

**NWX-US DEPT OF COMMERCE**

**Moderator: Gregory Pewett  
October 6, 2016  
1:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time all participants are in a listen-only mode. At the end of today's presentation we will conduct a question and answer session. To ask a question please press Star 1. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time.

We'd now like to turn the meeting over to Mr. Jim Spletzer. You may begin.

Jim Spletzer: Good afternoon and welcome to the October 6, 2016 CSAC virtual meeting of the Census Scientific Advisory Committee. We are delighted to have you join us as members of this committee and we look forward to a productive discussion this afternoon.

I am Jim Spletzer, the Acting Designated Federal Official for the Census Scientific Advisory Committee. As such I am required to preside over the advisory committee meeting as specified by the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This is a virtual meeting and we have Advisory Committee members attending virtually, members of the public attending virtually and also attending in person at our building located at 4600 Silver Hill Road, Suitland,

Maryland and we are in Conference Room 1. All participants have been provided with materials for today's meeting. They are also accessible at the Census Advisory Committee Web site.

Before we begin I have some leading providers for our Advisory Committee members attending virtually. If you have not done so already for audio access all CSAC members should dial into today's conference 888-790-3565 access code 48935. Please place your phone on mute until you are called on to speak. If your phone does not have a mute button press Star 6 to mute and unmute. Do not place your phone on hold or answer another line. Hold music will be heard by all meeting participants.

Barbara and I will be moderating the committee discussions. When you're ready to provide a comment please unmute your phone, state your name and say you're ready to comment then mute your phone again and wait to be called. Barbara and I will acknowledge your desire to complete this comment and let you know when your turn has approached.

For public comments with time allocated for this purpose is at 3:40 pm. We will open the lines and the floor for public comments at that time. Each person will be granted up to two minutes per comment. Public attending the meeting please dial in 888-790-3565 access code 8267816. And now (unintelligible) here in Conference 1 one I ask you to please locate the emergency exits and follow safety procedures as needed.

I will now proceed to the introduction of the head table. Before proceeding with a review of today's agenda I would like to introduce our (unintelligible) panel. Sitting at the head table are Nancy Potok, Deputy Director of the Census Bureau, Nicholas Jones, Director of Race and Ethnic Research and Outreach, Michael Mike Bentley, Chief of Census Experiments branch. And

we also have our national content test subject matter experts and other census officials in attendance. I'm going to ask them to introduce themselves.

Beverly Pratt: Hi. My name is Beverly Pratt and I'm at the Racial Statistics Branch in the Population Division here at the Census Bureau.

Tara Dunlap: Tara Dunlap, Advisory Committee Branch.

(Rachel Marx): (Rachel Marx), Ethics and Ancestry Branch.

Sarah Rosario: Sara Rosario, CSAC Coordinator.

(Ellie Matthews): (Ellie Matthews), Census Experiment Branch.

Julia Coombs: Julia Coombs, Census Experiment Branch.

Jim Spletzer: Thank you very much. And now Barbara Anderson, CSAC Chair will proceed with the introduction of Census Advisory Committee Members.

Barbara Anderson: Hi. This is Barbara Anderson from the University of Michigan. Since I don't know exactly what CSAC members are on the line I would ask the CSAC members in turn -- you're all well-behaved people -- to introduce yourself.

Kathy Pettit: This is Kathy Pettit from the Urban Institute.

Dan Atkins: And this is Dan Atkins at the University of Michigan.

Bob Hummer: Bob Hummer, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.

(Willie Hasa): (Willie Hasa), New York University.

Andrew Samwick: Andrew Samwick, Dartmouth College.

Barbara Anderson: Is there anyone else? If not I'd like to say CSAC is delighted that you scheduled this meeting. We're very interested in the national content test. And hopefully at the end of today's meeting we'll have some constructive and helpful comments and recommendations. I'm very glad this is happening. Thank you so much.

Jim Spletzer: Back to Jim. Barbara and I will share in facilitating the deliberations today. Between the two of us will do our best to keep the discussion moving ensuring that we hear from everyone who has a comment and we will try and stay on schedule. I would like to have a few acknowledgments here. I welcome any regents who are listening to our meeting. I recognize anyone from DOC the Department of Commerce especially the Economic and Statistics Administration, congressional staff and I would like to recognize regional staff that also may be attending. We also think members of the public who are attending virtually. A reminder the line for public comments will open at 3:40 pm.

A quick review of today's agenda. Our meeting agenda for today includes discussion of the 2015 National Content Test results which were released after the CSAC's fall meeting. The Census Bureau would like to discuss the results with the Census Scientific Advisory Committee members and obtain your advice. Time has been allocated for committee member discussion.

First on today's agenda is our Committee Chair, Barbara Anderson who will bring opening remarks. Following Barbara, Nancy Potok, Census Deputy Director will provide executive remarks. At roughly 2:20 pm Nicholas Jones

and Mike Bentley will provide the presentation on the 2015 National Content test results. At 3 o'clock Barbara will lead the committee in the discussion and at 3:40 the floors and lines will open for public comment. After the public comment the CSAC chair will present the committee recommendations. Today's meeting will adjourn at 4:00 pm.

I would like to remind each presenter to state your name and speak directly into the microphone each time you speak or have a comment so that we may actually - accurately capture them. You are reminded that all meeting deliberations are recorded for the public record. For advisory committee members attending the meeting virtually please mute your phones until Barbara or I open the floor for committee discussion or questions.

And as a reminder to the audience during any of the question and answer sessions occurring later today only committee members are permitted to ask questions and/or make comments of Census Bureau panelists. The public will have an opportunity to comment this afternoon at 3:40 pm during the time set aside for public comment.

If any attendee in the conference room intends to give public comment please sign your name on the Public Comment sheet. If you have comments that exceed two minutes please submit your comments in writing to the Advisory Committee Office for the record. I know welcome Barbara Anderson who will bring chairs remarks.

Barbara Anderson: As I said before on behalf of CSAC I wanted to say how happy we are that this is happening. We are extremely interested in the race and ethnicity questions both the categories included and the formatting of it. And it's clear from looking at the PowerPoint that the Census Bureau has been working extremely hard. And so we're happy we're here and we hope we're helpful and

we will watch and listen and ask questions with great interest. So I think now you can go on to the next thing. Thank you so much.

Nancy Potok: Operator oh. This is Nancy Potok. Thank you Barbara for your remarks. Good afternoon everyone and welcome to today's virtual meeting of the Census Scientific Advisory Committee. It's good to speak with you all again and I really appreciate your participation in this meeting.

So our purpose today is to discuss the results of the 2015 National Content test. The Census Bureau conducted this test to assess questionnaire content and to obtain nationwide measurements of response rates for Internet and self-response. The test census was sent to a statistically representative sample of approximately 1.2 million households in the US and Puerto Rico and it ran from August 24 through October 31 of 2015.

In alignment with our plans to make 2020 the most automated census ever the 2015 National Content test used Web-based technology including Internet, smart phones and tablets to improve question designs and optimize the reporting. We tested different content strategies for self-response specifically via the Internet and were eager to pursue the Internet response because it turned out to be the least costly and most efficient response option.

We're here today to discuss specifically the 2015 content test that evaluated and compared the different versions of questions that will be asked in the 2020 census. It's our primary mid-decade opportunity to compare those questions prior to making our final decisions for the census. And because this is such a central issue to the census we thought it was important to apprise this committee of our findings and hear your reactions and recommendations. So first we'll hear a discussion of the results from Nicholas Jones, the Director of the Race and Ethnic Research and Outreach and Mike Bentley, Chief of the

Census Experiments Branch both of whom were introduced earlier. And then afterwards Barbara will moderate a committee discussion to formulate some recommendations.

I do want us to move right into the substance of today's discussion so I'll end my remarks here and thank you again both for serving on the committee and for your participation in today's meeting. As always we're very appreciative of you volunteering your time to help us and so we really look forward to hearing all of your comments and your feedback on the presentation today. So I will turn it over to Nick.

Jim Spletzer: I would like to remind the operator to mute all phones. Thank you.

Nicholas Jones: Thank you Nancy and thanks James. Good afternoon everyone. We are really excited to join you today to talk with members of the Census Scientific Advisory Committee about the preliminary results from our extensive research on race and ethnicity with the 2015 National Content test and we're very interested in hearing your feedback and your comments and your recommendations as Barbara said.

