

**Census Bureau Responses to the  
Recommendations of the  
Census Advisory Committee of Professional Associations  
Made as a Result of the Meeting on April 21 - 22, 2005**

**Recommendation 1**

Overall Recommendation

The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee

“The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee (**AMA/AC**) recommends that the Census Bureau identify agenda topics for the October CACPA meeting that will review plans for the integrated promotion of participation in the 2010 census. As we approach the 2010 Decennial Census, the American Marketing Association is concerned that there may be insufficient leveraging of the ACS, the Partnership Programs, and other points of contact that will help the Census Bureau maximize response and minimize cost. In order to be most effective, the session would need to have participation of senior members of the Communications Directorate and the Partnership Program Office, and as appropriate, the Privacy Office, Decennial Communications, ACS Communications, and other senior personnel as prescribed by the Director.

It is particularly important to that all proposed communication and partnership tactics be effectively tested off-line or in upcoming field tests. In the meeting, Jay Waite pointed out that field tests focus on the elements that are different from existing practice. Because the public reaction to privacy issues, to governmental practices, and to implementation of communication tactics is rapidly changing, we suggest that communication and partnership programs should be tested as early as is practical.

We do not expect that a review of these issues can be fully covered in a single meeting. Rather we would propose to provide input as these plans to communicate and promote participation in 2010 and for the ACS are developed and refined within the Census Bureau.

Specific topics for this discussion and future meetings could cover:

- Timeline leading up to and following the 2010 Decennial Census
  - Development of overall strategy and plan
    - Segmentation
    - Targeting
    - Language and messaging for specific target groups (e.g., demographic, ethnic, low literacy, etc.)
    - Budget allocation across objectives

- Metrics of success (How will you know that the communication and Partnership outreach programs were successful?)
- Development of RFP for agencies
- Selection of agency
- Final implementation plan
- Test plan
  - Creative development and testing
  - Use of in-market tests
  - Media and implementation
  - Use of the 2006 and 2008 tests for communication tactics
- Links to Community groups through the Partnership program.
  - How to amplify their efforts
  - Nontraditional media and word-of-mouth methods
  - Use by both the ACS and Decennial programs
- Use of logo
  - The compatibility and use of the 2010 Decennial Census logo with the corporate look and feel.
- Integrating, cross-promoting, and leveraging all tools that the Census Bureau has
  - ACS
  - Website
  - Other programs (e.g. economic surveys, health statistics)
  - Other governmental agencies.
- Possible communication approaches for privacy
- How will the value of cooperation be addressed with various target groups and communities?"

**Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 2**

### **2010 Decennial Census Program**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee (**ASA/AC**) shares the concern that major Information Technology (IT) contracting by the Census Bureau poses high risk to decennial operations. To reduce the risk, we suggest that the Bureau consider the on-site assignment of census staff at the contractor’s site to ensure that the contractor has adequate guidance and oversight on its tasks.

Especially given concern that coverage evaluation programs might be curtailed with no statistical adjustment being planned for the 2010 Census, the **ASA/AC** encourages a session in a future meeting on plans for accuracy and coverage evaluation for the 2010 Census.

The **ASA/AC** also encourages future half-hour updates/sessions on the progress of the IT contracting and other major contracts.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

### **Recommendation 3**

#### **Update from the Chief Economist**

#### **The American Economic Association Advisory Committee**

“Regarding further expansion of the Research Data Center network, the American Economic Association Advisory Committee (AEA/AC) recognizes that there are resource constraints within the Census for supporting this operation. We would like the Census to continue the development of data resources for users of the RDC network and then, as resources permit, focus on limited geographic expansion into regions where a clear need and desire exists. We do not recommend devoting significant management resources to recruiting local managers of prospective RDCs at this time.

The Committee also had some reactions to the research project updates presented.

- **Business List Reconciliation Project**: The Committee supports the efforts to reconcile the business registers used at the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Census. The construction of a unified business register is an important goal for the statistical agencies that we encourage. This project is a useful step in that direction and will be valuable in understanding the differences in employment estimates from the two agencies.
- **Measuring the Dynamics of Young and Small Businesses**: The Committee supports the efforts at the Center for Economic Studies to develop the data sources on nonemployer businesses. Integrating these data with the data sources on employee businesses will provide a valuable resource for understanding the process of firm formation and growth.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 4**

### **ACS Data Collection and Design**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The **ASA/AC** compliments the Census Bureau on the successful launch of the full-scale American Community Survey (ACS), and on obtaining excellent weighted response rate of 97% for the first wave.

