AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE CENSUS BUREAU'S PROPOSED AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY [ACS]

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 13, 2001

Serial No. 107–9

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/congress/house
http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

75–326 PDF WASHINGTON : 2001

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

DAN BURTON, Indiana, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland
CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
STEPHEN HORN, California
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
THOMAS M. DAVIS, Virginia
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
BOB BARR, Georgia
DAN MILLER, Florida
DOUG OSE, California
RON LEWIS, Kentucky
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
DAVE WELDON, Florida
CHRIS CANNON, Utah
ADAM H. PUTNAM, Florida
C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER, Idaho
EDWARD L. SCHROCK, Virginia

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, Washington, DC
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
JIM TURNER, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY, Illinois
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

KEVIN BINGER, *Staff Director*
DANIEL R. MOLL, *Deputy Staff Director*
JAMES C. WILSON, *Chief Counsel*
ROBERT A. BRIGGS, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL SCHILIRO, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

DAN MILLER, Florida, *Chairman*

CHRIS CANNON, Utah
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
BOB BARR, Georgia

WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois

EX OFFICIO

DAN BURTON, Indiana

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

JANE COBB, *Staff Director*
ERIN YEATMAN, *Professional Staff Member*
DAN WRAY, *Clerk*
DAVID MCMILLEN, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on June 13, 2001	1
Statement of:	
Barron, William, Acting Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census, accompanied by Dr. Nancy Gordon, U.S. Bureau of the Census	7
Voss, Paul, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Linda Gage, California State Census Data Center, California Department of Finance; Donald Hernandez, Population Association of America, Department of Sociology, SUNY-Albany; and Marilyn McMillen, Chief Statistician, Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education	41
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Barron, William, Acting Director, U.S. Bureau of the Census, prepared statement of	11
Clay, Hon. Wm. Lacy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri, prepared statement of	36
Gage, Linda, California State Census Data Center, California Department of Finance, prepared statement of	52
Hernandez, Donald, Population Association of America, Department of Sociology, SUNY-Albany, prepared statement of	61
McMillen, Marilyn, Chief Statistician, Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, prepared statement of	70
Miller, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida, prepared statement of	4
Voss, Paul, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, prepared statement of	43

THE CENSUS BUREAU'S PROPOSED AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY [ACS]

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 2001

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2 p.m., in room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dan Miller (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Miller, Cannon, Barr, Clay, and Maloney.

Staff present: Jane Cobb, staff director; Chip Walker, deputy staff director; Michael Miguel, senior data analyst; Erin Yeatman and Andrew Kavaliunas, professional staff members; Daniel Wray, clerk; Tim Small, intern; David McMillen, minority professional staff member; and Teresa Coufal, minority staff assistant.

Mr. MILLER. Good afternoon. The subcommittee will come to order.

We will proceed with my opening statement. Mr. Clay is on his way. If he does not come, then we will start with a video and then at some stage allow Mr. Clay to have his opening statement. And I apologize if I get beeped or such; I am in the process of a markup in the Appropriations Committee just upstairs, so I just run upstairs and run right back. So I apologize in advance. The markup was scheduled after this hearing and we could not change things.

Our census 2000 was a tremendous success. Because of the hard work and dedication of thousands of Census Bureau employees around the country, census 2000 was able to reach more of America's population and the traditionally undercounted than ever before, and is the most accurate census in our Nation's history. The hard work of thousands of census employees and the dedication of thousands of community volunteers nationwide made census 2000 a success.

As we leave last year's census behind us, it is time to begin planning for our next decennial census in 2010. One of the means by which the Census Bureau has proposed to improve the 2010 census is by implementing the American Community Survey [ACS] as a replacement for the decennial census long form. The American Community Survey, if funded by Congress, will allow for the Census Bureau to conduct a much simpler and more accurate census. Without the long form, the much talked about post card census may be closer to reality. Not only will it be easier for the Census Bureau to conduct, but it will also be easier and less burdensome

for the American people to respond. A higher response rate will decrease the need for costly followup field work and significantly reduce the overall cost of the decennial census operations.

The other major advantage of the American Community Survey is its ability to provide up to date and timely social, economic, demographic, and housing data that tells us who we are as a Nation. If and when fully implemented, the American Community Survey will be distributed continuously to 250,000 housing units per month and 30 million housing units over a 10 year period. Information collected by the survey will become available as early as 1 year after it is collected. It will continuously provide annual data in place of that which is now available only once every decade. This will allow our Nation's data users, community leaders, and policymakers to use much more current information as the basis for the decisions they will make that will affect all of us.

While full implementation of the American Community Survey has its definite advantages over the continued use of the census long form, there are some concerns with the survey that must be addressed. I hope we can get many of these issues into the record today so that the Bureau can respond and give Congress the assurances we need to go forward with confidence.

One of the issues is cost. Based on the Census Bureau's budget estimates for fiscal year 2003, the year in which the full implementation of the American Community Survey is proposed, the survey will not be cheap. The American Community Survey is projected to cost some $130 million in that fiscal year. I would like to explore what goes into this estimate and whether we can expect this figure to change significantly over the decade.

We must also examine the content of the American Community Survey questionnaire. The American Community Survey questionnaire currently being tested asks 69 questions. The census 2000 long form only asks 53. By what means will the questions be added or subtracted from the American Community Survey questionnaire? I believe that without the establishment of a predetermined and definitive process by which to alter the American Community Survey questionnaire, the survey has the potential to become a much more intrusive survey than the long form is or ever was. This will not be acceptable.

I would also like to explore whether the American Community Survey will generate the privacy concerns voiced over the long form. Many of my colleagues' offices here on Capital Hill have received calls from their constituents wondering just what the American Community Survey is and why they have to answer it when they just received and answered their census forms last year. If responding to the American Community Survey is deemed mandatory, as is the decennial census, will the privacy concerns and people's reluctance to answer the long form simply be redirected at the American Community Survey? And should the American Community Survey be a mandatory survey like the census? What are the implications if it were voluntary? Are we sure that the American Community Survey will not duplicate other current, ongoing survey work?

Ultimately, we must answer these and other questions in order to determine whether the American Community Survey is the best

means by which to collect the demographic information required for implementing our Federal programs and informing public policy decisions.

It was a little less than a year ago that we began the process of looking forward to our next decennial census by holding our first hearing on the American Community Survey. In the time that has passed since then, however, many questions remain. This afternoon we meet again to examine the American Community Survey to try to answer some of the questions and to determine whether the American Community Survey is the proper means by which to replace the decennial census long form and collect the demographic, social, economic, and housing information that our Nation's data users and policymakers need to aid their decisionmaking.

With us this afternoon is the Acting Director of the Census Bureau, Bill Barron, and data users from across the Nation and our Federal Government. Thank you all for being here today and I look forward to your testimony.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Dan Miller follows:]

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Honorable Dan Miller, Chairman

H1-114 O'Neill House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515

For More Information
202-226-1973

STATEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN
JUNE 13, 2001 HEARING
OVERSIGHT OF THE CENSUS BUREAU'S PROPOSED AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY (ACS)

Good afternoon. Our 2000 census was a tremendous success. Because of the hard work and dedication of thousands of Census Bureau employees around the country, Census 2000 was able to reach more of America's population and the traditionally undercounted than ever before and is the most accurate census in our nation's history. The hard work of thousands of census employees and the dedication of thousands of community volunteers nationwide made Census 2000 a success. As we leave last year's census behind us, it is time to begin planning our next decennial census in 2010.

One of the means by which the Census Bureau has proposed to improve the 2010 census is by implementing the American Community Survey (ACS) as a replacement for the decennial census long form.

The ACS, if funded by Congress, will allow for the Census Bureau to conduct a much simpler and more accurate census. Without the long form, the much talked about "postcard census" may be closer to reality. Not only will it be easier for the Census Bureau to conduct, but it will also be easier and less burdensome for the American people to respond. A higher response rate will decrease the need for costly follow-up field work and significantly reduce the overall costs of decennial census operations.

The other major advantage of the ACS is its ability to provide up-to-date and timely social, economic, demographic, and housing data that tells us who we are as a nation. If and when fully implemented, the ACS will be distributed continuously to 250,000 housing units per month, and 30 million housing units over a ten-year period. The information collected by the survey will become available as early as one year after it is collected and will continuously provide annual data in place of that which is now available only once every decade. This will allow our nation's data users, community leaders and policy makers to use much more current information as the basis for the decisions they will make that will affect us all.

While full implementation of the ACS has its definite advantages over the continued use of the census long form, there are some concerns with the survey that must be addressed. I hope we can get many of these issues into the record today so that the Bureau can respond and give Congress the assurances we may need in order to go forward with confidence.

One of the issues is cost. Based on the Census Bureau's budget estimates for FY03, the year in which full implementation of the ACS is proposed, the survey will not be cheap: the ACS is projected to cost some $130 million dollars in that fiscal year. I'd like to explore what goes into this estimate and whether we can expect this figure to change significantly over the decade.

We must also examine the content of the ACS questionnaire. The ACS questionnaire currently being tested asks 69 questions; the Census 2000 long form only asked 53. By what means will questions be added or subtracted from the ACS questionnaire? I believe that without the establishment of a predetermined and definitive process by which to alter the ACS questionnaire, the survey has the potential to become a much more intrusive survey than the long form is or ever was. This will not be acceptable.

I would also like to explore whether the ACS will generate the privacy concerns voiced over the long form. Many of my colleague's offices here on Capital Hill have received calls from their constituents wondering just what the ACS is and why they have to answer it when they just received and answered their census forms last year. If responding to the ACS is deemed mandatory, as is the decennial census, will the privacy concerns and people's reluctance to answer the long form simply be redirected at the ACS?

And should the ACS be a mandatory survey like the census? What are the implications if it were voluntary?

Are we sure that the ACS will not duplicate other current ongoing survey work?

Ultimately, we must answer these and other questions in order to determine whether the ACS is the best means by which to collect the demographic information required for implementing our federal programs and informing public policy decisions.

It was a little less than a year ago that we first began the process of looking forward to our next decennial census by holding our first hearing on the ACS. In the time that has passed since then, however, many questions remain. This afternoon we meet again to examine the ACS to try to answer some of these questions and to determine whether the ACS is the proper means by which to replace the decennial census long form and collect the demographic, social, economic, and housing information that our nation's data users and policy makers need to aid their decision making.

With us this afternoon is the Acting Director of the Census Bureau, Bill Barron, and data users from across the nation and our Federal government. I thank you all for being here today, and look forward to your testimony.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Cannon, do you have an opening statement?

Mr. CANNON. No, thank you.

Mr. MILLER. As I say, I think we will go ahead and proceed. When we get a break we will ask if any of the other Members have opening statements. I think we have a video first, so we will go ahead and proceed with the video.

[Video presentation.]

Mr. CANNON [assuming Chair]. Thank you all. I will be taking over a bit for the chairman who is, as I understand, going in and out of an appropriations markup of some sort.

I would like to welcome our first panel and our first witness, Mr. William Barron. Mr. Barron is currently serving as the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Census. Prior to January of this year he was the Deputy Director and Chief Operating Officer of the Bureau. Before being called to the Census Bureau, Bill served for almost 30 years at the Bureau of Labor of Statistics, working his way up from a management intern through the various positions to serve as Deputy Commissioner for the last 15 years of his tenure there. Mr. Barron has received numerous awards and honors for distinguished and meritorious career civil service. He is known and respected by his peers for his professionalism and integrity. And I have had the pleasure of learning these qualities first-hand.

Bill, thanks for being here today. As is customary, would you please stand and let me swear you in.

Mr. BARRON. If I may, Mr. Cannon, I would like to introduce my colleague, Dr. Nancy Gordon, who is in charge of our demographic work. She will be appearing with me today.

Mr. CANNON. Would you mind standing also and taking the oath.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. CANNON. Let the record reflect that Mr. Barron and Dr. Gordon answered in the affirmative.

On behalf of the subcommittee, we welcome you here today. Mr. Barron, if you would like to begin with your opening statement, you will have 10 minutes.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM BARRON, ACTING DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. NANCY GORDON, U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Mr. BARRON. Thank you very much, Mr. Cannon. I have a lengthier statement I would like to submit for the record and just make some summary remarks if I may.

It is a pleasure to appear before you again, Mr. Cannon, and to testify at this the second hearing that this subcommittee has held on the American Community Survey. The subcommittee's leadership in providing a public forum for discussion of the American Community Survey is very important and it is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Cannon, the American Community Survey is one of three key components of the Census Bureau's strategy for re-engineering the 2010 census. If the Census Bureau has adequate resources early to pursue this strategy, we can buildupon the success of census 2000 and take advantage of lessons learned. Thus, we can reduce the operational risks for the 2010 census, explore ways to further reduce the undercount and improve accuracy, and provide

more relevant and timely data throughout the decade, as well as ways to contain costs.

While our strategic plan for the 2010 census is still under development, we have identified what we believe are three main components: The first, improving the accuracy of our geographic data base and our master address file; second, eliminating the long form from the 2010 census by collecting those data in the American Community Survey; and finally, re-engineering the census process through early planning.

Mr. Chairman, in your opening remarks at last July's hearing on the American Community Survey, you said: "Today we are here to begin the process of eliminating the problematic census long form." Mr. Chairman, the process of eliminating the census long form is now well underway. The American Community Survey will simplify the 2010 census requirements and allow the Census Bureau to focus exclusively on the constitutional mandate for a basic count of the population. It will provide more current and more frequent detailed data for small geographic areas, and it will allow the Federal statistical system to keep pace with ever-increasing demands for timely and relevant data. The ACS will allow businesses, Federal policymakers, State, and local, and tribal governments to make decisions using more current and accurate data, and it will improve the distribution of Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, in your letter of invitation you asked that I address the issue of costs. Our initial estimates of life-cycle costs demonstrate cost neutrality when we compare the estimated cost of repeating census 2000 to the estimated cost of a re-engineered 2010 census, including an American Community Survey, a geographic system modernization, and early planning. Mr. Chairman, to achieve cost neutrality, and with further potential for cost savings, while also providing a rich new source of local area and national data on an ongoing basis throughout the decade, is a notable and remarkable achievement. I do not believe it is an overstatement, Mr. Chairman, to say that this is one of the most important developments in the modern history of the Federal statistical system.

Our goal in designing the American Community Survey was to produce data comparable in quality to the decennial census long form for the smallest areas such as a census tract. One decision we had to make was how many years should go into the moving averages that would replace the long form estimate. We have decided on a 5-year average for the American Community Survey that will give more timely data throughout the entire decade, and will give much better information about change over time than a once-a-decade measurement could.

Another decision is to determine how much sample is needed each year so that the 5-year averages would have a sample size to provide data of sufficient quality. We have chosen a sample size of 3 million because that will meet our goal of producing data based on 5-year averages comparable in quality to the census long form data.

The fact that the American Community Survey sample size and design will not provide data for the smallest areas until 2008 has led some to raise the concern that the American Community Survey may be treating rural areas and urban census tracts unfairly.

The Census Bureau takes this concern very seriously. Indeed, we wish it were possible to begin by providing small areas with high quality, current data right away. But that would basically require replicating the decennial long form every year, and that is not an acceptable option in terms of costs or burden on respondents. Once again, as we have so many times in conducting the decennial census, we are faced with the need to balance competing demands.