So we're to have a presentation this afternoon and then we'll get right into the dialogue as Nancy mention. We want to remind everyone that early this spring we met with members of the Census Scientific Advisory Committee as well as members of our National Advisory Committee on Racial and Ethnic and other populations in addition to colleagues at the US Office of Management and Budget or OMB, members of our Federal Interagency Working Group for Research on Race and Ethnicity and many other organizations and stakeholders to talk about the plans and the study design for the 2015 National Content test.

So this week we kicked off public discussions beginning with our National Advisory Committee meeting on Monday and today's dialogue with the Census Scientific Advisory Committee and this is our opportunity to share the preliminary results and to get feedback. So we really, really have been looking forward to this week for a long time.

Your advice and your feedback earlier this spring really helped us to sharpen our research and to think about the ways in which we convey the results that we're going to be sharing today. And over the past month we have been very busy preparing for the briefings that are taking place this week. We've shared and discussed the results with Director Thompson and Deputy Director Potok as well as our other census executive staff and colleagues at OMB and the Federal Interagency Working Group but we're here today to share these results with the public. We'll walk you through the results and again we look forward to hearing your thoughts about the research.

So we'll begin with the next slide to give you a quick refresher of the 2015 National Content test which we call the NCT. The 2015 NCT was conducted last summer and fall with the Census Day of September 1. And as Nancy explained we employed a large nationally representative sample of approximately 1.2 million households across the entire country including Puerto Rico. The sample design for the NCT included oversampling of key population groups such as Asians and Pacific Islanders, Middle Eastern and North African populations, African Americans, Hispanics and American Indian and Alaska native populations.

The NCT enabled us to test key census content areas for the 2020 census and we connected the successful strategies of our previous research with the 2010 census alternative questionnaire experiment and the 2015 NCT goals and objectives for improving and furthering our research on race and ethnicity. As

you know from our previous discussions by early 2017 the 2020 census topics must be submitted to Congress with the final question wording due in April of 2018. Through this test we also continued to test our contact strategies for optimizing self-response in particular Internet response, building on tests from 2014 and other parts of 2015.

The NCT as a reminder also included a very important re-interview operation. This enabled us to further assess the accuracy of the results and the different question alternatives. And finally the 2015 NCT as a reminder is the Census Bureau's primary mid-decade opportunity to compare these different types of content strategies prior to making decisions about the 2020 census content. As you may remember from our discussions about the 2015 NCT study plan there are several main goals or dimensions for the NCT as it relates to research on race and ethnicity. One dimension is question format as we continue to research the separate questions approach and the combined question approach.

Another dimension relates to response categories where examining how to collect and tabulate data for respondents of Middle Eastern or North African heritage with a MENA category M-E-N-A. Additional dimensions pertain to the wording of instructions and to question terminology where we're examining ways to optimize detailed reporting in particular and also improve respondent understanding of the options that they can report multiple race and ethnic groups. And as an overarching dimension we're using Web-based technology with the Internet, with smart phones and with telephone response to enhance question designs and optimize reporting of detailed racial and ethnic groups.

Now regarding the question format dimension on this slide we have three examples of question formats that we tested on paper in the 2015 NCT. On the left side is a separate questions approach and this is similar to what we used in

the 2010 decennial census where we have a separate question for Hispanic origin and a separate question for race. In the middle we present the combined question with write-ins approach. This is a design format similar to what was tested in the 2010 AQE. It combines race and Hispanic origin into one question and utilizes distinct right in lines for each of the major categories to elicit detailed responses. Finally on the right side of the screen we have an image of a combined question with detailed checkboxes as an approach again for paper. This time we're combined in the race and Hispanic origin question into one design for race and ethnicity utilized both major categories as well as six detailed checkboxes and a right in line to elicit detailed responses among the major categories.

Of course these three question formats had corresponding Web-based versions which we tested in the NCT and shown here on this slide are the separate question approach is that we used in Web-based designs. On the left side of the screen we have a separate question for Hispanic origin and on the right side of the screen we show an image of the separate question for race. We also extended our work to test versions of the combined questions and this is where we were really able to operationalize some different ideas in terms of utilizing the Web-based modes compared to paper.

The initial screen for the combined question with write-in areas shows the major race and ethnicity categories listed co-equally on the screen where each of the responses are looking for an answer and more than one response could be reported. As you can see here with the next version of a screen if a respondent reported any of those major groups they would receive a follow-up that listed the details about that specific category.

So for example on this screen for a respondent who reported that they were white they would be asked about their detail white ethnicity or origins with a

write-in area along with six representative example groups for the definition of the population.

A similar screen would elicit details in this example for a respondent who reported that they were Asian where they were given a distinct write-in area along with six examples to explain the diversity of that group's definition.

Finally this screen shows the combined question with detailed checkboxes and write-in areas. Again utilizing an initial screen which shows the major race and ethnicity categories a respondent that answers affirmatively to any of those checkbox groups would receive a subsequent screen to collect more detailed information. In this case as you can see here with an example of a respondent reporting Hispanic or Latino they're then presented with six detailed checkboxes and a distinct write-in area to collect more information about their identity.

Similarly if a respondent reported Black or African-American they would receive a screen with six detailed boxes and a write-in area. This was of course repeated for any of the groups the respondent may have identified with.

Regarding the next dimension of the NCT research this slide shows us an example of a paper questionnaire that tested a Middle Eastern or North African category. We ordered the race and ethnicity categories based on population size from largest to smallest with white listed as the initial category as it has the largest population.

You can see here with the red arrow that the MENA category falls between the American Indian or Alaska native response category and the response category for Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. This is based on

estimated population sizes for the Middle Eastern or North African population based on recent American Community Survey ancestry data.

Finally regarding the dimension where we're testing instructions and terminology this slide shows examples of what we tested. First focusing on the instruction wording we tested the traditional mark with a visible X one or more boxes against a version with instructions that reads Mark All Boxes That Apply and then also notes that you may report more than one group.

When it comes to terminology we tested the current versions of language that include race and origin as concepts with a question that reads what is your race or origin as well as introducing the concepts of race or ethnicity to ask what is your race or ethnicity and also using no categories at all and not including race ethnicity or origin on the design and asking simply which categories describe you. Now I'll hand it over to Mike who's going to talk about the methodological aspects of the NCT.

Michael Bentley: Thanks Nicholas. So first I want to briefly talk about the sample design is many of the sample has included 1.2 million housing units. And here we're explaining the sample design in terms of a map. To ensure the visual depiction of the geographic diversity of the sample at the national level we used estimates from the American Community Survey to put each census tract in the United States into one six sample strata based on the demographics of the track.

Housing units in each of the first five strata that is Middle Eastern or North African American Indian or Alaska native Asian and native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Black or African-American and Hispanic or Latino each of those were significantly over sampled so as to ensure sufficiently diverse sample and adequate representation from a variety of race and ethnic groups.

As we can see the patterns generally reflect what we know about the distributions of these population groups across the country.

Next here we've zoomed this slide in to one of the more diverse areas of the country, the Los Angeles metropolitan area. We can see how the various tracks are allocated by stratum and this shows how this region includes tracks from each of the six different sample strata.

Next Nicholas talked very briefly about the re-interview a bit earlier. The re-interview is a sample of about one in eight respondents from the initial survey who were selected to participate in the re-interview by phone. The intent was to assess the relative accuracy of the different questionnaire designs that were tested in the NCT.

We probed more extensively to the racial and ethnic background of each of the respondents with the ultimate goal of trying to ascertain each respondent's true racial or ethnic identity for comparison to the original survey responses.

Next we just want to briefly cover a few other aspects of the methodology. First for those of you familiar with our 2020 census operational design we are planning to allow responses without a unique ID. We also included this option in the NCT and removed those cases which was about 5% of responses from our analyses. The reason for this is that while the sample is fully balanced in the random assignment of cases to each experimental treatment, non-ID respondents all received the same content with no variation.

Second we made appropriate weighting adjustments to account for the sample design and for non-response. We also performed extensive editing and coding of the race and ethnic responses so that each response could be properly tabulated. And Nicholas is going to talk a little bit more about this in just a

moment. Finally analysis of re-interview responses included those people that were matched between the re-interview and the self-response roster and the overall match rate was about 96%.

