a skip pattern present.

Note: For these items, there are ALWAYS two donors. The first donor is used when both parts (the "screener" portion and the subsequent items) of the imputed item are missing. The second donor is used when the respondent has answered the screener item with a "yes" response, but the subsequent item(s) are missing and need to be imputed. The method of imputation for this second donor is simple imputation.

Example: Question 16

*D1: If item 16 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry. If the entry is "No," mark all parts of item 17 as blank. If it is "Yes," impute the donor's entry to any part of 17 that is unanswered.

*D2: If "Yes" is marked in item 16 and any part of item 17 is unanswered, impute the donor's entry.

Donor Type 4 – Ratio Imputation

Description: The missing item is imputed using the donor's ratio of that item to some predetermined related item ("ratio variable") and applying it to that same related item in the record being imputed.

Example: Q27

*If item 27 is unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the total number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Donor Type 5 – Ratio Imputation for Multiple Items

Description: A series of missing items is imputed using the donor's ratio of each of those items to some predetermined related item ("ratio variable") and applying these ratios to that same related item in the record being imputed.

Example: Question 26

*If any parts of item 26 are unanswered, use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the total number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Donor Type 6 – Simple Imputation with Blanking Edit/Ratio Imputation

Description: Items requiring this type of imputation have two parts. The first part is a simple imputation, where the initial missing item (usually an item with a yes/no response, referred to as a "screener" item) is imputed directly from that item in the donor record. Then, depending on the imputed response, the subsequent item(s) will either need to be imputed using ratio imputation (if "yes" is imputed to the screener item) or will need to be blanked (if "no" is imputed to the screener item). This type of imputation occurs for items where there is a skip pattern present.

Example: Question 18.

*If any part of item 18 is unanswered and item 11 is marked as "yes" or imputed as "yes," then use the donor's ratio of the entry for that item to the total number of enrolled students to impute a value.

Donor Type 7 – Ratio Imputation with Blanking Edit/Ratio Imputation

Description: Items requiring this type of imputation have two parts. The first part is a ratio imputation, where the initial missing item (referred to as a "screener" item) is imputed using the donor's ratio of that item to some predetermined related item ("ratio variable") and applying it to that same related item in the record being imputed.

Then, depending on the imputed response (whether a value of 0 or a value greater than 0 is imputed), the subsequent item(s) will either need to be imputed using ratio imputation (if a value greater than 0 is imputed to the screener item) or will need to be blanked (if a value of 0 is imputed to the screener item). This type of imputation occurs for items where there is a skip pattern present. There are no Donor Type 7's initialized in SSOCS.

Donor Type 8 – Complex Imputation Routine

The imputation cannot be dealt with using the combination of a database and macros. The item uses a method not covered in donor types 1–7, and there is no way to automate the imputation due to its level complexity (i.e., too many steps in the imputation process). Due to the uniqueness, each complex imputation routine is assigned a letter. For example, the first one (by way of processing order) is numbered donor type 8a, the second 8b, and so on. This would apply to question 35 in SSOCS 2016 (c0458 c0460 c0462 c0464 c0466 c0468 c0470 c0472 c0474 c0476 c0478 c0480 c0482 c0484 c0486 c0488 c0490 c0492 c0494 c0496 c0498 c0500 c0502 c0504 c0506).