The Census Bureau takes even the perception that small areas are being treated unfairly very seriously and we have worked with data experts to allay those concerns. Even the smallest areas will have data 4 years earlier than if we had no American Community Survey and we included a long form in the 2010 census.

So while concerns have been raised about the data for small areas, the Census Bureau is confident that the American Community Survey design is going to yield a major improvement over the existing situation. We need to understand the glass is more than half full and to fill it all the way would require some unacceptable tradeoffs in terms of costs and respondent burden.

We have designed the American Community Survey to provide the same quality data as census 2000 for all groups, regardless of size, and we plan to monitor the survey to make sure that this is the case on an ongoing basis. Remember, the American Community Survey does not count the population; it estimates their characteristics. To get accurate measurements, we need high response rates from all groups.

We have devoted considerable time to discussing the question of data for small population groups with our Race and Ethnic Advisory Committees. Working with them, we will focus on techniques and strategies to ensure that small population groups participate in the survey, such as exploring using language assistance guides, revising the mailing package, and using public service announcements. The permanent staff of field representatives will establish ongoing relationships with the communities they are working in, thereby enhancing trust and willingness to participate.

The data collected by the American Community Survey will help Congress evaluate and modify Federal programs and will provide up-to-date information for congressional districts and States, as well as smaller areas, enabling services to be targeted to maximize the impact of available resources at all levels of Government. The American Community Survey will provide a critical new source of data that will allow the Congress to evaluate programs below the State level and to determine and assess accountability. The up-to-date estimates from the American Community Survey will benefit, for example, welfare reform, funding for educationally disadvantaged children, and programs for the elderly.

The American Community Survey is providing current data from 21 of its 31 test sites to address real-life issues in rural and urban communities. In my written statement, I have provided examples of both Federal and State uses.

In conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, we have also established a jointly chaired Interagency Committee charged with balancing respondent burden with the legitimate information needs of the Congress and the Federal Government. The Interagency Committee is working on reviewing the content of the

ACS in a process similar to what we did with the decennial census long form for census 2000. OMB has asked relevant Federal departments and agencies to document their legal requirements for these data, the level of geography that is required, and for what population groups. This information is expected to be available to us by the end of August.

The Census Bureau takes questions and concerns about intrusiveness and privacy very seriously. We are aware of the time pressures confronting people and of the concerns they have about privacy and confidentiality. The Census Bureau has a 60 year history, going back to the 1940 census, of working to reduce the number of questions and the number of households that would have to answer the longer set of questions. Weighed against the ever-increasing demands for new questions, including requests from the Congress and the executive branch, this is the evidence of the Census Bureau's sensitivity to this issue.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, as part of a strategy to re-engineer the 2010 census, the American Community Survey will improve the way we take the census by eliminating the long form, simplifying the 2010 census requirements, and allowing the Census Bureau to focus exclusively on the basic count. It will provide more frequent detailed data for all geographic areas regardless of size, so that Congress and Federal agencies will have up-to-date information to administer and evaluate programs. And it will contribute to a more efficient statistical system and allow us to keep pace with ever-increasing demands for timely and relevant data.

Mr. Chairman, in my more than 33 years of service in the Federal statistical system, two issues of dominant concern have been how to provide more current and more frequent small area data, and how to improve the accuracy of the census population counts. I believe the plan for re-engineering the 2010 census, including the launching of the American Community Survey, addresses both of these important longstanding concerns.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony and I will be glad, with my colleague, to try and answer any questions that you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Barron follows:]

ORAL STATEMENT OF

WILLIAM G. BARRON, Jr.

ACTING DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Before the Subcommittee on the Census

Committee on Government Reform

U.S. House of Representatives

June 13, 2001

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clay, and Members of the Subcommittee:

It is a pleasure to appear before you again and to testify at this second hearing on the American Community Survey. The Subcommittee's leadership, Mr. Chairman, in providing a public forum for discussing the ACS is greatly appreciated.

The American Community Survey is Part of the Strategy for a Re-engineered 2010 Census

The ACS is one of three key components of our strategy for re-engineering the 2010 Census. If the Census Bureau has adequate resources early to pursue this strategy, we can build upon the successes of Census 2000 and take advantage of lessons learned from Census 2000. Then we can reduce operational risks for the 2010 Census, explore ways to further reduce the undercount and

improve accuracy, provide more relevant and timely data throughout the decade, and contain costs.

While our strategic plan for the 2010 Census is still under development, we have identified what we believe are the three main components: 1) improving the accuracy of our geographic database and Master Address File, 2) eliminating the long form from the 2010 Census by collecting those data in the American Community Survey, and 3) re-engineering the census process through early planning.

Mr. Chairman, in your opening remarks at last July's hearing on the ACS you said: "Today we are here to begin the process of eliminating the problematic census long form." The process of eliminating the census long form is well underway. The ACS will simplify the 2010 Census requirements and allow the Census Bureau to focus exclusively on the basic count of the population. It will provide more current and more frequent detailed data for small geographic areas and allow the federal statistical system to keep pace with ever increasing demands for timely and relevant data. It will allow businesses, federal policymakers, and state, local and tribal governments to make decisions using more current data and will improve the distribution of federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, you asked that I address the issue of costs. Our initial estimates of life-cycle costs demonstrate cost neutrality when we compare the estimated cost of repeating Census 2000 to the estimated cost of a re-engineered 2010 Census, including the ACS, geographic system

modernization, and early planning. To achieve cost neutrality, and with further potential for cost savings, while also providing a rich new source of local area and national data on an ongoing basis throughout the decade, is a notable and remarkable achievement. It is not an overstatement to say that this is one of the most important developments in the modern history of the federal statistical system.

A Balanced Design for the American Community Survey

Our goal in designing the ACS was to produce data comparable in quality to the decennial census long form for the smallest areas such as census tracts. One decision was how many years should go into the moving averages that will replace the long form estimates. We decided on a 5-year average for the ACS that will give more timely data throughout the entire decade, and will give much better information about change over time than a once-a-decade measurement.

Another decision was to determine how much sample was needed each year so that the 5-year averages would have a sample size to provide data of sufficient quality. We chose a sample size of 3 million because that will meet our goal of producing data based on 5-year averages comparable to the census long form data.

Data for Small Areas

The fact that the ACS sample size and design will not provide data for the smallest areas until 2008 has led some to raise the concern that the ACS may be treating rural areas and urban census tracts unfairly. The Census Bureau takes this concern very seriously. Indeed, we wish it were possible to begin providing small areas with high quality, current data right away. But that would basically require replicating the decennial long form every year, and that is not acceptable in terms of costs or burden on respondents. Once again, we are faced with balancing competing demands.

But the Census Bureau takes even the perception that small areas are being treated unfairly very seriously and has worked with data experts to allay those concerns. Even the smallest areas will have data 4 years earlier than they would if we had no ACS and included a long form in the 2010 Census.

So while concerns have been raised about data for small areas, the Census Bureau is confident that the current ACS design yields a major improvement over the existing situation. We need to understand that the glass is more than half full and to fill it all the way would require unacceptable trade-offs in terms of costs and respondent burden.

Data for Small Population Groups

We have designed the American Community Survey to provide the same quality data as Census 2000 for all groups, regardless of size, and we plan to monitor the survey to ensure that this is the case. The ACS does not count the population; it estimates their characteristics. To get accurate measurements, we need high response rates from all groups.

We have devoted considerable time to discussing the question of data for small population groups with our Race and Ethnic Advisory Committees. Working with them, we will focus on techniques and strategies to ensure that small population groups participate in the survey, including exploring using language assistance guides; revising the mailing package; and using public service announcements. The permanent staff of field representatives will establish ongoing relationships with the communities they are working in, thereby enhancing trust and willingness to participate.

Timely and Relevant Data to Manage Federal and Local Programs

Data collected by the ACS will help Congress evaluate and modify federal programs and will provide up-to-date information for congressional districts and states, as well as smaller areas, enabling services to be targeted to maximize the impact of available resources at all levels of government. The ACS will provide a critical new source of data that will allow the Congress to evaluate programs below the state level and determine accountability. The up-to-date estimates

from the ACS will benefit, for example, welfare reform, funding for educationally disadvantaged children, and programs for the elderly.

The American Community Survey is providing current data from 21 of its 31 test sites to address real-life issues in rural and urban communities. In my written statement, I provide examples of both the federal and local uses.

Developing American Community Survey Content

In conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, we have established a jointly chaired Interagency Committee charged with balancing respondent burden with the legitimate information needs of the Congress and the federal government. The Interagency Committee is working on reviewing the content of the ACS in a process similar to what we've done for the decennial census long form. OMB has asked relevant federal departments and agencies to document legal requirements for data, the level of geography needed, and for what population groups. This information is expected to be complete by the end of August.

The Census Bureau takes questions and concerns about intrusiveness and privacy seriously. We are aware of the time pressures confronting people and of the concerns we all have about privacy and confidentiality. The Census Bureau has a 60-year history--going back to the 1940 census--of working to reduce the number of questions and the number of households that would have to answer the longer set of questions. Weighed against the ever increasing demands for new

questions, including requests from the Congress, this is evidence of the Census Bureau's sensitivity to this issue.

Conclusion

In summary, Mr. Chairman, as part of the strategy to re-engineer the 2010 Census, the American Community Survey will improve the way we take the census by eliminating the long form, simplifying the 2010 Census requirements, and allowing the Census Bureau to focus exclusively on the basic count. It will provide more frequent detailed data for all geographic areas regardless of size, so that the Congress and federal agencies will have up-to-date information to administer and evaluate programs. And it will contribute to a more efficient statistical system and allow us to keep pace with ever increasing demands for timely and relevant data.

In my more than 33 years of service in the federal statistical system, two issues of dominant concern have been how to provide more current and more frequent small area data and how to improve the accuracy of the census population counts. I believe the plan for re-engineering the 2010 Census, including launching the American Community Survey, addresses both of these important, long-standing concerns.

That concludes my testimony and I will now be happy to answer any questions.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF

WILLIAM G. BARRON, Jr.

ACTING DIRECTOR, U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Before the Subcommittee on the Census

Committee on Government Reform

U.S. House of Representatives

June 13, 2001

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clay, and Members of the Subcommittee:

It is a pleasure to appear before you again and to testify at this second hearing on the American Community Survey. The Subcommittee's leadership, Mr. Chairman, in providing a public forum for discussing the ACS is greatly appreciated.

The American Community Survey is Part of the Strategy for a Re-engineered 2010 Census

The ACS is one of three key components of our strategy for re-engineering the 2010 Census. As Secretary Evans testified in a Senate hearing on March 28: "While Census 2000 was an operational success and produced data of high quality, the process was costly, many people felt burdened by having to answer the long form questions, and the census was constantly at risk due to insufficient early planning and development, and disagreement on the design." If the Census Bureau has adequate resources early to build upon the successes of Census 2000 and to take advantage of lessons learned from Census 2000, then we can reduce operational risks for the 2010 Census, explore ways to further reduce the undercount and improve accuracy, provide more relevant and timely data throughout the decade, and contain costs.

While our strategic plan for the 2010 Census is still under development, we have identified what we believe are the three main components: 1) improving the accuracy of our geographic database and Master Address File, 2) eliminating the long form from the 2010 Census by collecting those data in the American Community Survey, and 3) re-engineering the census process through early planning.

We are planning improved geographic systems to ensure that there is a complete and unduplicated address list, that will facilitate automation and electronic data collection, and that will also provide the potential for significant efficiencies. We plan to investigate the use of Global Positioning System technology and satellite mapping imagery to link addresses to physical locations, which will allow accurate updating and improvement of Census 2000 maps and address information.

The ACS will simplify the 2010 Census requirements and allow the Census Bureau to focus exclusively on the basic count of the population. It will provide more current and more frequent detailed data for businesses and local, state, and federal policymakers for small geographic areas and allow the federal statistical system to keep pace with ever increasing demands for timely and relevant data. Data users now must still use 1990 long form data, data that will be 12 years old next year, when we begin the release of Census 2000 long form data. The ACS will allow federal policymakers, businesses, and state, local and tribal governments to make decisions using more current data and will improve the distribution of federal funds.

Early 2010 planning and development are necessary for a re-engineered process for the 2010 Census that takes advantage of the potential opportunities provided by having improved geographic systems and the ACS.

Mr. Chairman, in your opening remarks at last July's hearing on the ACS you said: "Today we are here to begin the process of eliminating the problematic census long form." The process of eliminating the census long form is well underway. That is why the ACS is one of the three key components of the plan for re-engineering the 2010 Census. It will allow us to eliminate the long form from the 2010 Census and collect data on congressionally mandated topics in an annual sample survey.

Census 2000 required the processing of more than 1.5 billion pieces of paper. About 60 percent of this paper was associated with the long form. It took a lot of talent, time, money, and effort to process that much paper. Implementing the vision, Mr. Chairman, of simplifying the decennial census by eliminating the long form will introduce opportunities for cost savings and improved coverage, and greatly enhance the Census Bureau's ability to streamline and modernize the census-taking process.

Replacing the long form with the American Community Survey will permit the Census Bureau to focus exclusively on conducting the basic count in 2010. It will allow us to streamline data capture, accommodate more multiple language response, increase mail response, and lower field costs. It will lead to better coverage of addresses in the census because it will require a continuously updated address list. Ongoing interaction with local officials will allow us to avoid the just-in-time address updating operations for the 2000 Census. The ACS will also provide current data to permit the Census Bureau to more effectively target areas where special procedures will be required in 2010. We are also looking at ways to use the highly trained ACS

field staff as a cadre of key supervisory staff for the 2010 Census. Because they will have been collecting ACS data successfully in hard-to-enumerate areas, they will have developed relationships with local leaders that will prove invaluable in more completely enumerating the population in the 2010 Census.

Mr. Chairman, you asked that I address the issue of costs. The Census Bureau recognizes that there are substantial up-front costs in the early years of the decade for this strategy. For example, our preliminary estimate of the cost of the ACS for FY 2003, the first year of collecting data in every part of the country, is $131 million, subject, of course, to the regular budget process. As I stated in my letter to you, Mr. Chairman, of April 19, 2001, there will be only 9 months of nonresponse followup field work in the first year, which lowers the cost somewhat compared with all future years. Our initial estimates of life-cycle costs will demonstrate cost neutrality when we compare the estimated cost of repeating Census 2000 to the estimated cost of a re-engineered 2010 Census, which includes the ACS, geographic system modernization, and early planning. To achieve cost neutrality, and even have some potential for cost savings, while also providing so much more data throughout the decade, is a notable achievement.

A Balanced Design for the American Community Survey

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will turn to the ACS, and first describe how we worked with the statistical system and data users to balance issues related to cost, feasibility, data quality, and respondent burden in designing the program. The ACS is not designed to provide a headcount. That is what the decennial census is for. The Census Bureau has a population estimates program to provide updated population totals for years following the most recent census. The ACS will serve a similar role in providing updated population and housing characteristics.