Nicholas Jones: Thanks Mike. So we're almost to the results. The last thing we want to talk about before we get into the preliminary results is to briefly describe how responses are coded and tabulated for the separate questions approach and for the combined question approaches based on the current 1997 OMB standards for race and ethnicity. Now this is a particularly important for discussion about the coding and editing of Hispanic responses in the separate questions approach with a separate Hispanic origin question and a separate question on race.

The current standards advise that race and ethnicity are two distinct concepts and therefore Hispanics may be of any race. Thus Hispanic responses that are written or provided to the census race question especially responses of Hispanic or Latino Mexican-American, Peruvian, et cetera, they're all coded as quote some other race rather than classifying them with a particular singular race groups such as making all Mexican-Americans Asian or making all Peruvians black.

With the concept of the combined question approach where a separate Hispanic or Latino category is placed co-equally among the other major response categories with White, Black, Asian American Indian Alaska native Middle Eastern North African native Hawaiian Pacific Islander and some other race if the respondent reports that they are Hispanic by marking the Hispanic checkbox or writing in a term that's classified as Hispanic we classify those responses in the combined question as Hispanic.

If they do not report they're Hispanic or they report one or more quote race categories -- White, Black, Asian, et cetera. then we classify them along with the reported race and determine that they are not of Hispanic origin as they did not report that they were. This is a really important concept to address as it's in line with the approach taken by OMB in the current guidance for a combined question in the 1997 standards.

When using a combined question format both race including multiple responses and ethnicity may be collected through a combined question but the selection of only one category either race or ethnicity in the combined question format is acceptable. This means that if a respondent reports only Hispanic in the combined question that is acceptable.

It also means that if a respondent only reports Black in the combined question that is also acceptable. Of course it's also acceptable for a respondent to report multiple groups such as reporting both Black and Hispanic. So this premise extends to the way in which the 2015 NCT data are collected and presented in the results that we're going to be sharing in a minute.

Previous research including the 2010 alternative questionnaire experiment and/or report on race reporting among Hispanics in the 2010 census by (Rios), Romero and Ramirez found that the vast majority of Hispanics answered the separate question on Hispanic origin. However most Hispanics struggle to answer the separate question on race. In fact many Hispanics either do not answer the separate question on race all together as we found the 13% of Hispanics in the 2010 census did not answer the race question or they repeated what they reported for the Hispanic origin question.

Again in 2010 we found that 30% of Hispanics repeated what they had written in the Hispanic origin question, responses that will be coded in some other

race. In addition some Hispanics also report another category such as White or Black, et cetera, but often as we found with the 2010 AQE research this did not accurately reflect how they self-identified.

Additionally and specifically regarding the combined question for race and ethnicity the 2010 alternative questionnaire experiment research found that Hispanics were able to answer the combined question more easily and a vast majority of Hispanics identified as only Hispanic. The AQE research found that the use of a combined question more accurately reflected self-identity for Hispanics who also reported another category such as white and Hispanic, Black and Hispanic, et cetera.

Michael Bentley: So moving on to what everyone is waiting for first the results by question format. One thing we want to point out is that in all of our analyses in the National Content test where looking at the results for each individual response mode -- paper, telephone and Internet and just so it's clear there was no nonresponse follow-up in the NCT. We know from this test and past research and we're going to see the same thing again in the 2010 census that the demographics of respondents from each mode are different. That's not a bad thing. It's just a function of different people choosing to respond in different ways.

So in the NCT we want to understand for instance if there are differences by question format but also if we are seeing similar differences across the different modes. In the results we're presenting today we are primarily showing the results by question format for Internet respondents. We will however note key findings from the other modes when they are relevant. So we begin with the race and ethnicity distribution by format alone or in combination.

So this means the distribution will add up to more than 100% for each question format. That's because multiracial respondent reporting in more than one category. So it's clear the blue bars are for the separate questions design, the red bars are combined with write-in areas design and the green bars are for combined with detailed checkboxes format.

So the first main takeaway that we want to point out is that the sum of the race frequency is lower in the combined question format than in the separate question format. Further the white frequency is lower in the combined question format. Both of these are in line findings from the 2010 AQE Experiment. Next we want to look at the distribution in a slightly different way. So here we have the non-Hispanic race distribution in the middle and the Hispanic distribution has been split up into three different categories -- Hispanic alone, Hispanic plus some other race and Hispanic plus another major group.

What we want to point out here is that there are differences between the separate and combined question formats for those three Hispanic categories and that's - we believe that's mainly do it's in part due to how Hispanic responses are edited but are - we believe it's mainly due to how Hispanics are able to find a category for themselves in the combined question format.

In a combined format many Hispanic or Latino's just want to tell us that they are Hispanic and nothing else. The non-Hispanic groups have similar levels of reporting regardless of question format particularly non-Hispanic white non-Hispanic black and so on. Again this is consistent with what we learned in the 2010 AQE.

Next we look at for people who reported as Hispanic or Latino what was the race distribution? We note on the right-hand side here that most Hispanics

reported only a Hispanic response in the combined question. This was on the order of about 70% meaning about 70% of Hispanic or Latino respondents only told us that there were Hispanic and nothing else. There are large differences in some of race alone in two or more categories. This may be attributed in part to differences in how Hispanic responses need to be coded as I just mentioned but it's also due to the way the Hispanics answer the separate race question. Namely they are often confused and struggle with how to answer it.

For those that want to just report that they are Hispanic or Latino some are doing so in the some other race write-in field while some will check white but also again say Hispanic in the write-in or tell us that they're Hispanic using one of the other write-in fields.

Another key finding is that there are no differences among the question formats for Hispanics who identify as Blacks or other race categories. This was a concern after the AQE results were released that for example Afro Latinos wouldn't report Black and Hispanic as the same rate with a combined question format. As we can see though that is clearly not the case. Hispanics can easily select which other groups they want to identify with in a combined format.

Moving on to the next key metric that we are looking at for the analysis by question format is a level of item nonresponse. And here I want to note that we examined missing but also in valid responses, invalid meaning they provided something un-code able such as human or Martian or other things we can possibly imagine. Overall nonresponse to the combined question is lower than nonresponse to the separate race question.

Soft edits on the Internet instrument due help nonresponse. So if a respondent online tries to skip a question such as the race or Hispanic origin question we prompt them once to please answer it but we don't force a response. And we find that those soft edits greatly reduce our item nonresponse rates for online responses. Paper questions yielded a higher nonresponse rate for the separate Hispanic origin and race questions on the order of about 8% and 7%.

And in fact those decisions shown on this slide among Hispanic respondents about 27.4% skip the separate race question on paper. And this was about 2% that skipped the separate race question online however that was still significantly higher than normal combined question format.

Next we look at the level of detailed reporting for each major group. So for example out of all people who identified as Asian what percentage provided details such as Chinese or Cambodian? One finding and Nicholas talked a little bit about this in the 2010 QE earlier was that the tested combined question similar to the NCT's combined question with write-in format elicited less detail for Hispanics primarily because the checkboxes were removed. And this is true here too.

As you can see the red bar is lower than the blue bar for the level of Hispanic detailed reporting but the new combined version with checkboxes does seem to help. In fact the combined question with checkboxes elicits the same or more levels of detail than the separate questions format for every major group.

Overall Internet results were consistent with what we observed for paper respondents and also for phone respondents with one exception the combined question with detailed checkboxes format on paper showed lower levels of detail for the American Indian or Alaska native population. We believe this is a function of the detailed American Indian Alaska native checkboxes

representing more broader conceptual categories of American Indian, Alaska native and Central or South American Indian and not more specific groups like Navajo or Blackfeet. We're actually going to come back and talk about this topic in a little more detail later in the presentation.

And lastly we're now bringing some of the re-interview results. We examined the level of consistent reporting. For those who are in a given group based on the re-interview how many identified in the same fashion in the self-response phase? Largely the results were very similar across a different question formats with few differences and that's a good thing. We want all of our census questions to be producing consistent answers from Point A to Point B. We did however see however see significantly lower level of consistency for Hispanic respondents between the separate question format combined - excuse me compared to the combined with checkboxes format.

You may notice that the bars are lower for some of those smaller groups on the right-hand side such as American Indian or native Hawaiian for instance. That is in part due to those smaller population groups often be multiracial. And the more diverse someone is the less likely we can elicit the same response for them every single time. For instance one person who sometimes identifies as both native Hawaiian and white might only think of themselves as white at one point but at another time they just want to report as native Hawaiian.

