



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: Ability to Fully Staff Selected Census Operations

I am pleased to present the executive summary of one of the evaluation studies 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 addressing multiple options for census reporting, 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@ccmail.census.gov. Please note that the complete copy of the following reports will not be publically released: reports regarding procedures addressing multiple options for census reporting and the Evaluation of Housing Unit Coverage on the Master Address File.

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.

Ability to Fully Staff Selected Census Operations

May 1999

Karen G. Pennie and
Christine L. Hough
Field Division

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation was designed to answer six questions regarding staffing during the 1998 Dress Rehearsal:

- Was the Census Bureau able to adequately hire, train, and maintain staff to conduct:
 - 1) Nonresponse Followup in the three Dress Rehearsal Sites?
 - 2) Integrated Coverage Measurement Person Interviewing in the Sacramento and Menominee Dress Rehearsal sites?
 - 3) the Post Enumeration Survey in the South Carolina Dress Rehearsal site?
- Did recruiting activities provide an adequate supply of applicants and replacements?
- Among those offered jobs, did a sufficient number accept the offer?
- Did enough people who accepted the job offer show up at training?
- Did we have an adequate supply of persons complete training to begin work at the beginning of operations?
- Were we able to maintain an adequate supply of staff throughout various operations?

The answer in all cases is yes.

To ensure that Local Census Offices are adequately staffed to meet operational deadlines for Census 2000, the Census Bureau carried out over-recruiting and over-hiring strategies for many dress rehearsal operations. The combined recruiting goal for Nonresponse Followup and Integrated Coverage Measurement/Post Enumeration Survey was approximately ten times the number of authorized production enumerator positions.

For Nonresponse Followup the selecting goal, also referred to as frontloading goal, was approximately twice the number of authorized production enumerator positions. Integrated Coverage Measurement/Post Enumeration Survey did not implement a frontloading strategy, thus the selecting goal for initial training was equal to the number of authorized enumerator production positions, with replacement enumerators selected as needed.

The results of this evaluation support the continued use of over-recruiting and frontloading strategies for Census 2000. The results also indicate that it may be possible to reduce the recruiting goals. In the summer of 1998, the Census Bureau decided to reduce the over-recruiting goal from ten times the number of authorized enumerator positions, to eight times the number of authorized enumerator positions. Specific major findings include the following:

Enumerator Recruiting

The combined recruiting goal for Nonresponse Followup and Integrated Coverage Measurement/Post Enumeration Survey was to be met by 5/16/98. While the dress rehearsal sites did not meet the goal, their success in meeting the *selecting* goal may indicate that the recruiting goals were set too high.

When recruiting ended for the dress rehearsal, most recruits were eligible applicants (83% in Columbia, 66% in Menominee, and 70% in Sacramento). In Menominee, 13% of applicants

refused jobs when they were offered, compared to 2% in Columbia and 5% in Sacramento.

Enumerator Selection

For Nonresponse Followup, all three sites exceeded the selecting (or frontloading) goal (Columbia 126%, Menominee 227%, and Sacramento 133%).

For Integrated Coverage Measurement/Post Enumeration Survey, all three sites exceeded the selecting goal (Columbia 118%, Menominee 200%, and Sacramento 131%).

Enumerator Training/Receiving Assignments

In Menominee, 79% of enumerators who showed up for Nonresponse Followup training, completed training. In Columbia and Sacramento, 74% of enumerators who showed up for training completed training.

- In Columbia, 100% of the Post Enumeration Survey enumerators who showed up for training stayed on to receive an assignment. In Menominee and Sacramento, 86% and 88% of enumerators who showed up for training stayed on to receive an assignment.

Enumerator Turnover

The Nonresponse Followup turnover rates for Columbia, Menominee and Sacramento were 13%, 41%, and 19% respectively.

For the Person Interview stage of Integrated Coverage Measurement/Post Enumeration Survey, the turnover rates for Columbia, Menominee, and Sacramento were 18%, 42%, and 27% respectively.

Enumerator Production for Nonresponse Followup

A comparison of the number of necessary enumerator workdays to the actual number of enumerator workdays showed that Columbia exceeded the required staffing levels throughout the operation. Near the midpoint of the operation 82% of the workload had been completed. Over the course of Nonresponse Followup, enumerators worked an average of 3.0 hours per day, 4.3 days per week. Nonresponse Followup was completed ahead of schedule.

A comparison of the number of necessary enumerator workdays to the actual number of enumerator workdays showed that Menominee reached the required staffing levels during the third full week of production. Near the midpoint of the operation, 59% of the workload had been completed. Over the course of Nonresponse Followup, enumerators worked an average of 3.8 hours per day, 4 days per week. Nonresponse Followup was completed on schedule.

A comparison of the number of necessary enumerator workdays to the actual number of enumerator workdays showed that Sacramento exceeded the required staffing levels after the first week of the operation. Near the midpoint of the operation 56% of the workload had been completed. Over the course of Nonresponse Followup, enumerators worked an average

of 3.2 hours per day, 4.8 days per week. Nonresponse Followup was completed on schedule.

Enumerator Production for the Person Interview Stage of Integrated Coverage Measurement/Post Enumeration Survey

A comparison of the number of necessary enumerator workdays to the actual number of enumerator workdays showed that Columbia exceeded the required staffing levels after the first week of the operation (during the first week of the operation the full workload was not available). At the midpoint of the operation 76% of the workload had been completed. Over the course of the Post Enumeration Survey, enumerators worked an average of 2.9 hours per day, 4.0 days per week (compared to the budgeted 4.0 hours per day, 4.8 days per week). Columbia completed Post Enumeration Survey ahead of schedule.

A comparison of the number of necessary enumerator workdays to the actual number of enumerator workdays showed that Menominee exceeded the required staffing levels throughout the operation. At the midpoint of the operation 77% of the workload had been completed. Over the course of Integrated Coverage Measurement, enumerators worked an average of 2.4 hours per day, 2.9 days per week (compared to the budgeted 4.0 hours per day, 4.8 days per week). Menominee completed Integrated Coverage Measurement ahead of schedule.

A comparison of the number of necessary enumerator workdays to the actual number of enumerator workdays showed that Sacramento exceeded the required staffing levels after the first week of the operation (during the first week of the operation little work was available). While at the midpoint of the operation only 36% of the workload had been completed, an additional 30% of the workload was completed in the two following weeks. Over the course of Integrated Coverage Measurement, enumerators worked an average of 2.0 hours per day, 5.8 days per week (compared to the budgeted 4.0 hours per day, 4.8 days per week). Sacramento completed Integrated Coverage Measurement on schedule.