The **ASA/AC** recommends an investigation of the impact of tract size on the coefficient of variation of tract-level estimates from ACS and a consideration of modifying the sample design to take this impact into account.

The **ASA/AC** recommends that the ACS research agenda should include evaluations of the stability of both small-area estimates over time and small group estimates, and as well that the research agenda should include both model-assisted and model-based estimation.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 5A**

### **An Overview of Selected Population Profiles**

#### **The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee**

“The **AMA/AC** recommends that the Census Bureau use the total population as a comparison group for the iterated description items in the population profile.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 5B**

### **An Overview of Selected Population Profiles**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The **ASA/AC** is pleased to see the inclusion of uncertainty estimates with American Community Survey (ACS) population profiles. The **ASA/AC** recommends research into inference about rank orderings based on ACS data to take account of multiple comparisons issues and unequal precision of different estimates.

The **ASA/AC** notes that comparison population data may not be necessary for many data users. If the Census Bureau does decide to include a comparison population, the **ASA/AC** recommends using the total population, as this would be the only way to provide a comparison group that would be consistent across all profile reports. The committee encourages the development of spreadsheet-friendly formats for its web-based tables, as appears in the prototype format of the sample-subject table, to provide flexibility to data users.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 5C**

### **An Overview of Selected Population Profiles**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“The Population Association of America Advisory Committee (**PAA/AC**) supports the U.S. Census Bureau’s efforts to develop and disseminate population profiles based on the ACS. However, we strongly recommend that neither non-Hispanic Whites nor any other specific subgroup be used as the comparison group. If there is to be a comparison group, it should be the total population. The **PAA/AC** encourages the Census Bureau to include both counts and percentages in each profile. We also recommend the Census Bureau consider profiles that are derived from more than one item in the ACS schedule (e.g., single women heading families with children).

The **PAA/AC** recommends that the Census Bureau create some special population profiles from ACS for non-nested geographic units (e.g. region, metropolitan/non-metropolitan, urban/rural, etc.). Some of these are available for specific states or metropolitan/micropolitan areas, but to produce them for the country as a whole would require the user to sum up all the component parts.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 6A**

### **Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing Sub-Sampling**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The **ASA/AC** commends the Census Bureau for its work investigating the effects of variable subsampling rates on precisions and costs of estimates. The **ASA/AC** suggests that it may also be useful to consider analytic solutions to the problem such as in a constrained minimization framework in addition to the empirical work that has been done.

The **ASA/AC** notes that altering the sampling rates to increase Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing in tracts with lower mail/Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviews response could increase mode effects. However, the quality of data from CAPI in these tracts is likely to be better than from other modes of data collection.

The **ASA/AC** recommends interactive adjustment of CAPI subsampling rates, perhaps annually, on the basis of actual outcomes of field operations.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 6B**

### **Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing Sub-Sampling**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“The **PAA/AC** commends the Census Bureau on its excellent plan to alter the sub-sampling in the CAPI part of the ACS based on cooperation rates. However, the analysis of the effects of the changes would be more informative if they were presented for the following populations:

- Non-Hispanic White alone,
- Non-Hispanic Black alone,
- Non-Hispanic American Indian and Alaska Native alone,
- Non-Hispanic Asian alone,
- Non-Hispanic Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone,
- Non-Hispanic Two or More Races, and
- Hispanic.

The findings for Whites in the background paper by Asiala are not interpretable because Hispanics are included in each group.

The **PAA/AC** further recommends that in the ACS sample design for CAPI, mail cooperation rates should be monitored as sufficient data are assembled (e.g., no less than 1 year and no more than 3 years) so that tracts can be monitored to see if their classification should be changed for purposes of CAPI sub-sampling procedure (e.g., move from 2 in 5 to 1 in 3).

For purposes of comparing item non-response rates, the **PAA/AC** recommends replicating panel number 6 but having all response categories in question 9 vertically ordered as follows so that it becomes panel 7 and can be compared with panel 6.

Q: Is this person Hispanic?

- no....
- yes....
- yes....
- yes....
- yes....

Q: What is this person's race?

- White....
- Black....
- American Indians....
- Asian Indians....
- Chinese....
- Korean....

- Japanese....
- Vietnamese....
- Filipino....
- Other Asian....
- Native Hawaiian....
- Guamanian....
- Samoan....
- Other Pacific Islanders....
- Some Other Race....”

**Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 7**

### **2007 Economic Census Content Issues: E-Commerce Questions and Proposals**

#### **The American Economic Association Advisory Committee**

##### *Questions:*

- 1. Does the Committee agree with the proposal to eliminate the e-commerce question from the 2001 Economic Census?*
- 2. Do you think we should consider a 2007 e-commerce yes/no check box inquiry on all report forms, or should we limit it to selected sectors?*
- 3. Does the Committee agree with the recommendation not to publish any official 2002 Economic Census e-commerce estimates?*
- 4. Does the Committee think we should consider adding additional e-business process check boxes to 2007 Economic Census report forms similar to the Item 28 supply chain inquiry used in 2002? Examples might include: online ordering, e-procurement, automated order fulfillment, foreign sourcing of merchandise, materials and supplies, etc.*

##### **“AEA/AC Recommendations:**

1. The committee commends the efforts the Census Bureau has made to identify the extent of e-commerce activity in the U.S. The results compiled from responses to e-commerce questions on the 2002 Economic Census were sufficiently inconsistent with responses on the various annual sector surveys as to challenge their value. Further, the e-commerce questions on the 2002 Economic Census revealed that e-commerce activity is concentrated in a relatively few sectors of the economy and, within those sectors, in relatively few firms. For these reasons, and because e-commerce activity is more thoroughly reported in the annual sector surveys, the committee agrees that the current e-commerce questions should be eliminated from the 2007 Economic Census.
2. The committee thinks that the activities that may be described as “e-commerce” are sufficiently diverse, and the economic nature of e-commerce transactions are sufficiently different in various sectors, that a simple yes/no response to a generic question does not provide vital information. Accordingly, the committee recommends that an e-commerce yes/no check box not be included on the 2007 Economic Census.
3. For the above reasons, the committee agrees with the recommendation not to publish

any official 2002 Economic Census e-commerce statistics.

4. The committee recommends that in sectors of the economy where an establishment is the relevant entity to report e-commerce, and where a manageable set of relevant transactional processes can be identified, that a set of yes/no check boxes for reporting those activities could be worthwhile. The responses to such data would be useful in their own right and would aid in the design of the sampling frame for the annual sector surveys concerning e-commerce.”

**Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 8**

### **Supply Chain and Inventory Management Questions and Proposals**

#### **The American Economic Association Advisory Committee**

##### *Questions:*

1. *What alternative for Item 28 in the 2007 Economic Census do you favor? What do you think are the most important processes to focus on for the different sectors?*
2. *Do you agree with our conclusion that collecting inventory consistent with how companies maintain their financial records will result in more accurate and consistent inventory data?*
3. *Do you agree with our recommendation to develop a standard inventory question for use across all economic programs? Do you agree with the timeline for revising current survey questionnaires?*

##### **“AEA/AC Recommendations:**

1. The committee endorses Census Alternative 1. We do feel that the 28A questions are interesting and encourage Census to further examine the responses to these questions in the 2002 Economic Census for useful information. We recognize that response burden might preclude asking these questions in the 2007 Economic Census, but would recommend revisiting them for the 2012 Economic Census. Other related questions on inventories could enquire about:
  - a. Inventory management (e.g., is third party management done at the establishment, e.g. VMI, 3PL, 4PL).
  - b. Inventory tracking methods (e.g., are electronic inventory management techniques being used, where RFID is one of the many techniques).
  - c. Order processing/replenishment (e.g. are inventories replenished automatically or through data-sharing techniques that occur at the establishment, but with another firm; or through other electronic information-sharing activity such as forecast sharing, inventory level data sharing, or order sharing).

The committee does not believe Census should ask questions about auction methods, which are part of the pricing process and not necessarily related to inventory or supply chain management.

2. The committee agrees with Census that collecting inventory data in a way that is consistent with how companies maintain their financial records will result in more accurate and consistent inventory data. Ideally, we would prefer to see more

accurate inventory measures at an establishment location that include third party-owned inventory at that establishment's location, but recognize the difficulty with collecting that data in the Economic Census.

3. The committee agrees with the Census recommendation to develop a standard inventory question for use across all economic programs. We also agree that the three-year timeline for revising current survey questionnaires is appropriate.”

### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 9A**

### **2006 ACS Content Testing**

#### **The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee**

“The **AMA/AC** feels that the proposed testing plan and analyses are reasonable. We note, however, that the proposed measures assess method-to-method consistency and do not actually measure bias. A term other than bias should be used.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 9B**

### **2006 ACS Content Testing**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The **ASA/AC** notes that “net difference” is not “bias”, so the title of this measure needs to be corrected. The **ASA/AC** recommends that Census Bureau staff look at data validity by embedding debriefing questions for a subsample to identify as best as possible what the true value may have been. The **ASA/AC** recommends that this should be examined for subgroups of special interest that are most likely to have difficulty answering these questions.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 9C**

### **2006 ACS Content Testing**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“If the ACS is planning to have questions on marital history, the **PAA/AC** recommends adding a question on age at first marriage.