So in summary the combined question format does appear to elicit higher-quality data on race and ethnicity and this in keeping with the results of the 2010 AQE. In fact none of the results that I talked about were a surprise to us. We saw no changes in the distribution for major groups, decreased some of the race reporting, lower item nonresponse for the combined race and ethnicity question compared to the separate race question, same or higher

level of detailed reporting with one exception on paper for American Indian and Alaska natives that we just talked about and higher overall consistency for Hispanics.

We have made the recommendation to census Director Thompson and executive staff that we used a combined question with detailed checkboxes format for the 2018 end to end census test. As part of our ongoing work with the Office of Management and Budget and our inter-agency working group the Census Bureau and other agencies will be in dialogues with the OMB about these NCT results as well as other data inputs and feedback from the public through the Federal Register notice process ultimately to discuss and develop solutions to recommend to the OMB. Ultimately OMB will decide how to move forward with guidance on question format for race and ethnicity.

Nicholas Jones: Thanks Mike. So next we're going to move on to the preliminary results for the inclusion of a distinct Middle Eastern or North African category. In this case just as a reminder we tested half of the sample with no distinct MENA category in the design and the other half of the sample received question designs that included a distinct Middle Eastern or North African category.

In preparation for the 2015 MCT the Census Bureau determined which groups would be included in the MENA category for the purposes of this test. To do so 15 organizations were identified as they had published classification of the MENA region of the world. The organizations included research centers, universities, nongovernmental organizations and US federal agencies.

What we did is we analyzed those classifications and we determined the countries which were in the majority -- over 50% of the classifications -- and we identified them. Nationalities and ethnicities with origins in these countries were included in the working classification. So for example the working

classification of MENA includes 19 nationalities such as Algerian, Egyptian Iraqi, Iranian, Israeli, Jordanian Moroccan, Qatari, Syrian, et cetera. We talked about this a lot during our spring meeting in the study plan and the designs and the rationale are documented there. Nationalities and ethnic groups were also included where they may not be nationalities but they may be geographic or pan-ethnic terms such as Arab, or Syrian, Chaldean, Kurdish, Middle Eastern, et cetera.

The Census Bureau working classification included ultimately 19 nationalities and 11 ethnicities pan-ethnic terms. In addition as we talked about with our sample design the NCT oversampled populations that may also be considered MENA. And we got a lot of this from feedback from experts' scholar meeting last year and from research and feedback from the public that suggested other nationalities and ethnicities may identify with the MENA category such as Armenian, Djiboutian, Somali, Turkish, et cetera. Again these details are documented in the study plan for the NCT.

In terms of the research design to be coded as Middle Eastern or North African a checkbox or a write-in corresponding to a code included in the MENA working classification had to be provided. Now the response did need to be provided necessarily in they MENA category if one was available to be counted as MENA. If the MENA details were provided in a non-MENA category and the person checked that box then that person was also included in the non-MENA category. So some of the race category was the only exception.

Now the first example here on the left shows a questionnaire design from NCT without a distinct MENA category. A detailed MENA response such as Iraqi or a response such as Egyptian whether they were written in any of the major response category areas would have been coded and tabulated as

MENA. You can see here that the respondent in our hypothetical example checked the box for white and wrote in Iraqi. They also checked the box for Black and wrote in Egyptian. So in this case they would have been tabulated as White, Black and MENA.

The second example on the right shows a question design from the NCT where we did include a distinct MENA category. Again detailed MENA responses where they were written would have been coded and classified as MENA. In this case we have a hypothetical risk example where the respondent checked the box Middle Eastern or North African and provided write-ins of Iraqi and Egyptian. This respondent was coded only as Middle Eastern or North African with the detailed responses of Iraqi or Egyptian. Moving on to the results.

For the preliminary results from(NCT this graphic shows where MENA responses are reported by the presence of a MENA category. As we get started looking at this slide I want to mention a few points. The universe is for people who reported as MENA in the initial self-response. The light orange bars on the left represent question designs that did not have a distinct MENA category and the dark orange bars on the right represent question designs that did include a distinct MENA category.

Additionally we want to note that for the versions without MENA where there's no distinct MENA category present the white category had Lebanese and Egyptian as examples representing the definition currently in the OMB standards where white refers to people with origins in Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. Additionally in the question designs where we included detailed checkboxes Lebanese and Egyptian were detailed checkboxes underneath the category White.

Our takeaways from looking at where respondents reported MENA by the presence of a MENA category show that many people who are MENA used the distinct MENA category when it was available as you can see here close to 80% of those responses. When no MENA category was present the MENA ethnicities were usually reported in the White category as you can see her on the left-side of the screen with about 85% of responses coming in that way. We also found there was not as much use of a some other race category when the MENA category was present.

The next graphic that we show presents the self- response reporting patterns of MENA re-interview respondents again by the presence of a distinct MENA category. In this graphic the universe is for people who reported as MENA in the re-interview and we want to note that on the right-hand side of the slide there are too few people in the missing and invalid category to show the results. The main findings from looking at the self-response reporting patterns of MENA re-interview respondents is the people who identified as MENA were not able to easily indicate that they were only MENA when there was no distinct category present compared to when there was.

Some people identified as MENA in the re-interview did not identify as Middle Eastern or North African in the self-response return anywhere even when there was a distinct MENA category provided. And we're looking into this further. Some of our initial thoughts of this could just be a representation of people not recognizing that the category is available to them but we're trying to understand that further through our analysis.

In summary our preliminary findings show that the use of a distinct Middle Eastern or North African category appears to elicit higher-quality data for people who identify with MENA. People who identify as Middle Eastern or North African use the MENA category when it's available to them and people

who are MENA have trouble identifying as only Middle Eastern or North African when no category is available.

Our preliminary recommendation to Census Director Thompson and to census executive staff for the 2018 end to end census test is to include a dedicated Middle Eastern or North African response category. The Census Bureau is recommending a separate response category for MENA respondents but it will ultimately be up the US Office of Management and Budget to determine if the MENA category will be a minimum reporting category or if that category is distinct from the white category.

As a reminder under the current OMB standards on race and ethnicity MENA responses are aggregated to the white category based on the definition of white as responded - as individuals with origins in Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. OMB is currently conducting a review of these standards. In fact a Federal Register notice was issued last Friday on September 30 with a call for feedback and responses and comments on what OMB is looking into regarding improving data for race and ethnicity.

It will be OMB's decision as to whether or not MENA will become a new minimum reporting category and whether that category will be distinct from the white category. This slide shows an example from the 2015 NCT paper questionnaire where we had a design with Middle Eastern or North African utilizes the major category. Based on our preliminary results from NCT as well as feedback from stakeholders and experts the Census Bureau's recommending using a MENA response category with further testing of this concept in the 2017 census test.

I want to note here that the detailed checkboxes and the examples that are currently shown with the MENA category for 2015 are subject to change

based on future question designs. The results from the 2017 census test we'll be conducting and further MENA cognitive interviews and qualitative expiration slated for this fall and next year will help us to determine the final MENA checkboxes and examples for the 2018 end to end census test.

Building upon the successful NCT research we're going to continue to finesse the design of a new Middle Eastern North African category. On the next slide we have an image which shows the Middle Eastern or North African category that we're going to employ in the 2017 census test. As with the 2015 NCT we utilized a major checkbox with the category named Middle Eastern or North African. We also used six detailed checkboxes followed by a distinct write-in line with three example groups.

What we're exploring year for the 2017 census test are designs that reflect the feedback we received from stakeholders including the inclusion of an Israeli checkbox, the inclusion of Kurdish as an example for other MENA responses as we're anticipating and hopeful that this would represent the broad diversity of the Middle Eastern and North African population.

Our rationale for the approach that you see here for 2017 is to one, list the two largest Middle Eastern Arab nationalities which are Lebanese and Syrian in the United States, to also list the two largest North African Arab nationalities, Egyptian and Moroccan and third to list the two largest non-Arab nationalities within the Middle East and the North African region. Here those boxes represent Iranian and Israeli.

Our rationale extends to the examples as well. And here the examples associated with the write-in response area include the next largest Middle Eastern nationality, the next largest North African nationality as well as an example of a transnational group, these being Iraqi, Algerian and Kurdish.

All the checkboxes and the examples are listed in population size order from largest to smallest. And we feel that this approach will help to address the feedback we received to broaden the diversity and make it clear to respondents of who we're including in the Middle Eastern or North African category.