Our goal in designing the ACS was to produce data comparable in quality to the decennial census long form for the smallest areas such as census tracts. One decision was how many years should go into the moving averages that will replace the long form estimates. We decided on a 5-year average for the ACS that will give more timely data throughout the entire decade, and will give much better information about change over time than a once-a-decade measurement.

Another decision was to determine how much sample was needed each year so that the 5-year averages would have a sample size to provide data of sufficient quality. We chose a sample size of 3 million because that will meet our goal of producing data based on 5-year averages that are comparable to census long form data for the smallest areas such as census tracts. These data will be available in 2008, 4 years earlier than from a 2010 long form, and they will be updated annually thereafter. Moreover, the first data for communities of 65,000 people or more will be available in 2004, about 6 months after the 2003 data collection year ends, and every year thereafter. The first data for communities with between 20,000 and 65,000 people will be available in 2006, and also updated annually after they are first available.

The Census Bureau will mail questionnaires to each address in the sample and will use purchased lists of telephone numbers to interview households that do not mail back their form. We will select a one-in-three sample of the addresses not interviewed by mail or telephone and conduct personal visit interviews. Since personal visit interviews are very expensive, this sub-sampling will reduce costs while providing the desired level of accuracy. The quality of data is improved by using well-trained, permanent interviewers with computers to complete interviews. Computer-assisted interviewing by telephone or in person allows the Census Bureau to incorporate consistency checks of the data into the collection process. Data quality is further improved by the use of a permanent staff to code write-in entries for processing.

The American Community Survey will be based on making the most efficient use of existing systems and infrastructure. It will not require additional offices, but will be run out of our current regional offices. Field interviewers, who work on other surveys in addition to the ACS, will use existing laptop computers, and laptops from Census 2000 can be used as replacements, to the extent possible. As I noted in my letter of April 19, for FY 2003 the ACS will require about 1,230 full-time staff and 3,800 part-time staff. We will not require special data capture centers, as that will be accomplished in our processing center in Jeffersonville, Indiana. The Census Bureau is working to provide electronic versions of maps that will reside on the interviewers' laptops; this will reduce the massive requirements for paper copies of maps we encountered in the decennial census. We do not anticipate, at this time, any advertising expenditures for the ACS because its small monthly sample size would make it inefficient to use mass marketing methods such as we needed for the decennial census. We do expect to use community partnerships, which we have found to be very effective in the early test sites.

Mr. Chairman, you also asked whether the ACS would replace or incorporate any additional Census Bureau surveys. While there are no current plans to replace any existing surveys, the ACS can help make the entire federal statistical system more efficient in a number of ways by improving existing programs. They include the Current Population Survey, the National Crime Victimization Survey, and the Consumer Expenditure Survey. The Bureau of Labor Statistics will use ACS data as part of its Local Area Unemployment Statistics program to make improved monthly estimates of unemployment. And the Census Bureau will use the ACS data, along with the Current Population Survey data and administrative records, to improve poverty estimates for school districts.

Data for Small Areas

The fact that the ACS sample size and design will not provide data for the smallest areas until 2008 has led some to raise the concern that the ACS may be treating rural areas and urban census tracts unfairly. The Census Bureau takes this concern very seriously. Indeed, we wish it were possible to begin providing small areas with high quality, current data right away. But that would basically require replicating the decennial long form every year, and that is not acceptable in terms of costs or burden on respondents. Once again, we are faced with balancing competing demands.

But the Census Bureau takes even the perception that small areas are being treated unfairly very seriously and has worked with data experts to allay those concerns. For example, the Census Bureau contracted with WESTAT to bring together rural experts and get their suggestions for improving the ACS from the perspective of rural areas. The group of a dozen experts, who met in May 1998, expressed strong support for the ACS and we are pursuing their suggestions for further research and changes that might make the ACS even more valuable to rural areas.

At last year's hearing, you heard from Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson; Ms. Barbara Welty, representing the National Association of Towns and Townships; and Mr. Chuck Fluharty, Director of the Rural Policy Research Institute, on this issue and about the importance of having current data to support rural policy initiatives. If I may quote from Mr. Fluharty's statement last year:

> "While some statistical limitations for rural areas within the American Community Survey may exist, the more timely, cost-effective multi-year estimates produced by ACS are far superior to existing data produced by the decennial Census."

And this is the key point--even the smallest areas will have data 4 years earlier than they would if we had no ACS and included a long form in the 2010 Census.

So while concerns have been raised about data for small areas, the Census Bureau is confident that the current ACS design yields a major improvement over the existing situation. We need to understand that the glass is more than half full and to fill it all the way would require unacceptable trade-offs in terms of costs and respondent burden.

Data for Small Population Groups

We have designed the American Community Survey to provide the same quality data as Census 2000 for all groups, regardless of size, and we plan to monitor the survey to ensure that this is the case. As noted earlier, the ACS does not count the population; it estimates their characteristics. To get accurate measurements, we need high response rates from all groups.

We have devoted considerable time to discussing the question of data for small population groups with our Race and Ethnic Advisory Committees. We are evaluating their suggestions, together with our experiences collecting data from these groups in Census 2000.

Working closely with them, we will focus on techniques and strategies to ensure that small population groups participate in the survey. We are exploring using language assistance guides similar to those used in Census 2000; revising the mailing package to elicit a better mail response rate; and placing public service announcements in newspapers and electronic media serving minority populations.

The permanent staff of field representatives will establish ongoing relationships with the communities they are working in, thereby enhancing trust and willingness to participate.

Timely and Relevant Data to Manage Federal and Local Programs

We believe that the American Community Survey is the cornerstone of the government's effort to keep pace with the country's ever-increasing demands for timely and relevant household data. If we are to continue leadership in providing information to the knowledge society, we must invest in full development of the ACS. In our web-based society of the 21st century, it is no longer acceptable that planners and policy-makers must use data that are up to 12 years out of date.

Eliminating the long form from the once-a-decade census will give us an incredible head-start toward having a successful 2010 Census at a reasonable cost. Over the years, the long form included in the decennial census has met the Nation's need for detailed data essential for governing, by providing reliable, consistent data for small geographic areas once a decade. To eliminate the long form without an alternative method of collecting detailed population and housing characteristics would leave the Nation with a knowledge void at a time when timely and accurate information is required to design and manage federal programs and distribute federal funds fairly.

Without an appropriate alternative to the decennial census long form--the ACS--Congress would not have the data to run the programs it has written into law. It would not have a rudder to guide the ship of state.

The ACS will provide timely data to help the Congress, federal program managers, and the "end users" in every community in America. It recognizes the continuing roles of the Congress and federal agencies, while also elevating the importance of partnerships with other levels of government and those directly affected by the decisions based on data. Data collected by the ACS will help Congress evaluate and modify federal programs and will provide up-to-date information for congressional districts and states, as well as smaller areas, enabling services to be targeted to maximize the impact of available resources at all levels of government. The ACS will provide a critical new source of data that will allow the Congress to evaluate programs below the state level and determine accountability. When fully implemented, it will collect data in every county, American Indian reservation, Alaskan Native area, and Hawaiian homeland, as well as Puerto Rico. Because data from the ACS will be available every year, Congress can determine change over time and measure the results of federal programs. It means greatly improved annual estimates of population and housing characteristics and how they change over time. The up-to-date estimates from the ACS will benefit, for example, welfare reform, funding for educationally disadvantaged children, and programs for the elderly.

The welfare reform legislation provides performance bonuses to states. In some cases, no data are currently available to measure the results of state programs. The ACS will collect the

information about income and family structure that is needed to measure poverty and eligibility for benefits, as well as age, marital status, the presence of children, and educational attainment and school enrollment. In addition, it will shed light on the results of state and local welfare-to-work initiatives.

The American Community Survey dramatically improves poverty estimates for groups such as children and the elderly, and provides current information on changes in family structure. The Department of Education currently uses the estimates of poverty for children from the Census Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates program in allocating annually over $8 billion in Title I funds to school districts. The ACS will dramatically improve these estimates for school districts. The "Leave No Child Behind Act of 2001," currently under consideration in the Congress, specifically mentions the ACS as the source of data on the number of children with limited English proficiency--data to be used in administering grants to the States.

The ACS provides information about all age groups, including the current elderly population and the characteristics of people nearing retirement age. This information is essential for projections about the needs and resources of people who are eligible to enter the retirement system and can help target screening programs for particular health conditions.

While I have focused on federal uses of the data today, the American Community Survey is providing current data from 21 of its 31 test sites to address real-life issues in rural and urban communities, and I think it's important to mention just a few illustrations of local uses.

- A sparsely populated, rural county--Fulton County, Pennsylvania--is using the ACS data to develop an employment and training services system, a rural transportation system, and a "Help Line" for families to address health care and child care needs.

- Bronx County, New York, will use ACS data to identify and develop intervention strategies for juvenile diabetes in special populations.

- In Springfield, Massachusetts, community leaders and public safety officials are using ACS data to develop a youth violence prevention program for teens.

These are just a few examples of how having up-to-date information, instead of information that is 12 years old, will allow communities to provide services more efficiently. ACS data are also being used to help localities meet federal program requirements.

- Multnomah County, Oregon, will use ACS data as a source for enrollment forecasts that are used to justify support under various school programs. In addition, Multnomah County used 1996 ACS data for a study of students who were in poverty, a critical input to several federal programs. And ACS data on the number and demographic characteristics of children and families receiving

services are being used by the county to develop Head Start Community Assessment reports.

Next month, the we plan to issue additional data from the 21 test sites and national and state-level data from the nationwide operational test that collected data from a national sample of about 700,000 households. We conducted this test--the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey--to ensure that the ACS can be conducted separately from, but during the same period as, a once-a-decade census.

Developing American Community Survey Content

In conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget, we have established a jointly chaired Interagency Committee charged with balancing respondent burden with the legitimate information needs of the Congress and the federal government. The Interagency Committee is working on reviewing the content of the ACS in a process similar to what we've done for the decennial census long form. OMB has asked relevant federal departments and agencies to document legal requirements for data, the level of geography needed, and for what population groups. This information is expected to be complete by the end of August.

For 2003, we anticipate the questionnaire will be similar to the current ACS questionnaire. Since the survey is designed to produce 5-year estimates, we believe the content should remain reasonably consistent over time. We would plan to submit to the Congress in 2006 the revised content of the 2008 questionnaires, following the decennial model. In the interim, and through the Interagency Committee, all questions will be reviewed, those no longer required will be dropped, others can be re-worded and tested, and congressionally mandated topics can be added.

There was considerable discussion of the long form last year as an "invasion of privacy." This was partly because the long form was administered to about 20 million housing units all at one time. The American Community Survey provides a different atmosphere and will reduce public concern about intrusiveness.

Instead of about 20 million housing units receiving the census long form all at one time, in each monthly survey, only 250,000 housing units will receive the ACS questionnaire at any one time. This is 1 in every 480 households in any given month. In any given year, only 1 in 40 households, or about 2.5 percent of the total, will receive the ACS questionnaire.

Instead of having a large army of temporary enumerators, the ACS field interviewers will be highly trained permanent staff who will be better prepared to deal with the public's questions about the form. Our experience thus far with the ACS has been that our trained interviewers have achieved good cooperation with few complaints from the public. They can explain that the confidentiality of the data is strongly protected, they are used only for statistical purposes--not for regulation or law enforcement--and each questionnaire item is linked to a federal program.

Having said that, the Census Bureau takes questions and concerns about intrusiveness and privacy seriously. We are aware of the time pressures confronting people and of the concerns we all have about privacy and confidentiality. We also recognize and respect those who have philosophical objections to government activities, government programs, and government data collection. In fact, the Census Bureau has a 60-year history--going back to the 1940 census--of working to reduce the number of questions and the number of households that would have to answer the longer set of questions. Before 1940, everyone was asked the "long form" questions; that year, some of the questions were asked of only one-in-four people. For the 1960 Census, the percentage of households that received the long form was still one-in-four, but this was reduced to one-in-six by the 1980 Census. And in Census 2000, the short form was reduced to seven items--the shortest in 180 years. Weighed against the ever increasing demands for new questions, including requests from the Congress, this is evidence of the Census Bureau's sensitivity to this issue.

Conclusion

In summary, Mr. Chairman, as part of the strategy to re-engineer the 2010 Census, the American Community Survey will improve the way we take the census by eliminating the long form, simplifying the 2010 Census requirements, and allowing the Census Bureau to focus exclusively on the basic count. It will provide more frequent detailed data for all geographic areas regardless of size, so that the Congress and federal agencies will have up-to-date information to administer and evaluate programs. And it will contribute to a more efficient statistical system and allow us to keep pace with ever increasing demands for timely and relevant data.

That concludes my testimony and I will now be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. MILLER [resuming Chair]. Thank you.

Mrs. Maloney, did you have an opening statement?

Mrs. MALONEY. I have questions.

Mr. MILLER. OK. Mr. Barron, let me ask a couple questions. First of all, explain to me how low a level of geographic area would the data be available and when?

Mr. BARRON. The lowest level of data availability, Mr. Chairman, would be the census tract level. That data would be available beginning in 2005 if we were able to launch the survey in 2003, it would then be available on an annual basis thereafter. There are other data that we could make available to researchers below the tract level, but the basic unit of publication, if you will, will be the census tract.

Mr. MILLER. I have a question about the questions that are included in ACS. There are 69 questions included right now in ACS which is more than we had in our long form. I know the debate that always took place about trying to add questions; everybody wants more information. I know the Bureau was always in the difficult position of trying not to add questions. Apparently, you have already added some. How will you keep this from getting out of control and the cost and the response rate that this has an impact on?

Mr. BARRON. Mr. Chairman, I am hoping that when we come out of this process with the Office of Management and Budget we will, first off, have a good redefinition and re-examination of all the questions currently being asked. I am also hoping we can find a way to partner with the Congress on the congressional view of the questions we are asking and any needs for either more or fewer questions that we think reflect the perspective of the Congress.

On an ongoing basis, I am hoping we could establish some sort of interagency committee, perhaps with permanent congressional involvement, to look at this on an ongoing basis so that we can maintain a consensus as to how many questions we should ask or not ask.

Mr. MILLER. Is this going to have the potential for eliminating any other surveys or forms or any duplicative reports that would fix cost but also get more accurate information?

Mr. BARRON. I think on an ongoing basis, once the survey is fully established, we can look at that. I think for now, Mr. Chairman, what we are learning is that agencies are seeing this as a way to expand and improve their information. I know just recently we received some information from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicating that with the data that would be available from the American Community Survey they are going to be able to greatly enhance their program of local area unemployment estimates which currently is developed on the best data the BLS has but that it is not very detailed data by area. So, for now we are hearing more about ways to improve the accuracy of other datasets. I think down the road we will have to turn to the question of are there things we can eliminate. Right now we have not identified any candidates.

Mr. MILLER. The Current Population Survey, how does that relate and what are the duplication possibilities there?

Mr. BARRON. Right. The Current Population Survey is collected by the Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is the

survey that provides the official Federal Government measures of labor force activity, including employment and unemployment. It is a national survey of about 50,000 households. It is designed to measure month-to-month change in unemployment and other labor force characteristics. It does focus on labor force activity.