For the 2006 ACS content test, the **PAA/AC** recommends that where sample size is sufficient, control and test panel comparisons should be made across equivalent, sub-national levels (e.g., states). Furthermore, if such comparisons are made, that both absolute numerical differences and absolute relative differences should be measured for items to include item non-response.

To facilitate its role as adviser to the Census Bureau’s 2006 ACS Content Testing, the **PAA/AC** asks that a list of all content items and questions to be tested be sent to **PAA/AC** members.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 10A**

### **Proposed 2010 Census Residence Rules**

#### **The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee**

“The **AMA/AC** is concerned that application of the “Residence Rule” as described currently will result in under counting households with children when applied to group quarters’ counts of college dormitories and boarding schools. Also, using the rules at different times of the year, as in ACS during the summer, could result in different estimates.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 10B**

### **Proposed 2010 Census Residence Rules**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The ASA/AC believes that the biggest challenge is to translate the rules into simple, understandable guidance to the public (Response to Question 3).”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 10C**

### **Proposed 2010 Census Residence Rules**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“The ACS currently uses a two-month residency rule, whereas the decennial census uses the concept of “place of usual residence.” The **PAA/AC** members believe that using two different sets of rules is likely to cause data from the ACS to be inconsistent with the Decennial Census results and intercensal population estimates for many places.

Under the assumption that the major differences between ACS and Decennial Census residency rules can cause differences in results, we urge the Census Bureau to continue collecting data that can be used to test these differences. A test should be done as soon as possible. If there are significant differences in a substantial number of places, we believe the ACS should adopt the same residency rules used in the Decennial Census.

In addition, the **PAA/AC** urges the Census Bureau to collect information on secondary places of residence in the ACS (e.g. 1-6 or 2-6 months per year). We believe these data will be extremely helpful for understanding residency issues and mobility patterns and will lead to more accurate population counts and estimates.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 11A**

### **Proposed 2010 Decennial Program Group Quarters Definitions**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The ASA/AC recommends that redistricting data and other data products be published with as much detail as possible on type of group quarters, such as distinguishing populations in federal, state, and local correctional facilities, to allow policymakers across levels of government as well as other data users the greatest possible flexibility in tailoring diverse programs to distinctions in population subgroups that might be sensitive to group-quarters definitions.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 11B**

### **Proposed 2010 Decennial Program Group Quarters Definitions**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“The PAA/AC commends the Census Bureau for its work on the group-quarters population. We believe this is an important issue and that the Census Bureau’s research program will lead to numerous improvements in the quality of group quarters data in 2010.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 12**

### **2007 Economic Census Employment Issues**

#### **The American Economic Association Advisory Committee**

##### *Questions:*

- 1. Do you agree with the Census Bureau's proposal not to collect leased employment separately in the 2007 Economic Census? Do you think our assumption that leased employees should usually be 100 percent of the total permanent workforce is reasonable?*
- 2. Do you agree with the Census Bureau's proposal to use check boxes to detect the presence of leased, temporary, and contract employees? Can you suggest alternative names for these types (leased, temporary, and contract) of employees that might be more readily understood by our respondents?*
- 3. Do you agree that we should adopt a consistent definition of first quarter employees across all economic sectors?*
- 4. Do you agree with our proposal to make economic census pay period reference dates consistent with IRS requirements?*

##### **“AEA/AC Recommendations:**

1. The total employment in Professional Employer Organizations (NAICS 561330) is substantial, 1.7 million employees in 2002, and growing rapidly, approximately 95 percent from 1997 to 2002. The committee believes that it is important that the Census continue efforts to allocate this employment to the sector and geographic area in which it is used. We understand that the methods used to collect information on the use of leased employees in the 2002 Census did not provide accurate information. One suggestion is to see if the information can be collected through the “purchased services” questions on the survey. A first question would focus on the expenditure on all hired labor services by the establishment (leased workers, contractors, temporary help workers, professional and technical services). The second question would distinguish workers (and expenditures) exclusively or primarily employed in the plant from ones that worked outside the plant (in a law or engineering firm, for example). The third question would focus on employees under the supervisory control of the establishment manager. This would try to distinguish leased employees from other contract employees like janitors, guards, or landscapers.