Finally regarding both instructions and terminology we want to note that we're continuing to evaluate the data from the 2015 NCT and we're going to be developing responses that will help us - we're going to be developing analyses that will help us understand the results and make recommendations later this year. So therefore the preliminary results and recommendations that we have at this point are pending.

Michael Bentley: A few moments ago Nicholas just discussed some of the changes we are looking at for the MENA category in the 2017 census test. We wanted to come back to the topic of detailed reporting among the American Indian or Alaska native population and associated changes to the 2017 design. As we reported earlier overall we find this combined question with detailed checkboxes approach is working well for the Internet mode with detailed AI AN reporting of about 73%. This is similar to or higher than the amount of detailed reporting seen for Internet respondents that saw a combined question with write-in areas design.

In paper data collections however detailed reporting was about 54% with a combined question with detailed checkboxes approach. This was significantly lower than the amount of details reporting seen in paper responses compared to the combined question with write-in response areas version. We do recognize the detailed reporting among the respondents who identify as American Indian or Alaska native was around 70% in the 2010 census. So

most of these levels are comparable however we want to explore the best approaches for collecting detailed AI AN responses on paper so we will be furthering our research refinements with the opportunity of a 2017 census test.

The images on this slide are basic excerpts of the paper designs for the AI AN response categories in the 2015 NCT. On the top we show the combined question with write-in response area of design. On the bottom is a combined question with detailed checkboxes design. The combined with write-in area had detailed reporting of 70% while the combined with checkboxes had detailed reporting of 54%.

We believe this is happening for the detailed checkbox version because American Indian or Alaskan native responses may be checking one or more of the three boxes -- American Indian, Alaska native or central South American Indian but then not providing any further details in the write-in area. Simply checking the box does not count as detailed reporting as it does not tell us anything about that respondent's tribal, village or indigenous identity.

In the first version respondents don't have the option of the checkboxes such as Navajo or Blackfeet so most of those respondents are writing in their detailed tribal information. We did not see this issue online because respondents only saw a write-in field. For the combined with write-in response area design we asked respondents to provide their details in one write-in area that mirrored the paper version of this question. In contrast to the combined with detailed checkboxes version we include three different write-in areas without a checkbox.

We have more flexibility on the Internet versions for space than on paper where we are much - we are constrained by the limits of the size of the paper. For the Internet we made the conscious decision to not have checkboxes for

the Canadian Alaska native or Central South American Indians since our pretesting showed it was easier for these population to identify in the best way. Based on those preliminary results we wanted to ensure we were able to collect the most detailed information for all race and ethnic groups for both modes of data collection.

For the AIAN paper responses we know we needed to address the lower detailed reporting. With the 2017 census test being conducted on tribal lands and with an oversample of this population we knew we had an opportunity to test a different design for American Indians and Alaskan natives in this snippet of the race/ethnicity question for the 2017 form in order to elicit the most detailed data for the American Indian or Alaskan Native population we're testing the use of one write-in box as we did in the 2010 census and other census tests since then. For the other race and ethnic groups we will continue to include check boxes for the six largest groups.

On the Internet we're also going to continue with the successful design as having three separate write-in areas for American Indians, Alaskan Natives and central South American Indians. In conclusion and to simplify our presentation our preliminary recommendations to census director Thompson and executive staff for the 2018 end to end census test are shown here.

We're recommending to use the combined question with detailed check boxes as a design with the question format for the 2018 test to include a dedicated Middle Eastern or north African response category on the question design for race and ethnicity and as previously mentioned our team is continuing to analyze the data regarding instructions and terminology.

We'd like to conclude our presentation here and throughout your discussion we're interested in knowing about your feedback and your comments and also

if you have any specific questions or preliminary findings or – on any of the preliminary findings or recommendations please don't hesitate to ask. We have a lot of time for dialogue and I'll turn it back over to (James) to help us along with Barbara in proceeding through the Q&A.

Man: Barbara I'm going to ask you to lead discussion here.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. Can you hear me now? (Greg)?

(Greg): Yes.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. Committee we have 40 minutes total to ask questions and have a discussion. I think the best way to start would be for committee members to ask any questions they have of census staff. So does any committee member have a question?

Guillermina Jasso: I have – hello?

Barbara Anderson: Yes?

Guillermina Jasso: Yes. I have three issues I'd like to raise with census staff and with my fellow committee members but first I want to say thank you so much to the census staff for this really valuable thorough comprehensive presentation.

Okay. The three points are first I see the argument for listing groups by population size. It makes me uneasy and I wonder what you thought about listing them in alphabetical order. Now, one thing that comes up is that the reader faced with this set of names may not know, may not immediately realize that the ordering is by population size and may think that the ordering is by its importance or something else that I know is not the intent.

So the first issue has to do with the possibility of listing groups alphabetically rather than by population size. The second is about the persons who check the Hispanic box. In the presentation almost everything was worded in terms of Hispanics do this or that, Hispanics report higher or lower, Hispanics choose or don't choose a race, et cetera but I'm not sure that's quite correct because what's really happening is that there are – there's a basic population of persons eligible to check the Hispanic box.

Some will, some won't so the statements that are made in the presentation pertaining to Hispanics are actually about persons who check the Hispanic box, persons who report Hispanic then do this or that or choose or don't choose this or that race. And the third issue has to do with the fact that many persons eligible for the Hispanic label are biracial and this is well known to historians, anthropologists, etc.

In fact some countries may take a very big important feel about this as the (unintelligible). So that means that it's very good to include the category of central of south American Indian but on the other hand there's a process requesting specific (unintelligible) and the reason is that many persons who are eligible for this Hispanic label and eligible for a central or south American box do not know the precise origin. These are things that happened 300 years ago, 400 years ago and the lineages have been lost in some countries, not all. Those are my three questions/comments on which I would appreciate some further discussion. Thank you so much.

Barbara Anderson: So could the Census Bureau experts reply?

(James): Before we do that Jim I'm going to butt in real quickly with two comments. I'm going to ask the committee members who speak to identify themselves

before they start their remarks and number 2, if you're not speaking I'm going to ask everyone to please mute their phones. We're getting a little feedback. Thank you.

Jim Spletzer: Thanks (James).

Barbara Anderson: That was Guillie Jasso from New York University.

Nicholas Jones: Guillie thank you for your comments. This is Nicholas and I wanted to go through each of them. The first comment that you had was about the testing and utilizing the order of population size to the categories versus alphabetizing them. We have seen previous research where the Census Bureau attempted to list the categories alphabetically. In this case the first category would've been American Indian or Alaskan native and we found that a lot of times that it prompted respondents to check the box, thinking that it's asking for them to report that they're American. That was something that we went away from. We've been utilizing the order of population size for the last several decades.

And through this research we haven't seen that this is causing an issue for respondents to identify themselves. Even when they may have a smaller category it's listed further down on the list. This is the importance of where we – with the re-interview as part of our operation both with the NCT and with the 2010 alternative questionnaire experiment research to understand the reporting patterns that we received.

In terms of the language and the way that we described Hispanics are reporting this or Hispanics identified in such a way the reason that we're talking about it from that perspective is that this is all based on self-identification. So from the universe of people who did check the box, that's

people who were considering to be Hispanic and the same way that someone may have checked the box for black, we're saying these are African-American or these are Black respondents.

We can go back and we'll look at finessing some of the ways that we describe the results but it's really important just to communicate that we're basing our understanding of these results on the ways in which people may have self-identified. The reason we're testing different alternatives and different question designs is because we know from previous research that the way that we pose the question or present the category to respondents, particularly Hispanic respondents, has some impact on how they'd self-identify. Again that's the importance of the re-interview for us to understand how those patterns compare given different questionnaire designs.

And finally I want to point back to this following up on both the AQE research and the NCT research that we found that the use of the combined questions relate more accurately to help us understand Hispanics were able to report what they wanted to identify with which is reporting that they're Hispanic and that they also – if they were self identifying<sup>6</sup> with more than one group such as Hispanic and White or Hispanic and Black, that was a more accurate reporting with the use of a combined question rather than through the separate question's design.

There was one final piece that I think that you mentioned regarding the ways in which people may choose to report details. I wanted to comment on that and also note that we're not expecting that everyone will report a detailed option – a detailed response. We want to make sure they understand they have the option to report detailed responses and this is another important part of what we're comparing to see where those results come through with the NCT. Barbara I'll turn it back to you.