The American Community Survey is going to have a labor force component. But the American Community Survey is far more detailed in terms of its geographic reach, if you will. It is also designed to provide estimates on an annual basis. So the BLS is viewing the Current Population Survey and the American Community Survey, and I think I would agree with this, as complements. They are going to be able to use the data from the American Community Survey to greatly improve the local area unemployment estimates that they are required to produce for purposes of distributing job training funds. They are going to be able to greatly enhance the data quality of those estimates. Right now, they have, as I said a moment ago, sort of a paucity of data to develop these monthly estimates.

Mr. MILLER. For 2010, the post card census is what we are talking about, is that right, if ACS goes forward and is working?

Mr. BARRON. Mr. Miller, I think we are very close to a post card census in terms of content. I do not know what particular mail instrument we would use to send it out to people, but we are essentially talking about the short form. I do not know whether we tested whether that would actually fit on a post card or not. I would have to check on that. But in terms of content, we are talking about a greatly reduced census.

Mr. MILLER. I just received a report the other day about the cost. I just received it yesterday so I have not had a chance to really fully evaluate it. But the projected cost for fiscal year 2003 is $131 million. Would you care to comment about this report on the lifecycle cost which like $500 million less total cost if we——

Mr. BARRON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. First, let me apologize. We spent a lot of time working on that document and it is a very sensitive matter. It took us a lot of time to make sure all the appropriate bases were touched in terms of getting that document up here to you. I regret that I was not able to get it here sooner.

I think it is a very important document. It basically is laying out the fact that if we were just to take census 2000 and use some standard assumptions about inflation, Federal pay, and pay for information technology contracts, and things like that, if we compare the cost of taking census 2000 and moving it out 10 years inflated by assumptions for those basic types of costs, it is going to approach $12 billion. And if we are able to re-engineer the census, starting with early planning, starting with an improved and technologically enhanced master address file process, and, of course, eliminate the long form, than in terms of annual appropriations, we think there would be a cost avoidance of about half a billion dollars.

What we are also achieving though, Mr. Chairman, in having done that is we would have an ongoing set of new data never before available except on a decennial census basis, an ongoing set of products providing a rich dataset—an ongoing video, if you will, of what is happening to America in terms of all the characteristics

that are collected on the long form. So you could look at it as cost neutral but with a tremendous benefit in terms of the amount of data provided. So that is basically what the life-cycle document is setting forth for you. Depending on whether you look at net present value or cost avoidance, it is either cost neutral, that is according to net present value calculations, or a savings of about a half a billion if you look at funds that would not have to be appropriated in the annual appropriations process. So I think it is a very important finding.

Mr. MILLER. I think it was a very interesting document.

Mrs. Maloney.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Mr. Barron. Mr. Barron, can you document the number of times and the reasons for the Census Bureau putting out data from the American Community Survey that subsequently had to be retracted because of errors?

Mr. BARRON. From the American Community Survey?

Mrs. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. BARRON. No, I cannot, Mrs. Maloney. Let me ask my colleague, Ms. Gordon, if there are any such documents that we have.

Ms. GORDON. I am not aware of retracting data from the American Community Survey. The one circumstance I think that you might have heard about would be information for Bronx County in New York where, because we did not have the American Community Survey in the last decade, our population estimates were not able to take advantage of that kind of information and so the use of the population estimates for that particular county resulted in data that we thought was not as accurate as we would like. And so those data have sort of a warning label on them. But the data for all of the other sites that we have released we think are really quite good and there have been no concerns that I know of expressed about them.

Mrs. MALONEY. OK. Mr. Barron, could you tell me under what authority are you withholding information from the U.S. Census Monitoring Board? Their enabling legislation clearly states that: "Each co-chairman of the board, and any members of the staff who may be designated by the board under this paragraph, shall be granted access to any data, files, information, or other matters maintained by the Bureau of the Census or received by it in the course of conducting a decennial census of population which they may request subject to such regulations as the board may proscribe in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce."

Mr. BARRON. I guess no one would ever give me an authority that complicated because I would not be able to understand it. But I think what you are referring to, Mrs. Maloney, is that as we enter into the next phase of the process of looking at whether adjustment would improve estimates from census 2000, we were attempting to replicate the same process that I think we used very successfully earlier in the year where we provided access to the data that we were looking at on a real time basis. At the same time we were looking at it, we provided access to the National Academy of Sciences, to the Congress, and to the Monitoring Board. So we thought it would be a good practice to try and replicate the same thing.

Now, since all of the issues that you raise now were not raised then, I am sort of surprised. But we are simply trying to be open about what we are doing. We prefer to have people look at the data that we are looking at at the same time. We are also aware that the Monitoring Board will be having to issue reports early in the fall and we would like to help them do that. We would like them not to publish local area data, specific area data until we have. That is basically the concern that we have. We would like to focus on doing our work and not get caught up in a lot of external debates about local data until we have finished our work. And that is what we are trying to achieve.

Mrs. MALONEY. The Monitoring Board, I believe there are members here from the Monitoring Board, would be glad to give you a list of data that they would like the information. Under law, they are entitled to it. I would like you to provide the committee a legal memorandum that explains under what authority you are withholding any information. It is against the law.

Mr. BARRON. Well, I will go back and ask my attorneys to see if they can defend me on this.

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you very much. I have a few more questions. In your letter, Mr. Barron, to myself and Mr. Clay, dated April 24, you stated that the "Census Bureau is preparing a plan for examining demographic analysis, the ACE, and Census 2000 which will be available in the next month." Can the committee get a copy of this plan?

Mr. BARRON. I do not think the plan exists right now. But the answer is, absolutely. When it does exist, we would be glad to provide it to the committee. It should be available very shortly.

Mrs. MALONEY. So you are saying that the plan does not exist?

Mr. BARRON. I know that a plan has been discussed internally and it is being modified. As soon as there is a public plan, we would be glad to give it to you.

Mrs. MALONEY. So, in your letter of June 8, you stated that it did not yet exist, and now you are saying that it still does not exist. Four months after the decision not to go forward with the corrected data, you do not even have a plan done to review the differences. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRON. We have spent a lot of time identifying problems that came out of the last set of ESCAP deliberations, and we do have a plan for that, those kind of data are being established. In terms of a plan for how we will conduct our review over the summer, that is another stage of planning that we have not yet completed. It will be done soon. I am confident that by the time the fall arrives we will have examined all of the issues that arose in our initial set of ESCAP deliberations and, hopefully, we will arrive at a recommendation that will be acceptable to everyone.

Mrs. MALONEY. Well, as you stated, you still do not have a plan after 4 months. Then why are you embarking on a project to reconfigure the post-strata of the ACS if you have not even got a plan to reconcile the differences between the corrected and uncorrected data and the demographic analysis?

Mr. BARRON. I am not familiar with a project to restructure post-strata, Mrs. Maloney. We have a lot of work under way to assemble the data that we need to continue our analysis. We have not pro-

duced a plan on the actual conduct of that analysis, but that is something that I think we can do in relatively short order. A lot of effort is going into developing some way to understand the data sets that we have. I think the Bureau, by October, will have a fine report on this issue.

Mrs. MALONEY. And finally, the Census Bureau has told the subcommittee that it is conducting a study to identify duplicates in the group quarters population. However, the Census Bureau has made no effort to measure people missed in group quarters and has no intention of doing such a study. Congress has repeatedly asked the Census Bureau to pay attention to people missed in the group quarters population and has been repeatedly ignored. How do you justify this one-sided approach to measuring error in the group quarters population? Is this a search for the politically correct number, or are there other instances where the Bureau tries to assess the level of duplicates and does not count those missed?

Mr. BARRON. I am not sure I completely understand the question, Mrs. Maloney. We are looking at group quarters and will, in fact, soon be issuing the short form data and be working with State and local officials. That is probably the most effective, nonpartisan, unbiased, open way to assess group quarter data quality since everyone in the country will have the data and will be able to assess it. So I do not know really how to respond to the comment that we are doing something that is not open and straightforward, but I regret you feel that way.

Mrs. MALONEY. Just to get to the facts. Are there other cases or instances, past or present or historically, where the Bureau tries to assess the level of duplicates and does not count those missed? That is a reasonable question.

Mr. BARRON. I am afraid I cannot really answer that.

Mrs. MALONEY. Could you have your team look and try to get the answer?

Mr. BARRON. Sure.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would be glad to meet with you and go further in with it. We have a vote right now.

Mr. BARRON. I would be glad to meet with you, too.

Mr. MILLER. I believe we will have time. The second bell has not gone. We have a vote on the floor, so we will have to run out shortly.

Mr. Cannon.

Mr. CANNON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Barron, I appreciate your being here, again. Of course, the basic constitutional purpose of the census is the apportionment of congressional seats. You and I are in a maelstrom over the difference between North Carolina's count and Utah's count. Utah is missing a seat. So if you would not mind, I would like to revisit some of those issues that we have spoken about before.

The last time you were here I asked you several questions related to disproportionate counting of Americans overseas in the 2000 census and how that affected the State of Utah, and missionaries of the Mormon Church, in particular. If you recall, I asked specifically about how the Bureau is progressing on a report and then a final plan on how to count Americans overseas in the 2010 census.

At the time, I found the progress a little disappointing. But let me pose that full question to you again.

Chairman Miller included in the Bureau's fiscal year 2010 appropriations a requirement that the Secretary of Commerce "Submit to the Congress no later than September 30, 2001, a written report on any methodological, logistical, and other issues associated with the inclusion in future decennial censuses of American citizens and their dependents living abroad for apportionment, redistricting, and other purposes." What progress has been made on that report since our last hearing with you, if any? And given the tremendous and immediate interest in this issue, might that report be given a greater priority by the Bureau?

Mr. BARRON. I think we have made a lot of progress, Mr. Cannon. We recently had a briefing up here, and I would like to have staff come back and meet with your staff because I understand it was not a convenient time for your folks and we want to make sure that your folks are involved in it. I think we have made a lot of progress in identifying the issues that we see in trying to construct an accurate count of Americans overseas. One of the big issues, for example, is whether we could rely on administrative records to do that, whether that would be from a perspective of folks who are very interested in this number, and whether that would be sufficient. We are also interested in trying to reach a consensus on uses and whether it would be satisfactory to identify people who sort of "self-nominate" themselves as being an American overseas, or do we have to go through some further degree of proof to determine exactly who they are and why they are there and that sort of thing.

At any rate, we have made a great deal of progress. I do not know if it is possible to speed up the September 30th report. I will look into that and get back to you. I think maybe the first thing to do might be to get with your staff and brief you on what we have done.

Mr. CANNON. Thank you. We will take you up on that. But even if the report is on time, proceeding as you are now, how long do you think before there is a final plan for counting overseas Americans in the next census?

Mr. BARRON. Well, we are probably a pretty good length of time away from having a final plan, Mr. Cannon. I think the issues are daunting. Another thing we need to do, and I think we agreed to do this in the briefing we held up here last week, is to meet with the groups that are representing the folks who live overseas to see what sort of reaction we can get from them in terms of the issues that we have identified. So I do not want to commit to a timeframe. It depends on whether we can get a consensus on the type of enumeration we can conduct and how that number would be used.

Mr. CANNON. Let me just jump on to the next question. It looks like you are going to spend about $131 million on the American Community Survey this next fiscal year. Can you give me a rough estimate of how much the Bureau is spending this fiscal year to put together the report and plan for counting overseas Americans?

Mr. BARRON. I would have to provide that to you for the record, Mr. Cannon. It is a very small amount of money relative to the budget request for the American Community Survey.

Mr. CANNON. I appreciate your responses to this line of inquiry. I remain concerned that the Bureau is neglecting this core responsibility and devoting its resources to projects outside the core mission, it is a paramount mission in the Constitution, while leaving unresolved these really difficult issues which we have been dealing with for 70 years. So I would appreciate your getting back to us on some of those things, and look forward to having our staff meet with you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. Mr. Barr, we have a vote but if you would like to proceed before the vote.

Mr. BARR. Thank you. Is this the survey that we are talking about, the American Community Survey?

Mr. BARRON. I believe so, sir, yes.

Mr. BARR. This copy is 24 pages long. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRON. I think that is correct. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARR. How many questions including subparts are contained in this?

Mr. BARRON. I believe there are 65 questions.

Ms. GORDON. It is approximately that many. You asked about including subparts, in many questions, for example, asking about how much you pay in a mortgage, we need to first ask do you have a mortgage. So we do not have a tally of the subparts available right at the moment. But we could certainly provide it to you.

Mr. BARR. It would be interesting. I could go through and count them all up. It is an awful lot more than 65. Do you have any concern that this is awfully intrusive?

Mr. BARRON. We are very concerned about it, Congressman.

Mr. BARR. Then why are you asking it?

Mr. BARRON. Well, the basic reason, Congressman Barr, is that there is in back of each one of these questions a legislative requirement by a Federal agency. I want you to know that we are working with the Office of Management and Budget this summer to review each and every one of those requirements to make sure that it is there and to assess that and to see if the question could be restructured. But, no, we are very worried about that. It is our staff who go out and, in this case, talk to people face-to-face about filling out the survey. So we want it to be as acceptable to the American public as we can make it.

Mr. BARR. What if somebody just does not want to fill all this out. Is there anything he can do about that?

Mr. BARRON. Well, one of the issues that has been raised is whether this should be conducted with mandatory reporting. Our initial thinking, although we want to work with the Congress on this, is that we think as part of the decennial census it should be mandatory reporting.

Mr. BARR. All of this information?

Mr. BARRON. Yes, sir. That is consistent with the approach to conducting the collection of the long form on the decennial census which this is replacing.

Mr. BARR. But there are an awful lot of concerns raised about that.

Mr. BARRON. Indeed, there were.

Mr. BARR. And this just perpetuates it.

Mr. BARRON. It does, but we also think, and we will do the review to make sure that we have got this down to the bare minimum, we also have found that when——

Mr. BARR. This is not the bare minimum, is it?

Mr. BARRON. I do not know, sir. I think that each one of those was looked at prior to the 2000 census and it may be terribly close. So I do not want to lead you astray and make a promise to you that I cannot come close to keeping. I think each one of those questions——

Mr. BARR. So 24 pages of detailed questions with numerous subparts might be the bare minimum?

Mr. BARRON. There is a legislative requirement that——

Mr. BARR. You are starting to smile. You cannot say that with a straight face, can you?

Mr. BARRON. The reason I was smiling is I think that some of the——

Mr. BARR. You are smiling because there is no way that it can legitimately be maintained that this is the bare minimum information that the Government needs to get a handle on how many people are in this country.

Mr. BARRON. No, these are population characteristics, not numbers of people. I think some of the length is coming from the fact that we do ask a set of questions for each person. That makes it longer.

Mr. BARR. So what is it specifically that you are going to do to pare this thing down?

Mr. BARRON. First we are going to meet with the Office of Management and Budget which has asked every Federal agency to examine the questions that they say are required by law in this form and to explain back to the Office of Management and Budget is this true or is it not true. We are going to examine that, we are going to document it, and then I hope we can come back up to Capitol Hill and share that with folks up here so that they understand that this is the situation that we are dealing with.

Mr. BARR. And when you do that you will not just look at the number of questions, but all of these cockamamie subparts. Some of these questions go on for columns.

