



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Bureau of the Census
Washington, DC 20233-0001

MEMORANDUM FOR Distribution

From: Cynthia Clark
 Associate Director for Methodology and Standards

Subject: Service Based Enumeration Coverage Yield Results

I am pleased to present the executive summary for the evaluation study for the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal. The dress rehearsal was conducted in three sites — Columbia, South Carolina; Menominee County, Wisconsin; and Sacramento, California. The evaluation studies cover detailed aspects of eight broad areas related to the census dress rehearsal — census questionnaire, address list, coverage measurement, coverage improvement, promotion activities, procedures for nonrespondents to mail census, field operations, and technology.

The executive summary for each evaluation study is also available on the Census Bureau Internet site (<http://www.census.gov/census2000> and click on the link to “Evaluation”). Copies of the complete report may be obtained by contacting Carnelle Sligh at (301) 457-3525 or by e-mail at carnelle.e.sligh@census.gov.

The evaluations are distributed broadly to promote the open and thorough review of census processes and procedures. The primary purpose of the dress rehearsal is to simulate portions of the environment we anticipate for Census 2000, so we can identify and correct potential problems in the processes. Thus, the purpose of the evaluation studies is to provide analysis to support time critical review and possible refinements of Census 2000 operations and procedures.

The analysis and recommendations in the evaluation study reports are those of staff working on specific evaluations and, thus, do not represent the official position of the Census Bureau. They represent the results of an evaluation of a component of the census plan. They will be used to analyze and improve processes and procedures for Census 2000. The individual evaluation recommendations have not all yet been reviewed for incorporation in the official plan for Census 2000. These evaluation study reports will be used as input to the decision making process to refine the plans for Census 2000.

The Census Bureau will issue a report that synthesizes the recommendations from all the evaluation studies and provides the Census Bureau review of the dress rehearsal operation. This report will also indicate the Census Bureau’s official position on the

utilization of these results in the Census 2000 operation. This report will be available July 30th.

Evaluation of the Nonresponse Followup Operation (A1b)

Evaluation of the Mail Return Questionnaire (A2)

Evaluation of Telephone Questionnaire Assistance (A4)

Service Based Enumeration Coverage Yield Evaluation (D1)

Effectiveness of Paid Advertising (E1a)

Promotion Evaluation: Exposure to Paid Advertising and Likelihood of Returning a Census Form (E1b)

Field Infrastructure: EEO Process (G7)

Evaluation of the Housing Unit Coverage on the Master Address File (B1)

Service-Based Enumeration Coverage Yield Results

April 1999

Tracey McNally
Decennial Statistical
Studies Division

For questions regarding this summary or to request a copy of the full report, contact the Planning, Research, and Evaluation Division, Bureau of the Census (301) 457-3525.

Executive Summary

The goal of Service-Based Enumeration (SBE) is to enumerate people without housing who may be missed in the traditional enumeration of housing units and group quarters. In the 1995 Census Test, we enumerated people at emergency shelters and soup kitchens to test procedures for enumerating people without housing. In September of 1996, we conducted a small-scale test in New York City designed to streamline the soup kitchen procedures and adapt those procedures to mobile food van enumeration. In the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal we expanded the list of enumeration sites to include targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations, such as outdoor encampments where groups of people without a usual residence live and/or stay and who do not usually receive services. The Census Bureau also counted people without housing through the Be Counted program.

We conducted a complete enumeration of emergency shelters on April 20, 1998. A separate Individual Census Report (ICR) was used to enumerate each person, including children. Every sixth person was given a long form to complete. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it in a sealed envelope.

During the day and evening of April 21, 1998, we conducted a complete enumeration of soup kitchens. Enumerators were instructed to divide the lines into segments, list each person on a Group Quarters (GQ) Listing Sheet annotating their sex and race for last resort, hand the respondent a Privacy Act notice, and conduct the interview using the Individual Census Questionnaire (ICQ). A separate ICQ was used to enumerate each person, including children. Every sixth person was enumerated on a long form ICQ.

On the evening of April 21, 1998, enumerators were to visit mobile food vans that operated on a regular schedule. There were no mobile food vans in any of the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal sites.

We also conducted a complete enumeration at targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations on April 22, 1998. Enumerators were instructed to hand the respondent a Privacy Act notice and conduct the interview using the ICQ. A separate ICQ was used to enumerate each person, including children. There was no long-form sample.

The Census Bureau also distributed Be Counted forms at targeted locations in the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal sites. People enumerated during the Be Counted operation on Be Counted forms who indicated that they had no address and marked the "No Address on April 18, 1998" box on that form were included in the SBE universe. Also those respondents who gave an emergency shelter as their residence on the Be Counted form became part of the service-based enumeration universe.

Data capture records for shelter enumerations, soup kitchens, targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations, and Be Counted form enumerated persons with no usual residence were included on the file used for service-based enumeration unduplication.

While observers in Sacramento reported that there were people counted at the targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations in Sacramento, this was not reflected in the file received. Research indicates that all the people enumerated were incorrectly given a Transient Night Enumeration type code.

South Carolina had a total of 13 shelters, 4 soup kitchens, and 2 targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations enumerated. There were 11 shelters and 1 soup kitchen enumerated in Sacramento. Menominee did not have any shelters or soup kitchens at the time of the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal, although people were enumerated at 2 targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations.

Of the questionnaires that were included in the SBE universe unduplication, 94 percent represented unique people that were added to the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal. It is important to note that this is probably an overstatement of the number of unique people since questionnaires with insufficient data for matching were treated as unique people in the SBE universe in the Census 2000 Dress Rehearsal.

In South Carolina, a total of 452 people were tabulated, with the majority of people (58 percent) being enumerated at shelters. Approximately 5 out of 10 people (54 percent) enumerated in Sacramento were enumerated in shelters while the remainder were enumerated at the soup kitchen. In Menominee, 5 people were enumerated at a targeted non-sheltered outdoor location and two people were allocated from a Be Counted Form. A total of 85 people were added to the SBE universe as a result of the Be Counted Program.

Approximately one-half (49 percent) of the short form ICQ respondents in Sacramento and one-fourth (27 percent) of the short form ICQ respondents in South Carolina refused to give their age and date of birth when asked or the enumerator did not ask for it when conducting the interview. This is nearly twice the nonresponse rate for birthdate and age on the ICR in both Sacramento (20 percent) and South Carolina (14 percent).

More than one-half (56 percent in Sacramento and 72 percent in South Carolina) of the ICR long form respondents completed a majority of the long form questions analyzed. At the soup kitchens and targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations in Sacramento, approximately 3 out of 5 (61 percent) people gave responses to the ICQ long form when asked.