Barbara Anderson: This is Barbara. Guillie you can correct me if I'm wrong. I think that the last part of Guillie's question referred to the issue of not allowing a check off of being American Indian, native Alaskan, for being central or South American. I think the concern there was if someone knew they were central or South American native population origin but didn't know what group that they wouldn't know how to – and say and also Hispanic, that they wouldn't know how to indicate that.

Guillermina Jasso: This is Guillie Jasso. Yes Barbara that's correct. In fact I was thinking if I were being given this questionnaire I would've expected to have seen the little phrase. If no – so it says enter for example Mayan, Aztec, Dino, etc. It'd be right after that comma if no.

Man: If no, okay. Part of the reason for this research is to understand how people would self-identify and whether or not they'd provide those key set of responses so we'll make an effort to really clarify the way in which we've understood the results and talk about that as we come to prepare the report on detailed reporting.

Barbara Anderson: Thank you, other questions?

Nicholas Jones: I'm getting a lot of feedback – not feedback but echo on the line. I don't know if you can hear that operator.

Coordinator: It's actually coming from Ms. Anderson's line.

Barbara Anderson: There isn't any noise here. Are there any other committee members with questions?

Dan Atkins: Yes. This is Dan Atkins with the University of Michigan. Can I be – am I being heard?

Barbara Anderson: Yes. Go ahead Dan.

Man: Thank you Dan.

Dan Atkins: So I have two questions, first just to say that I am not an expert by any means on survey methodology or any of the real content. My expertise is more in interface design and technology more general. I'm wondering – I have two questions. The first is to what extent have you done observation of people actually using the online website and have you made – if you've done that have you noticed anything about the layout or structure or usability that influences the results that you've seen or might there be some correspondence?

Barbara Anderson: Thank you. Second question Dan?

Man: Thank you for your question. The answer is yes. Before we do any of our census test, 1 people we really feel (unintelligible) the field. It's a sense of laboratory, qualitative testing, usability testing. We bring real people in from outside to test our instrument. They test it on laptops. We ask them to bring their phone. They'll test on their phone. We sometimes ask them to bring iPad or tablet to make sure that we're thoroughly testing across different devices and different operating systems.

Generally speaking we haven't really seen the race and ethnicity questions where we've seen any issues in the past other than that when people – offhand comments, people have said I'm glad to see Middle Eastern option or I'm glad that Hispanic is within the race categories, comments like that otherwise we

haven't really noticed people having a lot of difficulty figuring out how to answer the question overall online.

Dan Atkins: Okay thank you. But the people that you brought into the laboratory are a reasonable micro chasm of the people who participated in the field trials?

Man: Yes. We try to bring a broad range of demographic groups and different levels of Internet experience. We try to do it at various locations across the country. We try not to – it's not just the D.C. bubble. We try to get a wide breadth of people but it is – there is a limitation to it. It's qualitative testing. We can't thousands and thousands of people when we do this but we try to get a really good mix of people.

Dan Atkins: So my second question is do you have any anecdotal evidence of support the idea that people may be reluctant to answer these questions or answer them at the depth of detail you're requesting out of fear that the government is somehow compiling a database that might be used for future deep rotation or other uses of that would be counter to the interest of the people participating?

Man: I'm sorry. So we're being asked to say our name each time just because this is being recorded and the transcript is going to come out later. Dan.

Dan Atkins: This is Dan Atkins, Dan Atkins at the University of Michigan, sorry.

Nicholas Jones: Thank you Dan. Sorry that was primarily for me so I'd say my name to respond to you. Dan this is Nicholas Jones from Census and I think one of the main takeaways that we've seen from our research in the 2010 AQE work back in the last census as well as with our NCT research and through a lot of the qualitative work that Mike talked about is that respondents when they're given the option of the combined question, not just the fact that it's combined

where all the categories are available to them but that they really thought there was a lot of equality because of design and balance.

(Nicole) expressed in our qualitative research and focus groups that we did with the AQE as well as the qualitative work in the NCT but they liked the design better because they felt like it was giving them an opportunity to present their self-identification. They didn't talk about the separate question design in the same way. They felt like groups were missing or certain groups had favoritism or other groups were being singled out.

Dan Atkins: Okay.

Nicholas Jones: (Unintelligible) you heard a lot of those comments about why are doing it this way, why do you need all of these details about a certain category but not other categories? Now that may be and we have certainly heard over the decades that some people choose not to report their race or ethnicity but what we've seen in the combined question and the designs both in the AQE and the NCT is that the non-response levels are much lower compared to the separate question's design for Hispanic origin and for race.

So I think we can talk about some of that as positives that people are finding it more easy for them to find a place to report and they're answering it like they would another question about their demographic background.

Dan Atkins: And seeing that there's a broad range of people being asked or respond to this, yes that makes sense to me. Yes thank you.

Nicholas Jones: Thanks for your question.

Enrique Lamas: Dan this is Enrique Lamas and one other thing that we try to do is an extensive outreach with trusted voices from all of the local groups in the different ethnic groups. So one of the groups that we're thinking about is MENA and whether there may be some hesitancy in terms of reporting that category. What we do is reach out to all of the Arab-American institute, all of the institutes that are trusted voices within that community in order to assure them that what they report would not be provided to any enforcement agency and we have a clear policy of that at the Census Bureau.

I think that we would reach out both in terms of the questionnaire design and how we approach that way but also in terms of the outreach and the ability for us to reach into the communities and have them talk to their members in that community.

Dan Atkins: Thank you. Thank you.

Barbara Anderson: Any other committee member questions? If not I think we should go to the discussion and the development of recommendations. Hello?

Nicholas Jones: Thank you Barbara. We can hear you loud and clear so we're here at Census listening to your discussion. Thank you.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. Then can you open up all the committee member's microphones?

Dan Atkins: This is Dan Atkins. I would – in our recommendations I'd like to underscore what others of the committee had said that we're extremely appreciative for the detailed presentation. It was done very efficiently and obviously a lot of preparation went into it. So I think that we should commend the Bureau for what they've done for our group.

Barbara Anderson: Can you give me control so that I can put the Word document up so that we can work on it as a committee?

Nicholas Jones: Yes Barbara. This is Nicholas. We're working to turn it over to you as we speak and we'll wait here to make sure that you have the connection. It'll just be one minute here Barbara.

Barbara Anderson: Committee members we tested this yesterday and it worked. We're trying to get to what we did at the CSAC meeting where you can see what I'm writing and you can tell me where I got it wrong.

Bob Hummer: Can anybody hear me? This is Bob. I have a question.

Barbara Anderson: Yes.

Nicholas Jones: Hello Bob.

Barbara Anderson: Bob go ahead.

Bob Hummer: Okay. I was in the queue and it wouldn't work so – anyway back to the ordering issue. First I really appreciate the presentation Nicholas and Mike. It was fantastic. Guillie asked a question about ordering. I've asked this question in various ways in past CSAC committee meetings but let me pose a scenario here.

So Nicholas the response I think was that we looked at this in the past and if you order by population size, American Indian comes first and that people check that thinking they're thinking they're American and so forth. That gets too many – I understand that.

We've also trained people over the years that there's no MENA category and Hispanic is a separate question and not part of the race question so I worry that in this combined check box format which I think is really the way to go but if MENA is listed – I think as the sixth category down, Hispanic is the second, but we've trained people not to – that those categories won't be in there if the ordering is as it exists and White is first. What will be checked?

People will move on and never get to the MENA or Hispanic possibilities. Okay long story short, I think it'd be very useful given the addition – potential addition of these two categories in this new format to do a test of ordering and to see if it does or doesn't make a difference given how these changes are being made.

Nicholas Jones: Bob this is Nicholas and Mike and I both may have a couple things to say here. First we just want to say thank you for your comment on that and we recognize that this has been something that we have discussed before, particularly the alphabetical ordering but we've also received questions about the ordering based on perhaps a reverse population size list.

So we're thinking about that and we also just want to point out that with the NCT as well with the AQE research one of the important aspects of this research design was that we included the re-interview. What the re-interview enables us to do is to understand what people are identifying with when we specifically ask them about each of the individual major categories. While on the initial self-response perhaps someone didn't see the box for Middle Eastern or North African or perhaps the box for Hispanic or a box for Asian, etc.