Mr. BARRON. I promise you that we will look at all the cockamamie subparts.

Mr. BARR. Thank you. And I know that you are concerned about this, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to working with you to address the very serious privacy concerns that we have with this sort of detailed information project. Thank you. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MILLER. On the mandatory issue, is that a determination that Congress will ultimately make on whether this is mandatory, or will OMB or Census Bureau issue the decision?

Mr. BARRON. I do not know who has the ultimate authority on that, Mr. Miller. Given the obvious sensitivity, we would come up and talk with——

Mr. MILLER. What impact will it have on response rates and all that?

Mr. BARRON. That is a worry. Our sense both from talking to our staff who actually goes out and knocks on doors as well as the several times when this has been tested in the past, the sense is that

if it is not mandatory the response rates will go down and costs would go up and accuracy would deteriorate. Obviously, that is a very serious concern to us. The life-cycle cost document we have provided you assumes, that the ACS has got a sample size now that is right at the cusp of what is going to meet the important objectives that we think need to be met to provide local data. If it gets cut further, we would be very worried. Similarly, therefore, if response deteriorated further, we would be very worried.

Our concern is maintaining response and maintaining the ability to provide accurate data.

Mr. MILLER. We have to go vote right now. But one question, and I remember seeing the report on the 2000 census about all the long form questions and the documentation, if it is going to be something that we can legislatively do to reduce questions and if they are not essential, I think we need to revisit them. I know the only question that was added since the 1990 census was one that was added in the welfare reform about grandparents. So that is the type of thing that is mandated by Congress that I think maybe we need to revisit.

We will stand in recess for a quick vote.

[Recess.]

Mr. CANNON [assuming Chair]. The subcommittee will be in order.

Mr. Clay, do you have some questions that you would like to ask?

Mr. CLAY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me to request unanimous consent to submit an opening statement.

Mr. CANNON. Without objection, so ordered.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Wm. Lacy Clay follows:]

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WM. LACY CLAY FOR THE CENSUS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY

JUNE 13, 2001

Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome the witnesses from both panels testifying today. I want to especially welcome Mr. William Barron, Acting Director of the U.S. Census Bureau who will testify on Panel I. I also want to welcome the witnesses for Panel II, Mr. Paul Voss, Ms. Linda Gage, Mr. Don Hernandez and Mr. Gary Phillips.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for bringing our attention to this issue. The American Community Survey, like many government programs, comes to us full of promise, and with a large price tag. It is our responsibility to judge whether or not this expenditure is in the public interest, and whether or not the program can fulfill the promises made to the American public.

From the first census in 1790, Congress has seen the decennial census as an opportunity to collect information about the character of the nation. In 1790, Congress wanted the census to collect information about occupation, but the Senate objected. As James Madison reported to Thomas Jefferson, the Senate considered collecting this additional information "a waste of trouble and supplying materials for idle people to make a book."

Congress expanded the census throughout the 19th century. By the end of the century, the census had collected literally thousands of items

on a number of different forms covering topics like population, mortality, agriculture, manufacturing, libraries, fish and fisheries, wealth and debt, religious organizations, surviving soldiers, and inmates of soldiers' homes.

The long form, as we know it today, began in 1960 when the Census Bureau divided the census questions into two forms -- a short form, sent to every household, and a long form, sent to only a sample of households. The Census Bureau first began experimenting with asking some questions of a sample of households in 1940. In that census, 15 of the 85 questions were asked only of a sample of households.

After the 1980 census, Congress began pressing for a shorter census. After 1990, that pressure intensified. The American Community Survey is an attempt to address those Congressional concerns.

There are three questions I hope we can begin to answer today. First, how well does this survey serve small communities? Second, how do we justify to our constituents the cost and increased burden of the ACS? Finally, how do we measure the success or failure of the ACS in time to determine whether or not we need to continue the long form in 2010?

The census, as Director Prewitt was fond of saying, is an American ceremony. As such, it represents the best aspects of our society - equality, fairness, and a commitment to protect the minority. In this case, the minority is small places. The testimony today suggests to me that the ACS has not yet found an answer to providing equal treatment of small villages. In fact, it may be going in the wrong direction.

The cost of the ACS is still a serious question. The cost of the census has increased steadily over the past few censuses. According to

recent work by GAO, in 1980, the real dollar cost per household of the census was about $24 in 1998 dollars. That increased to $31 for the 1990 census. The 2000 census appears to have cost about $56 dollars per household. The 2003 cost for the ACS sample of 3 million households is about $140 million. That is a cost of $46 per household in 2003, or $43 per household in 1998 dollars, without any 2010 costs added in. If the ACS fails to serve well the smallest communities, that is not money well spent.

Finally, Congress needs a well-defined set of milestones and performance measures for the ACS. Ultimately, Congress must judge the success of the ACS. Without adequate performance measures, that task will be too political. Performance measures and data for managers to track operations were inadequate in the 2000 census. The ACS will fail if it progresses along that same path.

I look forward to today's hearing. The ACS represents both the promise and the difficulties of innovation in the government. The ACS promises to be a major step forward for our statistical information system. The road, however, has not been an easy one. Innovation within the federal government is done with everyone looking over your shoulder. Maintaining the integrity of a design while responding to advice from the outside is difficult. I am sure, to those of you responsible for the survey, that has been a heavy burden at times.

The officials at the Census Bureau are to be congratulated for pursuing this initiative. I hope they will welcome a partnership with Congress, in the final stages of development, with the same enthusiasm that has been devoted to the initial stages of creating the American Community Survey.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you. Mr. Barron, let me first thank you for being here today and for your testimony. I am pleased that we are able to focus on the American Community Survey in a bipartisan spirit of inquiry. I hope you will take my questions in that spirit and not as an attack on the ACS.

As we approach the full funding of the ACS in the fiscal year 2003, Congress must determine whether this expenditure is in the best interest of the Government. We must ask if we are going to invest $130 to $140 million a year in our statistical infrastructure is the ACS the best investment we can make. There are proposals before the Congress to create a registry of violent deaths, similar in structure to the birth registration system. Others are urging Congress to improve the collection of information on the service sector. In fact, the Census Bureau is urging Congress to improve collection of information on electronic transactions. Still others would have us improve collection of information on the environment, or on energy supply and consumption, or on the supply of fish in the ocean. Our questions today are to help us make the judgment of whether we should fund the ACS or not.

Would you please tell us why you think that funding the ACS is the best investment we can make today in the Federal statistical system.

Mr. BARRON. Sure, Mr. Clay, I would like to try. I think it would be the best investment for the Federal statistical system because it is going to be a smart investment, an investment that is going to have to be made in 2010. In other words, the plan that we are proposing, when you look at all parts of it, not just the conduct of the American Community Survey, but the fact that if we are able to launch it completely, it would replace the long form. If you look at the cost of a re-engineered census—which we can do if we start now to plan it—if we improve our way of assembling a master address file and use new technology, and we are way behind local areas in fact in terms of use of technology, and if we can replace the long form with an ACS, we actually have a proposal that is cost neutral. And while I know there are a lot of important statistical needs in the other statistical agencies, and I know from my own personal experience that is a very serious problem, I think one advantage we have over them is that we have a cost neutral proposal to do something that, in fact, is a constitutional mandate.

So I think we have some important advantages that need to be considered as we discuss this proposal with you.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you for that. We will hear from witnesses later today one of the primary purposes of the ACS is to provide small area data that will replace the data currently collected as a part of the decennial census. The Census Bureau has decided to provide small communities with data which are somewhat less precise than the long form in exchange for 5 year averages updated each year. Can you explain to us why you believe this is advantageous to local governments?

Mr. BARRON. Well, it is a tradeoff that we are making, Mr. Clay. But it is a tradeoff that we think is providing data that is of good quality, slightly less in terms of measures of accuracy, but very comparable to the data that is available from the long form, in terms of sampling error. In terms of nonsampling error, the fact

that we are going to have the data collected by an experienced enumerator, and we will be able to follow up—we think there are some important data quality advantages in that process. And the fact that we will have an ongoing stream of data is an important advantage.

So we think that relative to providing data once a decade—by the time the local area folks receive it it is often 12 years old—we think that this has some very powerful advantages.

Mr. CLAY. It is my understanding that there are no new funds requested in your 2002 budget to improve the demographic analysis estimates for the State and county estimates program. Have you considered reprogramming some of the remaining decennial census funds to improve these estimate programs in 2002?

Mr. BARRON. We have and we are still looking at it. We have not made a final decision. We are also looking at future budget cycles, but that is beyond the scope of what I could talk about today.

Mr. CLAY. When do you think you will make a decision?

Mr. BARRON. I think as we get into the summer and we go through the next set of deliberations that the Executive Steering Committee on Adjustment Policy needs to go through, I think we in the Census Bureau are going to come out of that process with a better insight as to what we have in terms of the demographic analysis system. It needs to be improved. Whether we need more resources or can use some existing resources in the short run is really the issue we can look at in the summer. It does need to be improved.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER [resuming Chair]. Mr. Barron, thank you very much for being here today. I am glad we are planning ahead for 2010. It just seems like we have not even finished all the data for 2000 and we are immediately planning for 2010, which is exactly what has to be done. So thank you for the leadership you are providing at the Bureau. Thank you for being here.

Mr. BARRON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. We will take a short recess till the next panel comes up.

[Recess.]

Mr. MILLER. Our next panel consists of Mr. Paul Voss, who represents the Department of Rural Sociology at the University of Wisconsin at Madison; Ms. Linda Gage, representing the California State Census Data Center; Mr. Donald Hernandez, who is the Chair of the Population Association of America; and Ms. Marilyn McMillen is the Chief Statistician for the Center for Educational Statistics at the Department of Education.

As is the procedure here in this particular committee, we have you sworn in. So if you would all stand and raise your right hands for the oath.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. MILLER. The witnesses have all answered in the affirmative.

We will begin with Mr. Voss. Welcome. If you would proceed with your opening statement, please, sir. And if you see me get up and leave, I have just been notified there is a vote upstairs on the appropriation committee. I apologize in advance for that. And we will

probably have another vote on the floor I am guessing in another hour or something like that.

STATEMENTS OF PAUL VOSS, DEPARTMENT OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON; LINDA GAGE, CALIFORNIA STATE CENSUS DATA CENTER, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE; DONALD HERNANDEZ, POPULATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, SUNY-ALBANY; AND MARILYN MCMILLEN, CHIEF STATISTICIAN, CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. VOSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could you tell us how much time approximately you would like us to take.

Mr. MILLER. I think we would like to hold it 5 minutes. But your full statement will be made a part of the record.

Mr. VOSS. Five minutes. Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clay, members of the committee, I appreciate your invitation to be here today and to offer my comments on the subject of the American Community Survey. Specifically, I have been asked to reflect on any implications the ACS might have on the quality of data for rural areas and small population groups, and I will mostly confine my comments to that topic. I am going to skip over roughly the first half of my prepared remarks. That was the part that was quite complimentary to the Census Bureau. I am now going to skip to the other half. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. We will include all your statements in the record.

Mr. VOSS. Basically, I work in an academic research setting focusing on rural areas. I am engaged on almost a daily basis on data analysis and in providing data assistance to the hundred of rural communities, rural agencies, rural small businesses in my State. I also mentioned in my prepared testimony that because of that particular interest in rural areas, small places, small population groups, I was, for a time, an early critic of the initial plans for the ACS. But having now spent considerable time evaluating the evolving ACS procedures and recognizing its potential ability to yield timely and useful data for rural areas and small places, I have pretty much now reached my peace with this new initiative. With the changes in the ACS design that have been implemented over the past several years, and having first-hand awareness of the Census Bureau's willingness to listen and respond to the data user community, I now believe the ACS does have the potential to meet rural information needs over the course of the decade better than does the traditional census long form.

However, the durability of my peace with the ACS is contingent upon the Census Bureau's ability to base rural ACS data on a sufficiently large sample for the data to have a level of statistical precision similar to that provided by the census long form sample. This has been the goal of the ACS all along. But in this regard, it is my present option that the ACS is beginning to fall short of this goal.

In my view, the ACS, as currently moving forward in this critical period of testing and evaluation, is extraordinarily fragile. The over-sample for small places, which I mentioned earlier in my testimony, has been reduced significantly from that discussed by the ACS team 3 and 4 years ago and is substantially below that used

for the census 2000 long form sample. I give two highly specific illustrations in my written testimony, but here let me summarize.

Not all that many years ago, the ACS team at the Bureau was projecting that ACS estimates would have levels of uncertainty around 25 percent larger than corresponding long form estimates. That is a substantial difference in precision. Yet, regrettably, current plans at the Census Bureau are now aiming for uncertainty levels around 33 percent larger than comparable long form estimates. Can the ACS still meet its goals with these sampling fractions and these levels of estimate uncertainty? I confess to having considerable anxiety on this question.

Certainly there are efficiencies that can be gained by fine tuning the sampling and estimation procedures. But my biggest fear as I testify before you today is that the Census Bureau, in its desire to convince the Congress that a fully implemented ACS is cost neutral over the long haul, has the potential of not asking you for enough money to actually fully support this important and exciting initiative. Any further reduction in funding, to a level below what I suspect is the Census Bureau's already too modest goal, could well place the quality of small area data from the ACS outside the range of acceptability to the small area data user. And such an outcome likely could revert user preferences away from a weak ACS and back to the traditional census long form.

Now let me be very clear. I am a supporter of the ACS and I do not wish to see that happen. But my fear, if ACS data decline any further in reliability, any further in precision, is that a groundswell could develop around the notion that statistically more precise data available only once each decade are preferable to less precise data provided on a continuous basis. Or said another way, timely data are important, but only if they are reliable, only if they meet certain minimum levels of precision. In its sampling design for the ACS, and in a world of tradeoffs, in a highly responsible effort to contain both costs and respondent burden in this initiative, the Census Bureau has already sacrificed some of the statistical precision that communities of all sizes have come to appreciate in the census long form data. This weakens the utility of the data for small villages, for city tracts, for block groups, and for neighborhoods. Any further weakening will likely be the beginning of the undoing of this exciting data innovation.

My fervent hope, then, for a sound ACS, as it moves into full implementation in 2003, is that the risk of truly "full" implementation be tried; that the Census Bureau continue to work with its partners in the data user community and with its congressional partners to ensure sufficient funding for the ACS actually to do what it promised almost a decade ago to do—to meet the continuing data needs of all of America's communities, to provide such communities with annually refreshed, statistically reliable data for the small areas that make up these communities, and thereby to enable America's communities to make better decisions for their people and to use their limited resources more responsibly.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to speak with the subcommittee. I would be happy to take questions if there are any.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Voss follows:]

Statement of

Paul R. Voss, Ph.D.
Professor of Rural Sociology
Director, Wisconsin Applied Population Laboratory
University of Wisconsin-Madison

before the

Subcommittee on the Census
Committee on Government Reform
Congress of the United States

June 13, 2001

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clay, Members of the Subcommittee:

I very much appreciate your invitation to be here today and to offer my comments on the subject of the American Community Survey (ACS). Specifically, I have been asked to reflect on any implications the ACS might have on the quality of data for rural areas and small population groups, and I will mostly confine my comments to this topic. This is a matter I have spoken about and written about over the past seven years, and with your permission I wish to append to my oral testimony this afternoon a more extensive statement I prepared in 1999 under the title, "The American Community Survey and Small American Communities."