The panel believes that, over the long run, a better way to determine the industry and work locations of leased employees will likely to involve an administrative data solution. In particular, we believe it would be very valuable for the accurate measurement of leased employees if the IRS would provide the Census Bureau with some summary information for each PEO. This information would include the EIN, level of employment, and expenditure on leased employees for each of the PEO's clients. With this information the Census could much more accurately allocate leased employees to the correct industry and geographic area. Such an IRS/Census Bureau partnership would go a long way in enabling the Census Bureau to fulfill its mission of accurately measuring employment by industry and geographic region. Given the expected high rates of growth of PEOs over the coming years, the development of a solution for accurately measuring leased employment should be given a high priority.

2. If the confusion that arose in answering the 2002 Census question was caused by the respondents misunderstanding the distinction between leased, temporary, and contract employees then the same confusion will probably arise with the check boxes. The check boxes don't allow any way to double check the accuracy and consistency of the responses, as you were able to do with the 2002 responses. Maybe the distinction we outlined in our response to question 1 will help reduce the respondent errors.
3. We agree that a consistent definition based on March 12 employment is desirable. Quarterly employment should continue to be reported in manufacturing and construction industries as it is now.
4. We agree with this change to standardize the reference dates with the IRS."

### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 13A**

### **Race & Ethnicity Component of the 2005 National Census Test**

#### **The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee**

“Lack of comprehension, uncertainty about an answer, and perceived time pressure are but a few of the reasons why subjects may give invalid or less than optimal responses. The magnitude of this problem varies across questions and across data collection methods. The **AMA/AC** recommends that a set of standard procedures be developed to measure the validity of responses. Consideration should also be given to developing decision procedures that would address tradeoffs in validity, response rate and cost in determining how best to collect data.

The **AMA/AC** recommends that questionnaire forms be consistent when giving respondents directions on how to answer. As is current practice, if one response is desired, then give no instruction. If multiple responses are acceptable, then instruct respondents to "Mark [X] all that apply" whenever that type of response is desired. Leaving it open to respondent discretion will yield inconsistent interpretations of the task and therefore, inconsistent responses.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 13B**

### **Race & Ethnicity Component of the 2005 National Census Test**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The **ASA/AC** compliments the Census Bureau on the care and attention that Bureau staff have devoted to issues of race and ethnicity measurement and language issues.

The **ASA/AC** further recommends that the Census Bureau test the effect of including a multi-language pamphlet, describing the American Community Survey (ACS) survey (or census) and providing instructions for obtaining help and/or a questionnaire in another language, along with the advance letter or mailing package.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 13C**

### **Race & Ethnicity Component of the 2005 National Census Test**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“The PAA/AC recommends that Panel 5 drop “only United States,” because this wording will confuse people, especially new immigrants who may be more likely to choose “United States.” It is not the information we are trying to gather, and a large number of people will say it anyway, even without “United States only” as a listed category.

In addition, if the Census Bureau expects to use ancestry data to help with imputing non-responses to the Hispanic and race questions, the “United States only” category will not provide guidance for the imputations.

The data from the ancestry question are likely to be very valuable in tracking demographic changes in the population, especially in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generations deriving from immigration. We therefore encourage the Census Bureau to test these combinations of race, Hispanic origin and ancestry for the short form.

The PAA/AC recognizes that current OMB guidelines require the collection of data on race and Hispanic origin, and that race and Hispanic origin are considered two distinct concepts. However, the PAA/AC recommends that the Census Bureau works with OMB and other parties to rethink and revise guidelines on collecting data on race and Hispanic origin. Revisions to current OMB guidelines on race and ethnic data are particularly timely given changing racial and ethnic demographic trends and the shift to allow more than one race reporting in the census.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 14A**

### **Language Program for the 2010 Decennial Census Program**

#### **The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee**

“The Census Bureau requested input regarding recommended methods to make more clear to Spanish-speaking respondents that they can call to request an ACS Spanish questionnaire. Given the relatively low request rate to-date for Spanish language materials, the **AMA/AC** suggests maximizing the exposure of the offer to provide these materials, including:

- Highlighting the offer by pulling it out of the text and placing it in a box, with the text in Spanish.
- Using multiple opportunities for highlighting the message ... including the advance letter, the questionnaire envelope, and the questionnaire itself.

The **AMA A/C** agrees with the approach of testing methods of increasing Spanish language response before expanding these techniques to other languages.