We're going back through a series of probing questions in the re-interview design to ask them to report affirmatively or to not identify with by saying no

each of those major category groups. We're asking the respondent are you white, are you Hispanic, are you black, are you Asian, et cetera all the way through the list. And then part of our research that we presented today and that we'll further go into details as we like to report are that with the combined question approach we got more consistent reporting.

We got more consistent reporting also among multi-racial and multi-ethnic respondents. Then we did with a separate questions approach and we're also finding that people while they may identify with certain detailed groups in a certain way when we have a Middle Eastern category or not, as we showed on wonder graphics – with the MENA categories included we found that we have upwards of 70 and 80% using that category who are MENA through the re-interview.

So we feel like it's working and we're seeing that through the evidence of the empirical research here. We also recognize that there's a need when questions are finalized for the census to include our partnership efforts as Enrique spoke to ensure that people do understand the option to choose among any and all these groups that are represented. We expect that that will also be the case from MENA communities and other communities like Enrique talked about where they will be working with our communities to understand their options.

We take all of that into very, very important consideration as we think about the usefulness of these designs and the newness of the designs and we want to make sure that people understand what they have as options in order for them to make their own self determination as to how they'd identify.

Mike Bentley: This is Mike Bentley. Again thanks again for your comment and question. We greatly appreciate it and I just want to say we've actually heard similar feedback like that from a couple other avenues recently. We're definitely

taking it under very careful consideration to look closer at the ordering of the categories and for possible future testing.

Bob Hummer: Thank you both. Thank you. That's great and I look forward to future tests if you do them. I think that'd be a good avenue. I've got to go teach so I'm done. Thank you. Thank you all.

Man: Thanks Bob.

Barbara Anderson: Thank you. Can you all see my Word document?

Nicholas Jones: Yes we can Barbara. This is Nicholas. As you're typing we can see it here and that means that everyone online should also be able to see what you're writing.

Barbara Anderson: That's great the (unintelligible) here. Committee members, say if you think what I've written is wrong or such and any other – this can be a combination of questions to Census and the valid recommendations since we only have 3:40 to finalize our recommendations. We're a speedy committee. Any other comment or – m

Dan Atkins: Sorry, this is Dan. I don't know how to see – I was just looking at the PDFs of what Barbara sent. Is there another link we should be opening up to see what you're typing?

Nicholas Jones: I think it was in the meeting invite (unintelligible).

Dan Atkins: Okay. I'll look for it.

Barbara Anderson: What I wrote so far, what I drafted as the first recommendation is CSAC appreciates the careful research and the report that we received today. The second one is Census should continue to investigate the effective ordering of response categories. Does that sound okay?

Dan Atkins: Yes definitely.

Andrew Samwick: Hello Barbara. It's Andrew. Just the next item I'd put on there, maybe putting it was number 2 would be if it's true that the members of CSAC that are on the call generally concur with the results of the test to use the combined question with detailed check boxes. That seems to be what we were – that seemed to be the major part of the test and I think they're converging on that as the framework going forward. So I think we should affirm support for that.

Barbara Anderson: I agree. I'm writing it right now.

Guillermina Jasso: This is Guillie Jasso. Can you hear me?

Barbara Anderson: Yes.

Guillermina Jasso: Okay. I just wanted to follow up very quickly and possibly suggest just one word to the recommendation about continuing to explore ordering and that one word is to explore also randomized ordering which is extremely easy to do with the online versions.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. So I changed to - the Census should continue to investigate the effect of ordering and closing including randomized ordering of response categories and for the third recommendation I drafted CSAC supports success of bill recommendation that the combined race/ethnicity question with check boxes be used. Okay?

Guillermina Jasso: Perfect.

Dan Atkins: Guillie this is Dan. I got interrupted by someone at the door when you were speaking earlier but were you not advocating consideration of alphabetical ordering and is random better or – could you just repeat the essence of what you said earlier about order?

Guillermina Jasso: Sure. It's not advocating. It's suggesting exploring two things, alphabetical and randomized.

Dan Atkins: Okay both, yes all right.

Guillermina Jasso: And by the way one of my concerns has to do with the new MENA category. I'm uneasy about some things that – some sentiments that can be awakened shall we say from looking at the ordering based on population size.

Barbara Anderson: I changed to – Dan I don't know if you can see the thing yet. Census should –

Dan Atkins: I'm on the WebEx now. Thank you. Yes, I am seeing it now, yes.

Barbara Anderson: Including alphabetical and randomized ordering of response categories? Is that okay with people now?

Guillermina Jasso: Perfect.

Dan Atkins: Yes.

Barbara Anderson: Do we want to support the Census Bureau recommendation that there should be included a MENA response category? It seems to be from the research that including it gives better results if you think of having people identify that way as being able to indicate than not including it. What do people think?

Dan Atkins: Would you repeat what the it is? I missed the first part of your sentence.

Barbara Anderson: Category.

Dan Atkins: Okay.

Guillermina Jasso: This is Guillie Jasso. Let me just jump in here and say that the things that I'm more and more doing routinely is comparing these Census categories to the ones in (unintelligible) software and MENA is one of them. It's one of the major categories for example in the (unintelligible) composition in 23 and Me.

Barbara Anderson: What's your conclusion, that it's a good idea to include it or not?

Guillermina Jasso: Yes.

Barbara Anderson: So if we agree on this, slide 32 of the presentation was a (unintelligible) recommendation that there'd be included dedicated response category of MENA. So do we support inclusion of a dedicated response MENA category?

Man: Hello, (unintelligible) for the experts on that.

Andrew Samwick: Hello this is Andrew. I agree with Dan. I don't object to it but I would want the folks who have more direct experience like Guillie to (unintelligible). So it sounds like we should base on our small discussion here.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. What I wrote is CSAC supports the inclusion of a detailed response category MENA, okay?

Guillermina Jasso: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. Are there any other thoughts? The Census presentation which I thought was quite good said that they were continuing to investigate how they should phrase this, let's say what race or ethnicities do you identify with or race or just say what categories do you consider yourself a member of and they're doing more research but does anyone have any thoughts that they'd like communicated from us to the Census Bureau on this topic?

Guillermina Jasso: This is Guillie Jasso. One thought and I'm not sure myself, okay? Presumably the data from the content test include country of birth for foreign born. It seems to be that we –

Nicholas Jones: Guillie – I'm sorry. This is Nicholas. I do not – so this is only the testing for the Census. We're not asking about country of origin or place of birth.

Barbara Anderson: You have to go to ACS for that.

Guillermina Jasso: Okay, all right. That's too bad because what I was going to suggest was analyze everything by country of birth. So for example take everybody who says that they're born in Nicaragua and then see the proportion who check off Hispanic in the race category, et cetera. If you don't have the data you can't do it.

Barbara Anderson: Based in category to be tried in ACS, that's the way one could do that.

Guillermina Jasso: Yes, exactly. Absolutely.

Barbara Anderson: But that'd be too late to be useful in this round.

Guillermina Jasso: Right.

Barbara Anderson: Okay, any other recommendations? We're doing well on time folks.  
You're a great committee, any other recommendations or comments to the Census Bureau? I think we could say that we support the ongoing efforts to analyze the effects of differences in wording in the introduction and terminology. Is that okay?

Guillermina Jasso: It's excellent. Yes.

Man: Yes.

Barbara Anderson: I'll fix my typos. Is that okay?

Guillermina Jasso: Yes.

Barbara Anderson: To say (unintelligible) research (unintelligible).

Man: Yes, fine.

Barbara Anderson: Is there anything else we need to recommend or comment on or are we happy or what?

Dan Atkins: This is Dan. I have nothing further to suggest.

Barbara Anderson: Guillie do you have anything else?

Guillermina Jasso: No. It looks terrific.

Man: Yes I agree, nothing else here.

Barbara Anderson: Anyone else? Kathy are you there?

Kathryn Petit: Yes I'm here. No, I don't have anything else to add.

Barbara Anderson: Okay, anyone else? I don't know who I missed. I didn't take notes. Then we are – nothing is not efficient.

Kathryn Petit: Wait. Can we – this is Kathy. I just – Allison just sent a note that she's having trouble getting heard.

Barbara Anderson: Allison are you there?

Man: Hello?

Kathryn Petit: Allison did you use the – I'll resend the – she might've called in on the general line. Maybe that was – I could just have her email it to me.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. We have four minutes. If you can do that, that'd be great.