My name is Paul Voss. I am Professor of Rural Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Director of the Wisconsin Applied Population Laboratory – an applied research and outreach activity working to assist governmental units, communities, school districts, organizations and small businesses throughout Wisconsin to acquire and use census data in order to do their jobs better. I also represent the Population Association of America, the professional association of demographers in North America, on the Commerce Department's Decennial Census Advisory Committee.

In the brief time I have to speak with you this afternoon, let me organize my remarks around a single theme. I have chosen to address the fundamental purpose and role anticipated for the ACS in America's statistical infrastructure. In doing so, I will comment along the way on how I perceive things are going for the ACS and on the likely quality of data to be issued from the ACS for rural areas and small governmental jurisdictions.

It sometimes is said that the purpose of the ACS is to replace the long form portion of the decennial census with a monthly rolling survey activity. While unburdening the decennial census of the obligation to gather detailed social and economic data for the nation has turned out, as I see it, to be a highly fortuitous outcome the ACS, the original and fundamental purpose of the ACS is to provide this nation, and its institutions of governance at all levels (large and small), with annually updated data necessary for effectively and equitably managing their affairs.

The earliest ideas for a rolling monthly survey with which to gather and report such information can be traced to members of the professional statistical community who were closely involved with sample survey data and the U.S. statistical system. But the real urgency for the implementation of these ideas in what we today know as the ACS came from this very House Subcommittee – or more correctly, a predecessor of your subcommittee. As you know, Mr. Chairman, in the early 1990s it was your predecessor, Ohio Congressman Tom Sawyer, who insisted that the Census Bureau begin developing a means of making available to the Congress critical data about our country and its communities on a more timely basis than once every ten years. Data provided only once each decade by the census long form simply are inadequate for the Congress to legislate, and for the Executive agencies of Federal government to effectively manage, the variety of social programs for which they are responsible and the billions of dollars in funding they must target on the communities, school districts and neighborhoods eligible to receive those funds. Old data, regardless of their accuracy at the time of data collection, cannot possibly serve decade-long programmatic needs in an era of fast-paced demographic change and devolution of authority.

The Census Bureau responded by designating a small team of talented career professionals to begin breathing life into this new Congressional initiative. And, quite frankly, the early plans for what at the time was rather inauspiciously called "Continuous Measurement" did not meet very well the needs of all governmental units in this nation. I was a vocal critic of these initial plans because I believed they had a strong bias favoring states and large cities and counties while not addressing well the exact parallel needs of thousands of small governmental units. To their credit – and I want to be very clear and complimentary in saying this – the ACS staff at the Census Bureau listened to their critics and returned to their offices to rework the initial ACS design to make it more responsive to local concerns. Let me give some specific examples of their positive responses.

Small-Area Data Precision. Census Bureau staff revised the initial ACS sampling design to provide more precise data for small places and rural areas. They accomplish this by over-sampling (that is, drawing a proportionately larger sample) in small governmental jurisdictions and school districts. I will say more about this in a moment, but it may be helpful at this point in my testimony if I were briefly to explain what I mean by statistical terms that will appear again and again in the remainder of my comments. When speaking about an estimate from the census long form survey or from the ACS survey I will use the words "precise" of "reliable" to refer to the level of uncertainty or, said another way, to the level of confidence we can attach to that estimate. In polling terms, a survey estimate of 30% ± 2% is a considerably more precise estimate than, say, 30% ± 5%. Sample size and sample design both control the level of confidence we can attach to an estimate. To their credit, it became an eventual goal of the ACS development team to design an ACS sampling plan that would yield ACS estimates that were roughly comparable in their levels of precision for geographic areas both large and small, for big cities, small villages, school districts and census tracts.

Boundary Changes. The Census Bureau developed a plan to gather and tabulate data for communities whose boundaries change during the period of data collection. This is a tricky matter, but their plan largely resolves the dilemma of how to provide data that has

been collected over a five-year period for a community whose boundaries have been affected during that period by an annexation, a new incorporation, or some other change in official geography.

Data Gathering Rules and Procedures. The ACS team listened to concerns expressed by data users regarding the implications of differences in data collection procedures between the ACS and the census long form. Fortunately, such differences will be the focus of an ambitious research agenda over the course of the next two years. Many data users, I am among them, want to understand the effect of on-going *monthly* data collection (compared to *point-in-time* long form data collection) for communities subjected, for example, to large shifts in seasonal populations.

Multi-Year Data Averaging. The Bureau's ACS staff is also working with data users on such matters as the meaning, in an ACS context, of time-referenced periods (such as "last year" or "five years ago") for data that have been averaged over a multi-year time frame. And they are helping on such matters as how to communicate to less sophisticated data users the interpretation of a rolling average on topics like median income or a child poverty rate. The ACS staff not only shares these concerns of data users, but they are working closely with the data user community to help carry out the research necessary to provide clarity on these issues.

I said earlier that I work in an academic research setting focusing mostly on rural issues. I am engaged on almost a daily basis in data analysis and in providing data assistance to the hundreds of rural communities, rural agencies, and rural small businesses in my state. I also mentioned that I was, for a time, a critic of the early plans for the ACS. Having now spent considerable time evaluating the early ACS procedures and early results, and recognizing its potential ability to yield timely and useful data for rural areas and small places, I have now reached my peace with this new initiative. With the changes in the ACS design that have been implemented over the past several years, and having first-hand awareness of the Census Bureau's willingness to listen and respond to the data user

community, I now believe the ACS has the potential to meet rural information needs over the course of a decade better than does the traditional census long form.

However, the durability of this peace is contingent upon the Census Bureau's ability to base rural ACS data on a sufficiently large sample for the data to have a level of statistical precision similar to that provided by the census long form sample. And in this regard it is my present opinion that the ACS is beginning to fall short of this goal. In my view, the ACS, as currently moving forward in this critical period of testing and evaluation, is extraordinarily fragile. The over-sample for small places, mentioned earlier in my testimony, has been reduced significantly from that discussed by the ACS team three and four years ago and is also substantially below that used for the Census 2000 long form sample. The very smallest governmental units in the U.S. (those communities with 800 housing units or fewer) are now being sampled at the rate of 7.5% annually. This would yield an effective sample over a five year period of 37.5% compared to the 50% sample used for the 2000 Census long form in the nation's smallest communities. Small governmental units with between 800 and 1,200 housing units are now sampled in the ACS at 3.75% annually. This yields a five-year sample of 18.75% compared to approximately 25% for the 2000 long form. Recall that lower rates of sampling mean lower levels of precision. Lower rates of sampling mean higher levels of uncertainty.

Not all that many years ago, the ACS team at the Bureau was projecting that ACS estimates would have levels of uncertainty around 25% larger than corresponding long form estimates. That's a substantial increase in uncertainty. Yet, regrettably, current plans at the Census Bureau are now aiming for uncertainty levels around 33% larger than long form estimates. Can the ACS still meet its goals with these sampling fractions and these levels of estimate uncertainty? I confess to having considerable anxiety on this question. Certainly there are efficiencies that can be gained by fine tuning the sampling and estimation procedures. But my biggest fear as I testify before you today is that the Census Bureau, in its zeal to convince the Congress that a fully implemented ACS is cost neutral over the long haul, has the potential of not asking you for enough money to support this important and exciting initiative. Any further reduction in funding, to a level below what I suspect is the Census Bureau's already too-modest goal, could well place the quality of small-area data from the ACS outside the range of acceptability to the small-area data user. And such an outcome likely could revert user preferences away from a weak ACS and back to the traditional census long form. Let me be very clear: I

am a supporter of the ACS concept, and I do not wish to see this happen. But my fear, if ACS data decline any further in reliability, any further in precision, is that a groundswell could develop around the notion that statistically precise data available only once each decade are preferable to highly imprecise data provided on a continuous basis. Said another way, timely data are important -- but only if they are reliable; only if they meet certain levels of precision. In its sampling design for the ACS, and in a highly responsible effort to contain both costs and respondent burden in this initiative, the Census Bureau has already sacrificed some of the statistical precision that communities of all sizes have come to appreciate in the census long-form data. This weakens the utility the data for small villages, for city tracts, for block groups, and neighborhoods where most people live. Any further weakening will likely be the beginning of the undoing of this exciting data innovation. But innovation is generally accompanied by risk, and the eventual high payoff from the ACS seems to warrant taking that risk at this time.

My fervent hope, then, for a sound ACS, as it moves into full implementation in 2003, is that the risk of *truly* "full" implementation be tried; that the Census Bureau continue to work with its partners in the data user community and with its Congressional partners to ensure sufficient funding for the ACS actually to do what it promised almost a decade ago to do: to meet the continuing data needs of *all* of America's communities; to provide such communities with annually refreshed, statistically reliable data for the small areas that make up these communities; and thereby to enable America's communities to make better decisions for their people and allocate their resources more equitably and more responsibly.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to speak with the Subcommittee. I'm happy to take questions at this point.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. We will proceed with the statements. As I said, everyone's written statements will be included in the record.

Next we have Ms. Linda Gage from the California State Census Data Center, California Department of Finance.

Ms. GAGE. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today to represent the State of California in discussions about the American Community Survey. The State of California, along with its councils of governments, city, county, and tribal governments, relies on high quality census data. Data from the decennial census not only help determine the amount of funding the State receives from various Federal programs but also supports a myriad of decisions throughout each decade on the allocation of funds and resources throughout the State. The data further support needs assessment for State programs, site and size of service locations, and program evaluation.

It is our goal that official data published about the people of California, and used in policy and funding decisions, be as current, complete, and accurate as possible. Since the early 1950's the State has invested in an independent demographic research program to annually update the population and housing counts of our jurisdictions to allow us to more equitably distribute State subventions and to plan and budget public services based on current demographic data. The State also devotes considerable support and expertise to the Census Bureau's decennial census, and other demographic programs, to aid the collection and estimation of complete and accurate information about the State's residents.

We support the full development and rigorous evaluation of the American Community Survey as a method to collect and provide more complete and more current demographic information between censuses. At this time we feel it is premature to endorse the ACS as the preferred method for collecting long form data in 2010.

Our primary interests are in the prognosis for the full development of the survey, the plan and timeline for evaluation of the survey data, and the determination of the role of the ACS in the 2010 census.

Full development of the ACS is contingent upon adequate funding, maintenance of a current and comprehensive master address file, and successful implementation of the survey for the next 7 years.

The survey is designed to publish annual 1-year estimates for areas of 65,000 or more population beginning in 2001. This is fewer than 2 percent of our cities and 24 percent of our counties. The survey would produce annual 3 year averages for areas between 20,000 and 65,000 population beginning in the year 2006. That is only 6 percent of our cities. And annual 5 year averages for areas and population groups of less than 20,000 population beginning in the year 2008. This is over 92 percent of our cities and 43 percent of our counties. On the current schedule, with no delays or shortfalls, the ACS will not be fully implemented with the data published until 2008.

The plan for collecting long form data in the 2000 census was to distribute a separate questionnaire to roughly 1 in 6 housing units nationally. We heard this morning that the ACS is not designed

with the same sampling rate for 2000 through 2010. If the sample size is smaller, is cut due to funding shortfalls, or remains static as population and housing growth occurs in our Nation, the data produced by the ACS may not be of sufficient quality to substitute for the 2010 long form.

The sample size for the ACS and the effect of lower sample sizes on the quality of data need to be specified in advance of a decision to endorse the ACS.

Concerning the evaluation of the ACS, the State of California has a longstanding concern about the accuracy of the Census Bureau's intercensal estimates of the State's population. They have been consistently lower than the independent estimates produced by the State and less accurate than the State's estimates when compared to decennial census counts. Since the 2000 census data were released, we have additional concerns that the Bureau also underestimates the national population. The Bureau's estimate for Census Day was 6.9 million persons lower than the number counted in the census, a 2.5 percent underestimate. If the ACS is not controlled to accurate population estimates, the long form data produced will be seriously flawed. Evaluation of the intercensal estimates is a critical component in the evaluation of the ACS data.

We are concerned that success in the 31 comparisonsites and in the Nation's largest jurisdictions will be encouraging but not definitive. They may form a sufficient base to suggest the potential, but not to demonstrate the ability, of the survey to collect high quality small area long form data across the country 9 years from now.

We are concerned about how data that are released from the ACS in the years 2006 and 2008 can be evaluated for accuracy since they will be so far beyond the 2000 census. We are concerned about whether these jurisdictions will have the same coverage and quality as the 2000 decennial census and as the data published for larger cities and counties.

There are case studies and anecdotes to suggest the usefulness of the ACS; however, a continuous and systematic evaluation is needed.

We recommend that continuing the successful partnerships created in the 2000 census process and expanding them to assist the Census Bureau in planning and evaluating documented usage and promoting the ACS.

As the role of the ACS is determined for the 2010 census, the dominant issues are cost, coverage, quality, and confidence. We recommend that the 2010 census planning include a contingency for a long form questionnaire until a positive decision to use the ACS can be made.

And we strongly recommend that a decision date, along with milestones and critical measurements, be established and monitored to support a recommendation and decision to use the ACS. It should be monitored annually for variables, identified in advance, that are critical to its success. Such critical measurements include cost, sample sizes, response rates, data quality, and the status of the master address file.

It is our hope that an ACS that is appropriately funded for full development will improve the 2010 census and meet the Census

Bureau's goals to provide annual timely information to States and local governments.

We offer our continued assistance in evaluating the procedures and results of the 2000 census, the ACS, and in planning the 2010 census.

We certainly want to thank members of the subcommittee for their continuing oversight of census programs and for the opportunity to testify today. I would be pleased to answer any questions that you have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Gage follows:]

Statement of
Linda Gage
State of California
Governor's Liaison for Census 2000 and Liaison to Demographic Programs
before the
Committee on Government Reform's Subcommittee on the Census
June 13, 2001

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for the privilege of appearing before you to represent the State of California in discussions about the American Community Survey (ACS), the Census Bureau's proposed alternative to the long form questionnaire in the 2010 census.

The State of California along its councils of governments, city, county and tribal governments, race and ethnic communities, the academic community, the private sector and the media rely on high quality census data. Data from the decennial census not only help determine the amount of funding the state receives from various federal government programs but also supports a myriad of decisions throughout each decade on the allocation of funds and other resources within the state. The data further support needs assessment for state programs, site and size of service locations, and program evaluation.

It is our goal that official data published about the people of California, and used in policy and funding decisions, be as current, complete, and accurate as possible. The state changes dramatically in size and composition between decennial censuses. Since the early 1950s we have invested in an independent demographic research program to annually update the population and housing counts of our jurisdictions to allow us to more equitably distribute state subventions and to plan and budget public services based on current demographic data. The state also devotes support and expertise to the Census Bureau's decennial census, and other demographic programs, to aid the collection and estimation of complete and accurate information about the state's residents.

We support the full development and rigorous evaluation of the American Community Survey as a method to collect and provide more complete and more current demographic information between censuses and as a possible means to collect those data traditionally collected on the decennial long form in the 2010 census. However, at this time, we feel it is premature to endorse the ACS as the preferred method for collecting long form data in 2010.