The Census Bureau requested any comments on the design of the ACS bilingual GQ form. The form was generally well received as to format. A continuing concern of the **AMA A/C** is to reinforce the message about privacy whenever possible in Census forms, including the ACS.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 14B**

### **Language Program for the 2010 Decennial Census Program**

#### **The American Statistical Association Advisory Committee**

“The **ASA/AC** supports the testing of the swim-format questionnaire. However, it may not be evident that the respondent is to complete the questions for all persons in the household. The **ASA/AC** recommends an evaluation of the effect of the new format on coverage and item response rates compared to a unilingual format.

The **ASA/AC** notes that a combined ancestry and tribal affiliation question may have the potential for confusion. The evaluation should pay particular attention to this issue.

The **ASA/AC** recommends that the Census Bureau include messages in multiple locations, including advance letters, letters in the mailing package and in the questionnaire itself, indicating that American Community Survey questionnaires can be requested in Spanish and other languages.

The **ASA/AC** suggests the inclusion of a Spanish 800 number on the transmittal envelope.

The **ASA/AC** recommends the development and exploitation of community-based partnerships for communicating availability of alternative language questionnaires and for outreach to promote non-English population participation.

The **ASA/AC** suggests the exploration of putting alternative-language versions of Computer Assisted Personal Interview forms on Universal Serial Bus (USB) storage devices.

The **ASA/AC** suggests a review of field operations in the event that some counties appear to have higher levels of language-barrier related nonresponse.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 14C**

### **Language Program for the 2010 Decennial Census Program**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“The **PAA/AC** commends the Census Bureau’s language program for the 2010 Decennial Census Program and the ACS. The “swim-lane” bilingual English/Spanish short-form is a promising and potentially important way to increase response from Spanish-speaking respondents. If this turns out to be effective, we recommend providing similar bilingual “swim-lane” short forms in other main non-English languages (such as Chinese, Vietnamese, etc.) that can be sent to households that are likely to be non-English speaking, based on the Census 2000 and local area review program data.

For the ACS, we recommend including a brochure with instructions in the main non-English languages informing respondents that they can call a phone number to request a specific non-English survey.

The **PAA/AC** is concerned with translation equivalence of the ACS survey across modes, specifically when the survey is administered by mail, or CATI or CAPI. The **PAA/AC** recommends that the Census Bureau carefully monitors and evaluates response and data quality of non-English ACS surveys across data collection modes.

The low language-barrier non-response rates reported by the Census Bureau are very encouraging but surprising. Because persons confronting language barriers may refuse to be interviewed without indicating a reason, the **PAA/AC** recommends that the figures provided be regarded as a lower bound on language-based non-interview rates. The **PAA/AC** recommends further evaluation of the role of language barriers in non-response rates of the larger counties where a low non-response rate because language barriers can translate into fairly large counts of non-responses from non-English speaking households, and to update **PAA/AC** members of the evaluation results.

In addition, we recommend that the Census Bureau carefully monitor field operations of the ACS in counties with high proportions of non-English speakers to ensure that language barriers do not reduce response rates or affect quality of data from non-English households.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 15A**

### **Meeting Materials**

#### **The American Marketing Association Advisory Committee**

“Regarding the timeline for sending session materials to the Committee, the **AMA/AC** will resubmit recommendation 14 from the April 2004 meeting:

“The **AMA/AC** would prefer to receive papers at least three weeks prior to the meeting. **AMA/AC** also recommends that these papers be available via email or a Web link and that additional background information also be available electronically. If the Census Bureau is concerned about the misuse of this information on a web site, many options are available such as creating PDFs, using log-in personal identification numbers for committee members, and creating a separate website for committee member use only.”

Regarding the presentation material used at the April, 2005 CACPA meeting, the **AMA/AC** will resubmit recommendation 15 from the April 2004 meeting:

“The **AMA/AC** commends the use of the new corporate identity throughout most of the CACPA presentations.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

## **Recommendation 15B**

### **Meeting Materials**

#### **The Population Association of America Advisory Committee**

“The **PAA/AC** requests that all presenters provide materials in electronic format so that they are more easily e-mailed to committee members.

All pre-meeting material, including previous recommendations, should be provided to committee members 2 weeks before the meeting. If not all materials are available 2 weeks before the meeting, the materials should be made available or mailed on flow basis.

The **PAA/AC** asks that all pre-meeting materials be posted on the Census Bureau’s website so that they are available to all committee members, including those who are away from the place where they usually receive mail.”

#### **Census Bureau Response**