Nicholas Jones: We have a few more minutes Barbara while we're waiting for you. This is Nicholas again. I just wanted to remind everyone who's listening online today that today's webinar virtual meeting is being recorded and the Census Bureau will provide a recording of the webinar and the discussion on the Census

Scientific Advisory website. We're hopeful that that will be up online next week so for people who aren't able to join in live today or who want to go back and listen to the deliberations, that webinar recording will be made available sometime next week.

Allison Plyer: Hello?

Barbara Anderson: Is this Allison? Is this Allison or Kathy?

Kathryn Petit: That sounded like Allison.

Allison Plyer: Hello? Can anyone hear me?

Barbara Anderson: Go ahead Allison. Say whatever you want to say.

Allison Plyer: Thanks. Sorry. I couldn't connect with you just now. I was interested in the test coming up of the American Indian and Alaskan native and building on what Guillie was saying. I wondered if the Census has considered renaming that something like indigenous or Native American or any other category. I can envision that a Central American indigenous wouldn't immediately recognize themselves there as the way the test is described. And if it were not American Indian and it'd be alphabetical ordering would that be a problem?

Barbara Anderson: I thought that was an OMB issue. I thought that was also why some of the examples were essential in top American groups. Is that right Nicholas or not?

Nicholas Jones: Yes Barbara, that's correct. So the wording for the current category is American Indian or Alaskan native. There was research done in the 1990s in discussion about whether that category name should be changed to something

else, perhaps Native American and the recommendation from OMB and the interagency was to use the terminology American Indian or Alaskan native.

The standards also specify that this category includes Central and South American Indians and that's why we utilized the examples and that conceptual concept for this particular category.

Allison Plyer: Right. And so as Guillie was saying if someone from Central America doesn't know that they're Mayan or Aztec and the category name doesn't include Central American Indian they may not be able to recognize themselves there.

Nicholas Jones: And that's part of what we're testing and trying to understand both with the self-response and the categories that are presented and with the re-interview to try and understand whether people may report something else as something different.

Barbara Anderson: I'm drafting a recommendation based on what you said Allison.

Allison Plyer: Yes, (unintelligible) continued research on wording, yes. That's great, thank you.

Guillermina Jasso: Yes that's terrific. This is Guillie. That's terrific and I'm just looking at the (unintelligible) website on 23 and Me. The way they handle it is they have a category Native American and then they say – they say underneath this is Native people of the Americas who populated North, Central and South America.

Barbara Anderson: Right. So Native American might be a category that's worth considering and it – the great research you guys did in the 90s and it's interesting how these category terms shift. I was considering it again.

What I drafted was CSAC supports continued research on the wording for the AIAN category especially to make clear to those of Central and South America Indian origin that they are included in this category.

Allison Plyer: Perfect.

Barbara Anderson: Great. That's great, thank you. Is that okay?

Guillermina Jasso: It's perfect.

Barbara Anderson: I think we've completed our recommendations. I will present them in the presentation part but do I email this to (Sarah) or what?

Jim Spletzer: Barbara I'm going to jump in here. This is Jim, Acting DFO for CSAC and it's 3:40 and it's now time for public comment. The participants attending virtually, the floor is now open. Please state your name and affiliation clearly. For public comments in person in conference room 1 here we will ask you to raise your hand and speak. I remind everyone before making your comment please state your name and affiliation clearly. Will the operator please open the lines for any comment?

Coordinator: At this time if you'd like to make a public comment over the phone line please press star 1. Please un-mute your phone and record your first and last name clearly when prompted your name is required to introduce your comment. To withdraw your comment you may press star 2. Once again at this time if you'd like to make a public comment please press star 1.

Jim Spletzer: Okay well we received no public comment like that stated. Barbara I'm going to turn it back to you to – I believe Juan Pablo wants to speak and then you can proceed to present the recommendations.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. Juan Pablo?

Juan Pablo: Yes. Can you hear me now?

Barbara Anderson: Yes.

Juan Pablo: All right finally, excellent. Yes, I wanted – I think everyone's comments were fantastic and actually a couple of you stole my questions earlier. So thanks everyone for what you said. I want to bring up something that Dan mentioned earlier, the evaluation of this question through electronic means. I think it's great that there's been usability testing that's been part of the process and I wanted to add another recommendation of continuing that process of usability testing and especially being very aware of any changes that might happen if we had more in-directivity to the questions.

For example selecting one answer then leads to different options depending on what you first select. I think if there's any such electronic implementation it'd be very important to evaluate that but generally continued evaluation of electronic means of answering the question.

Andrew Samwick: This is Andrew and I'd support that recommendation as well.

Guillermina Jasso: Me too.

Barbara Anderson: Okay, that's it. Time I'm doing it. What I added was CSAC recommends continued feasibility testing of electronic responses especially as more interactive aspects might be added.

Juan Pablo: I'd change feasibility to usability.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. I'll use usability. Thank you. What a good group.

Nicholas Jones: Barbara this is Nicholas again. I just wanted to make a quick comment on the topic that we just brought up with topic 6 here in the recommendations. And that's just to note that in the previous designs for 2010 or the 2000 census, we didn't include examples or any references in the American Indian or Alaskan native category to the collection of data for Central or South American Indians.

One of the aspects in the design features of the NCT was to try to make it clear to people of Central or South American Indian origin, that they were included in this category and so that's where with the NCT we included the examples of Mayan and Aztec and also the testing of the dedicated check box Central or South American Indian.

In addition the research was conducted in Spanish and we did a lot of other qualitative work to determine the ways in which we can operationalize that. Part of that was to include the terminology in ((Foreign Language)) to fully represent North, Central and South America. A lot of that thought went into trying to find ways that we'd help respondents recognize that Central and South American Indian is part of the definition American Indian or Alaskan native and that's where we're looking at for the results of this test.

Barbara Anderson: I think a big improvement over 2010 but I think I was saying here we're supporting continued research. Is that okay?

Nicholas Jones: That's fine. I just want to also note where we came from to where we are today.

Barbara Anderson: Well committee members, should we make some acknowledgement in this on what they've done already on this?

Guillermina Jasso: Yes. I think that's a good idea.

Barbara Anderson: Okay let me just add some stuff, recognize this. I'm almost done. Okay. I added a sentence at the beginning of recommendation 6, that CSAC recognizes improvements in the AIAN category to encourage those of Central of South American Indian origin to respond to in the AIAN category, and then I kept CSAC support continued research. Is that all right with everybody?

Guillermina Jasso: Yes.

Barbara Anderson: Hello. Is that all right with everybody?

Dan Atkins: Yes.

Man: Yes, okay with Dan.

Barbara Anderson: Okay. Nicholas I think that gives fuller fair recognition of what you all have been doing.

Nicholas Jones: No, thank you very much Barbara. We appreciate that and just wanted to –

Barbara Anderson: You were completely correct. You've been doing this stuff in making it better and we're trying to help you make it even better.

Nicholas Jones: We greatly appreciate that. Thank you.

Barbara Anderson: Great (unintelligible) pretty good. We have seven recommendations. Are we done today committee members?

Guillermina Jasso: Yes and seven is a magic number.

Barbara Anderson: It certainly is. I think we're done with this so then after the meeting do I email this to (Sarah)?

(Sarah): Hello Barbara. You may do that and go ahead and email that to me.

Barbara Anderson: Email it to (Sarah). And I also wanted to say we really – I think on the behalf of the committee I don't think anyone is going to scream they disagree. We really appreciate all the hard work the Census has done. We are eagerly awaiting the results. I think the results are overall fantastic and we shaded the infirmities in clear presentation and we said just a few things to try to help make what's really great even better so thank you, thank you so much.

Nicholas Jones: Thank you very much for the encouragement. We have much more work ahead of us as you can imagine but this has really been important for us to get to this point and we greatly appreciate your support and your feedback.

Jim Spletzer: As our Acting DFO for CSAC it's now time to close the meeting. I want to thank everyone for such an engaging meeting. Your comments and perspectives were beneficial and useful as Nicholas just said. Meeting recordings will be posted to the Census Advisory Committee website and

before adjourning I'd like to thank all of you for your participation today, both virtually and in person here. I also think the Census Bureau Director and the Deputy Director (unintelligible) who is here, the advisory committee team for their work, the conference management office, our presenters Nicholas and Mike, the subject matter experts and all the supporting Census offices. Barbara, thank you very much. This was enjoyable and we are now adjourned.

Coordinator: Thank you for participating in today's conference. All lines may disconnect at this time.

END