Our primary interests are in the prognosis for the full development of the survey, the plan and timeline for evaluation and validation of the survey data, and determination of the role of the ACS in the 2010 census.

Full Development of the American Community Survey

Full development of the ACS is contingent upon adequate funding, maintenance of a current and comprehensive master address file, and successful implementation of the survey for the next seven years.

Why such a long time? Currently, the survey is collecting data in just thirty-one counties for comparison with the 2000 decennial census and has produced 1999 vintage data for twenty-one

sites. The other comparison sites are below the population thresholds for data aggregation and release.

The planned collection of ACS data begins nationally in 2003. The survey is designed to publish annual 1-year estimates for areas of 65,000 or more population beginning in 2002; annual 3-year averages for areas between 20,000-65,000 population beginning in 2006; and annual 5-year averages for areas and population groups less than 20,000 population beginning in 2008. On the current schedule, with no delays or shortfalls, the ACS will not be fully implemented until the end of 2007 and data will not be published until 2008.

Planned Data Release Dates: Nationwide American Community Survey

Year	Population		
	65,000 or greater (1-year estimate)	20,000 or greater (3-year average)	Below 20,000 (5-year average)
2004	X		
2005	X		
2006	X	2003-2005	
2007	X	2004-2006	
2008	X	2005-2007	2003-2007
2009	X	2006-2008	2004-2008

An Average for the previous calendar year

Data from the 2000 Census reveal that fewer than 2 percent of the nation's cities and 24 percent of our counties had populations greater than 65,000, the threshold for producing annual 1-year estimates. About 6 percent of our cities are in the middle population range for which the ACS will produce annual estimates averaged over a 3-year collection period. Over 92 percent of our cities are below 20,000 population. The ACS will not produce data for the vast majority of our jurisdictions until the data collected in 2003 through 2007 are averaged over the 5 year period and published in 2008.

The plan for collecting long form data in the 2000 decennial census was to distribute a separate questionnaire to roughly 1 in 6 housing units nationally (16.7% of our housing stock), with over-sampling in small areas. Will the ACS be designed with the same sampling rate from 2003 through 2010 and be sufficiently developed to deliver long form data of a quality comparable to the 2000 Census?

If the sample size for the ACS data collection is lower than for the 2000 census, what is the minimum sampling rate or sample size needed to be confident that the data collected in the ACS are strong enough to produce accurate 2010 long-form data? If a specific sample size is selected, are there provisions for the ACS sample to maintain pace with the nation's housing

growth during the decade? If the sample is cut due to funding shortfalls or remains static as housing growth occurs, the data produced by the ACS may not be adequate to substitute for the traditional long-form in 2010. Between the 1990 and 2000 censuses, the nation's housing stock increased by 13,.6 million units, a 13 percent growth. For example, if we had started with a long-form sample of 17 million housing units in the 1990 census, a 1 in 6 sample, but did not increase the number of housing units sampled in the 2000 census to account for the growth in housing units, the long form questionnaire would have gone to only 14.7% of the housing units in census 2000 rather than 16.7% as in 1990, a sample of closer to 1 in 7 units than 1 in 6.

The sample size for the ACS and the effect of lower sample sizes on the quality of data and need to be specified in advance of a decision to endorse the ACS.

Evaluation of the American Community Survey

The State of California has a long-standing concern about the accuracy of the Census Bureau's intercensal estimates of the state's population. They have been consistently lower than the independent estimates produced by the State and less accurate than the State's estimates when compared to decennial census population counts. Since the 2000 Census were released, we have additional concerns that the Bureau's estimates are also underestimating the national population. The Bureau's estimate for Census Day, April, 1 2000, was 6.9 million persons lower than the number counted in the census, an underestimate of 2.5 percent. If the ACS is not controlled to accurate population estimates, the long form data produced will be seriously flawed. We believe the evaluation of the intercensal estimates is a critical component in the evaluation of the ACS.

The timeliness of the ACS data is a benefit only if the data are accurate and comparable for all areas. There has been no evaluation of the ACS long form data collection success measured against the 2000 census data. Rigorous evaluation of the data quality will require eight years of continuous research attention to the results produced by the survey.

This summer, important information about what items in the ACS are comparable to the decennial collection and identification of items where there may be substantial differences will be gained when the performance of the ACS in twenty-one of the comparison sites and the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey results with can be evaluated with census short form data. This will provide an early analysis of how well the Census Bureau's intercensal population estimates are performing as survey controls of total population, race/ethnicity, gender, and age and identify differences in the responses to other short form data items such as vacancy, household relationship, and housing tenure.

Next year, the comparison of the ACS and the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey to Census 2000 long form data for all the states and our largest governments and comparison of individual data item can begin. Next summer 2000 vintage ACS data for the comparison sites, the results of the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey that will support additional analysis for states and for cities and counties of 250,000 or greater population, and the actual long form data from Census 2000 will be available to the public, local governments and the academic community.

Success in the thirty-one comparison sites and in the nation's states and largest jurisdictions will be encouraging but not definitive. The largest and fewest jurisdictions, those evaluated first, represent 231 counties and 67 cities — seven percent of our counties and less than one-half of one percent of our cities. They may form a sufficient base to suggest the potential, but not

demonstrate the ability, of the survey to successfully collect high quality small area long form data across the country nine years from now.

How will we evaluate ACS data for population groups between 20,000 and 65,000 that will be collected and aggregated during 2003 and 2005, averaged over the three-year period, then published in 2006? Six percent of our cities and one-third of our counties are in this population category. There will be no temporal reference to the 2000 census and there is no planned validation with the 2010 census.

Comprehensive analysis of the comparison sites and the Supplementary Survey Data will not reveal the quality of the data collected by the ACS for our smallest and most numerous jurisdictions, those with fewer than 20,000 inhabitants. The ACS will not collect sufficient data to publish results for these areas until 2008.

This will be the first meaningful look we have for our smaller counties and cities. A population threshold of 20,000 may seem quite low but the results of the 2000 census showed that forty-three percent of the counties and ninety-two percent of the nation's cities were below this size. How will we evaluate the ACS results for those 1,300 counties and 23,000 cities? What is the comparison? Will they have the same coverage and quality as the 2000 decennial data or for data published for larger cities and counties? Will there be administrative, or other, data to evaluate some of the long form data in some or all of these jurisdictions?



There are some case studies and anecdotes that suggest the usefulness of the ACS; however a continuous and systematic evaluation is needed. As with the decennial census program, the ACS would benefit from a published evaluation plan and schedule including: results to date, case studies and local evaluations, comparisons of the survey results based on both 1990- and 2000-based estimates with actual census 2000 data items, comparison of data quality with independent data sources, currency and completeness of the master address file, possible

improvements to survey procedures, response rates, sample size, and coverage by race/ethnic and age group.

The Census 2000 Supplementary Survey controlled to Census 2000 should show good results and that will be an important comparison. The comparison of 2000 ACS survey results controlled to 1990-based estimates is especially important to show what survey results ten years after a decennial census would have shown versus what they show when we overlay the results of the current census. Evaluating the 2000 ACS data produced using 1990 census-based estimates as controls will avoid masking strengths or weaknesses of the ACS and missing opportunities to understand and improve the survey and the estimates controls.

Additional items for evaluation include sampling for non-response follow-up and the characteristics of the non-responding population, the effects of decreasing the number of respondents for which complete data are collected from 7 in the 1990 census to 6 in the 2000 census to 5 on the ACS, need to evaluate the content of the short-form in view of the performance of the ACS, research possible means and data sources to validate the accuracy of long form data, quality of data for jurisdictions in the three population size groupings, and support need for non-English speakers such as questionnaires, telephone and interviewer assistance? Is the survey the best way to collect group quarters information? Can administrative records be used to supplement or validate group quarters data? What is the comparability of data items from the ACS and decennial census such as residence, income data, and vacancy rates?

There were special limitations of the 1999 ACS estimates partly because of differences between the race and Hispanic origin questions on the ACS questionnaire and the wording of these questions on the 1990 census. How will similar changes in content to decennial censuses be handled in the ACS?

What are the likely effects of the survey not being mandatory? The public will have increased exposure to the long form over the decade. Will there be increased resistance to participation such that the non-response rates are too high? What is that level?

We recommend continuing the successful partnerships created in the 2000 census process and expanding them to assist the Census Bureau in evaluating and promoting the ACS. Partners on advisory groups, in local and tribal governments, academic institutions, community groups, and the business community can assist the Bureau in evaluating the data quality and documenting the uses and usage of the ACS.

Role of the American Community Survey in the 2010 Census

The dominant issues surrounding the collection of decennial census data remain cost, coverage, quality and confidence. Will the cost of collecting long form data using the American Community Survey be supported throughout a decade and will those data be comparable to a comprehensive decennial collection and comparable for all jurisdictions?

We recommend that 2010 census planning include a contingency for a long-form questionnaire until a positive decision to use the ACS can be made. If the ACS replaces the 2010 long form questionnaire, consideration should be given to enhancing ACS data collection in the decennial, or other, year to provide comparable and current single-year estimates for all units of government.

We strongly recommend that a decision date, along with milestones and critical measurements, be established and monitored to support a recommendation and decision to use the ACS as the instrument for collecting long form data in the 2010 census. The progress and viability of the ACS should be monitored annually for variables, identified in advance, that are critical to its success. Such critical measurements include cost, sample sizes, response rates, data quality and the status of the Master Address File.

Is the ACS being sufficiently funded in its development to date to remain a replacement option for the 2010 long-form questionnaire?
Are the identified minimum sample sizes needed to maintain the viability of the ACS as a replacement for the 2010 long form being maintained?
Is the minimum standard for data quality, in terms of identified range of acceptable standard errors, being maintained?
Are the response rates in the identified acceptable range?
Is the Master Address File complete and current enough to support the ACS?

What confidence will there be in the ACS if the Bureau's intercensal population estimates are significantly discrepant from future censuses, if the Master Address File becomes out-of-date, if response rates diminish and the sample size declines? The short form data items from the decennial census can always be used to re-control and recalibrate estimates made between censuses but can we maintain confidence in the ACS long form data without a decennial comparison for correction? Should the content on the short form decennial collection be modified to verify and validate the most critical long form data content or the ACS data collection in the decennial year enhanced to provide comparability and confidence to all jurisdictions and population groups?

It is our hope that an ACS that is appropriately funded for full development and evaluation will fulfill the Census Bureau's goals to provide federal, state, and local governments an information base for the administration and evaluation of government programs; improve the 2010 Census; and provide data users with timely demographic, housing, social, and economic data updated every year that can be compared across states, communities, and population groups.

We offer our continued assistance in evaluating the procedures and results of the 2000 census and the American Community Survey and in planning the 2010 census.

Hopefully it is appropriate to thank members of the Subcommittee for their oversight of census programs and for the opportunity to testify today. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Next, Mr. Hernandez, the Population Association of America, from the Department of Sociology at State University of New York in Albany. Mr. Hernandez, welcome.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, for this opportunity to present the position of the Population Association of America and the Association of Population Centers on the subject of the American Community Survey. I have submitted written testimony to the committee which I will summarize this afternoon.

The PAA and APC strongly commend the Census Bureau for initiating the American Community Survey in 1996 and for vigorously pursuing its development. The PAA and APC strongly endorse the ongoing development and evaluation of the ACS. The ACS is a potentially cost-effective alternative to the decennial long form beginning in 2010. But to realize its potential, the ACS must be subject to a thorough and scientific review with respect to its content, design, and estimation protocols.

The most important condition that must be met if the ACS is to be successful is that the ACS must be fully funded for each year during the present decade. This raises the question of what sample size is required for the ACS if it is to provide timely, high quality data for local areas. With continued population growth, a constant sampling fraction implies that sample sizes would increase. Therefore, we recommend that the Census Bureau develop a sampling plan for the next decade that takes into account population growth, and that it develop a budget reflecting sampling needs for each year. We also recommend that the Congress take necessary actions to assure full funding for the ACS during successive years.

This brings us to five issues involved in evaluating the quality and usefulness of ACS data: the organization of a full-scale evaluation; weighting and intercensal estimates; topical content; evaluation of test data; and response rate. In view of the limited time available today, I will discuss the first two of these, the organization of the full-scale evaluation and weighting and intercensal estimates.

First, in view of the complexity and magnitude of the task of evaluating the ACS and the substantial expertise available outside the Census Bureau, we recommend that the Bureau implement the following potentially fruitful mechanisms for organizing the evaluation. First, it should convene a standing committee of persons from within and outside the Bureau to propose innovative evaluative approaches and analyses of existing and future ACS data. Second, it should create a mechanism for identifying and funding researchers both within and outside the Bureau to conduct these analyses. Third, it should convene an annual conference devoted to the ACS research, where these and other researchers share their analyses and discuss data quality, idiosyncracies in the data, experiences when sharing data with local community leaders, and so forth. Fourth, it should publish these research results to foster wide distribution and comment. Fifth, it should develop a formal mechanism for making changes to the ACS in light of these research findings and experiences.

In view of the need for an evaluation that spans the years remaining in this decade, we recommend that the Census Bureau develop and promulgate specific, measurable benchmarks that will allow the Bureau and the Nation to judge whether the ACS is moving successfully toward the goal of providing high quality data with long form content. These benchmarks should include both the technical quality of the survey and the costs and benefits of the ACS relative to long form data collection. We also recommend that the Census Bureau report annually to the Congress on the ACS, and whether it is meeting technical and cost-benefit standards that would justify replacing the long form on the decennial census in 2010.

One of the most challenging technical issues for the Bureau will be developing effective weighting and estimation procedures. The ACS, like other Bureau surveys, must apply weights to the results from a sample in order to derive population estimates for various social and economic characteristics. These weights are based on intercensal estimates developed by annually updating decennial census data with results from demographic analyses. But the quality of these intercensal estimates deteriorates over the course of the decade. Moreover, Census Bureau comparisons of 2000 Census results with intercensal estimates strongly suggest that the quality of the migration component of the demographic analysis has declined during the past decade. The national statistical system is not adequately measuring either the number of emigrants leaving the United States or the number of immigrants in specific categories which are growing in importance.

We commend the Bureau for planning to improve its intercensal estimates, both by feeding ACS results back into its procedures for updating intercensal estimates, and by improving the international migration component of its demographic program. As the process of developing these procedures begins, we recommend that the Bureau cast a wide net in seeking approaches that might prove effective. In particular, we recommend that the Bureau consider introducing new questions in the ACS to identify and estimate the number of foreign-born persons in various categories who reside in various communities in the United States. We want to emphasize that improving intercensal estimates and hence sample weights for local areas is essential to the success of the ACS.

The Census Bureau plans full-scale annual ACS data collection in 2003. We commend the Bureau for its innovative plan to use 5 year moving averages as the foundation for estimates for small geographic areas and populations. This approach implies that a full-scale evaluation of ACS data for the smallest geographic areas cannot begin until the date for the full 5 years between 2003 and 2007 are collected and processed. We are confident of the Bureau's capacity to make an assessment of whether the statistical properties of the ACS are comparable to long form census data. But the evaluation of ACS data must also include considerable attention to the utility of the data, a judgment that can be made only by decision-makers, planners, and scholars who use data for specific purposes. We recommend, therefore, that Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as private sector users, be included among those conducting

evaluations of the quality and utility of the ACS when the full 5 year moving average results become available.

Not until evaluations are complete in 2008 or later will the Nation have the information required to know the quality of the ACS. We recommend, therefore, that the Bureau continue to plan a 2010 census which includes full-scale long form data collection. We judge the marginal cost of planning for long form data collection in the 2010 census to be small compared to the potential social and economic costs that would accrue if the ACS were not successful and if long form data were not collected in 2010.

A third possibility should also be considered; namely, the continued collection of ACS data and collection of long form data in the 2010 census. This might be the best decision if, for example, the ACS data are judged to be of acceptable quality and substantial value for States, metropolitan areas, and other large population groups, but of unacceptable quality for smaller geographic areas and populations.

A fourth possibility should also be explored seriously—an experiment in the 2010 census that includes both ACS data collection and long form data collection in some areas in order to permit a direct comparison of results between the ACS and the long form.

Our recommendations are aimed at an accurate, well-run, and responsive ACS that will meet the diverse and changing needs of policymakers.

Thank you again for the opportunity to present the PAA and APC position on the American Community Survey. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hernandez follows:]

Testimony on behalf of the

Population Association of America and the Association of Population Centers

Regarding the American Community Survey of the U.S. Census Bureau

before the

United States House of Representatives

Committee on Government Reform

Subcommittee on the Census

The Honorable Dan Miller, Chair

June 13, 2001

Submitted by

Dr. Donald J. Hernandez, Chair
Committee on Population Statistics
Population Association of America

Testimony on behalf of the
Population Association of America and the Association of Population Centers
Regarding the American Community Survey

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Government Reform's Subcommittee on the Census
June 13, 2001

Good Afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to present the position of the Population Association of America (PAA) and the Association of Population Centers (APC) on the subject of the American Community Survey. PAA is a scientific and educational society of professionals working in demographic research. APC is an association of population centers that conduct demographic research. Members of PAA and APC provide federal, state, and local government agencies, as well as private sector institutions, with data and research to guide decision-making. Today, I am coming before you as Chair of the Committee on Population Statistics of PAA. I also serve as Professor in the Department of Sociology and Research Affiliate at the Center for Social and Demographic Analysis at the State University of New York at Albany.

The American Community Survey (ACS) is an innovative effort by the Census Bureau to dramatically improve the timeliness of data which traditionally have been collected on the long form of the Decennial Census of the Population. Data from the long-form are of substantial value to governments at all levels and to the private sector, as well as to the scientific community. The PAA and APC strongly commend the Census Bureau for initiating the ACS in 1996, and for vigorously pursuing its development. To anticipate our conclusions, PAA and APC strongly endorse the on-going development and evaluation of the ACS. Our reasons for this recommendation are straightforward:

- The ACS is an unprecedented opportunity for the Bureau to provide valuable and timely demographic and economic data, for small areas, especially those which will rapidly gain or lose population during the decade;
- The ACS is a potentially cost-effective alternative to the decennial long-form, beginning in 2010;
- To realize its potential, the ACS must itself be the subject of a thorough and scientific review with respect to its content, design, and estimation protocols.

In this testimony we first highlight the value of census long-form and ACS data. Second, we review the potential advantages of ACS, compared to the decennial census, as a vehicle for collecting long-form data. Third, we discuss an essential condition that must be met, if the ACS is to fulfill its potential. Fourth, we raise five issues that require close scrutiny during the next eight years as the ACS evolves and decisions are made regarding the adequacy of ACS data as an alternative to collecting census long-form data in 2010. Fifth and finally, we offer procedural suggestions toward assuring that the ongoing evaluation of the ACS is as thorough and rigorous as possible.

Much of the information in the current long form was first collected in the 1940 census, in response to the increased information needs of public and private planners subsequent to the Great Depression. With expansions in topical coverage over the next six decades, the long-form has been the most accurate, and often the only, source of data for government and economic decision-making. Perhaps the greatest value of the long-form data has been its use in assessing and anticipating local area needs. Only samples of substantial size are adequate to this task. The long-form data are also often essential to the Congress and federal agencies in making program and allocation decisions for issues ranging from transportation and economic development to education and housing. State and local governments often rely almost exclusively on long-form data for planning the location and sizing of roads, sewers, schools, and other public goods and services. Long-form data are used by hospitals and schools to assess community needs and resources and by utilities to project the growth and distribution of energy demand. The decision to build, or not build, a regional shopping mall involves enormous costs and opportunities for the local economy, as do innumerable decisions by large and small businesses regarding the location of stores and factories that rely upon long-form data. In short, long-form data have become a critical component of the economic and social infrastructure of the nation.

But these data are collected only once every 10 years, and additional years are required to process, analyze, and release the data. As a result, long-form census data are 2 or 3 years old before they first reach public and private decision-makers, and they are as much as 12 or 13 years old by the time they are updated with new results from the next census. The primary purpose, and the major advantage, of the ACS is to provide new long-form information on a much more timely basis. At the time the ACS data reach public and private decision-makers, they would be less than 2 years old for states and metropolitan areas, and an average of only 3 years old for the smallest geographic areas and population groups. Equally important, the ACS would provide newly updated statistics each year, with but a 2-3 year lag. Because of the great value current data would have for public and private planners, the Congress has urged the Census Bureau, and supported the Bureau in its efforts, to develop the ACS as a vehicle for collecting long-form data.

The most important condition that must be met, if the ACS is to be successful in providing data comparable in quality to the decennial census long form, is that the ACS must be fully funded during each year of the present decade. This raises the question of what sample size is required for the ACS, if it is to provide timely, high-quality data for local areas. Traditionally, the census long form has relied on a sample of approximately 1/6 of the total population. The Census Bureau has determined that through the use of more efficient, differential sampling, results of almost the same quality can be obtained from the ACS with a smaller overall sampling fraction. But as the U.S. population continues to grow during the present decade, a constant sampling fraction implies that the number of persons in the sample must increase. Therefore, we recommend that the Census Bureau develop a sampling plan for the next decade that takes population growth into account, and that the Bureau develop a budget taking into account sampling needs for each year. We also recommend that the Congress take the actions necessary to assure full-funding for the ACS during each successive year. For reasons which we will explicate in a moment, full funding through 2007 is essential, if serious consideration is to be given to using ACS data as an alternative to long-form data in the 2010 census.

The ACS is an extraordinarily large and complex undertaking. For this reason, we take this opportunity to identify key issues and questions directed toward facilitating the progress and evaluating the success of the ACS in achieving its potential during the coming decade. We have identified five major issues involved in evaluating the quality and usefulness of ACS data: (1) topical content, (2) evaluation of test data, (3) response rates, (4) weighting and inter-censal estimation, and (5) full-scale evaluation. We review each of these in turn.

Because ACS data are intended to serve the same needs as census long-form data, and may replace the long form in 2010, we recommend that the decennial content determination process which may encompass the content for the ACS, include extensive consultation with public and private stakeholders. We recommend further, in view of differences between the decennial census and ACS data collection procedures, that the ACS content be open to small expansions beyond what might be expected based on the 2000 Census long form. Selected topics might be added to the ACS in response to pressing, emerging state-level public needs for local data, such as those associated with welfare reform or education needs, or in order to implement important technical improvements in the quality of ACS data. We specifically recommend that consideration be given to adding questions for improving the description of immigrants.

In developing the ACS, the Bureau already has collected data for 39 test sites. Data collection will continue and grow until 2003, when full-scale, annual data collection will begin. We commend the Bureau for evaluations it has conducted to date, and recommend that these evaluations continue and be substantially broadened in coverage and scope. It is essential that results from the ACS, including the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey, be systematically compared to 2000 census data, and that newly-collected ACS data be subject to evaluation as soon as practical. It is also essential that a wide spectrum of stakeholders in government, business, and academia be actively engaged in evaluating ACS data.

Response rates are an important indicator of the quality of a survey, but not the only indicator which should be examined. It is essential that the Bureau provide detailed information on refusals, and other reasons for non-interviews, for various levels of geography, as well as associated information on the characteristics of persons or households which refuse to respond, or are not interviewed for other reasons.

One of the most challenging technical issues for the Bureau will be developing effective weighting and estimation procedures. Annually updated data for large populations will be valuable, but if it is to replace the long form, the ACS must also provide high-quality data for small geographic areas and population groups. The ACS, like other Bureau surveys, must apply weights to the results from a sample in order to derive population estimates for various social and economic characteristics. These weights are based on inter-censal estimates developed by annually updating decennial census data with results from demographic analyses of births, deaths, and migration, as well as other sources of information. But the quality of these inter-censal estimates deteriorates over the course of the decade between decennial censuses, as the time between the previous census and the current inter-censal estimate increases. Moreover, the Census Bureau's comparisons of 2000 Census results with inter-censal estimates strongly suggest that the quality of the migration component of demographic analysis has declined during the past decade. In the contemporary world of international migration, the national statistical

system is not measuring well either the number of emigrants or the number of immigrants in specific categories which are growing in importance. The smaller the population group or geographic area of interest to the decision-maker, the greater the likelihood that the inter-censal estimates, and hence the survey weights, will be inaccurate. Inaccurate survey weights lead to inaccurate survey estimates of population characteristics.

We commend the Bureau for planning to improve its inter-censal estimates, both by feeding ACS results back into its procedures for updating inter-censal estimates, and by improving the international migration component of its demographic analysis program. As the process of developing these procedures begins, we recommend that the Bureau cast a wide net in seeking ideas for approaches that might prove effective. In particular, we recommend that the Bureau consider introducing new questions in the ACS to identify and estimate the number of foreign- born persons in various categories who reside in various communities in the U.S. We want to emphasize that improving inter-censal estimates, and hence sample weights, for local areas is essential to the success of the ACS.

The Census Bureau plans to begin full-scale annual ACS data collection in 2003. We commend the Bureau for its innovative plan to use 5-year moving averages as the foundation for estimates for small geographic areas and population groups. This approach implies that a full-scale evaluation of ACS data for the smallest geographic areas cannot begin until data for the full 5 years between 2003 and 2007 are collected and processed. We are confident of the Bureau's capacity to make an assessment of whether the statistical properties of the ACS are comparable to long-form census data. But the evaluation of ACS data also must include considerable attention to the utility of the data, a judgment that can be made only by decision-makers, planners, and scholars who use local data for specific purposes. We recommend, therefore, that federal, state, and local agencies, as well as private sector data users, be included among those conducting evaluations of the quality and utility of ACS data when the full 5-year moving average results become available.

Not until these evaluations are complete in 2008 will the nation be in a position to know the quality of the ACS. We recommend, therefore, that the Bureau continue to plan a 2010 census which would include full-scale long-form data collection. We judge the marginal cost of planning for long-form data collection in the 2010 census to be small compared to the potential social and economic costs that would accrue if the ACS were not successful and long-form data were not collected in 2010. A third possibility should also be considered, namely continued collection of ACS data and the collection of long-form data in the 2010 census. This might be the best decision if, for example, the ACS data are judged to be of acceptable quality and of substantial value for states, metropolitan areas, and other large population groups, but of unacceptable quality for smaller geographic areas and populations. A fourth possibility should also be explored seriously–an experiment in the 2010 census that includes both ACS data collection and long-form data collection in some areas in order to permit a direct comparison of the results of the ACS with the long-form.

The evaluation of the ACS is, clearly, critical to provide a firm foundation for future decisions regarding both the viability of the ACS and the possible need for long-form data collection in the 2010 census. In view of the complexity and the magnitude of the task, and the substantial expertise available outside the Census Bureau that might be brought to bear in the

continuing evaluation of the ACS, we recommend the following as potentially fruitful mechanisms for organizing the evaluation. (1) The Census Bureau should convene a standing advisory committee (of persons from within and outside the Bureau) to propose innovative evaluative approaches and analyses of existing and future ACS data. (2) The Census Bureau should create a mechanism for identifying and funding researchers (both within and outside the Bureau) to conduct these analyses. (3) The Census Bureau should convene an annual conference devoted to the ACS, where these (and other) researchers share their analyses and discuss data quality issues, idiosyncrasies in the data, experiences when sharing the data with community leaders, and so forth. (4) The Census Bureau should publish these results to foster wide distribution and comment. (5) The Census Bureau should develop a formal mechanism for making changes to the ACS in light of these research findings and experiences.

In view of the need for an evaluation that spans the years remaining in this decade, we recommend that the Census Bureau develop and promulgate specific, measurable benchmarks that will allow the Bureau, and the nation, to judge whether the ACS is moving successfully toward the goal of providing high-quality data with long-form content. These benchmarks should include both the technical quality of the survey and the costs and benefits of the ACS relative to the long-form census data collection. Finally, we recommend that the Census Bureau report annually to the Congress on the ACS, and whether it is meeting the technical and cost-benefit standards that would justify it replacing the long form on the decennial census in 2010. Our recommendations are aimed toward an accurate, well-run, responsive ACS that will meet the diverse and changing needs of policy-makers.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to present the PAA and APC position on the ACS.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Dr. McMillen.

Ms. MCMILLEN. Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing. In discussing my agency's use of data from the decennial census long form and our anticipated uses of data from the American Community Survey, I would like to focus on four areas this afternoon: the statistical reporting on critical topics in education; the ways the ACS can help enhance our current data collection capacity; the ways the ACS can help enhance the utility of ongoing data collections; and the importance of good data to ensure fair and equitable distribution of funds for American education.

Turning first to reporting. My agency, the National Center for Education Statistics, is congressionally mandated to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States and other nations. To meet this goal, we collect and disseminate data on all aspects of American education from pre-school through adult education. Our collections range from universe or census surveys of basic data, to cross-sectional and longitudinal sample surveys, to assessments of student performance. While our universe surveys collect and report basic data at fine levels of geographic detail, most of our sample surveys where we get our rich data are restricted to national and, in a few cases, State-level data.

In addition to our collections, we frequently use Census sample survey data from the Current Population Survey to report on a variety of population measures, such as: drop-outs, educational attainment, limited English proficiency, usually all at the National level.

One of the most frequent requests we hear from our data users is a request for more data at State and local levels. We have used the decennial census data to help fill this gap. Since 1980, data from the decennial census have given a once-a-decade snapshot of the economic and social demography of individual school districts across the Nation. This Decennial School District Project produces a special set of tabulations that describe the attributes of children, families, and households in school districts. These tabulations are then combined with school district education data that is collected by the Center to give a more complete profile of the education enterprise in the United States.

We ask then, how can the American Community Survey help us with these data? In a number of cases the overlap between the ACS long form and the CPS questions will allow us to drill down into more detailed levels of geography on key items. Just as one brief example. The annual NCES report on dropouts draws heavily upon data from the Current Population Survey. The ability to describe the young adult population out of school without a diploma or the equivalent at the State or school district level would be a major complement to the national data that are in this annual report.

In a different type of application, estimation models can be used to combine detailed data from the CPS with data from the ACS to create reliable estimates for small geographic areas. Each of our reports using national level CPS and decennial census data would

benefit from the availability of more current and more geographically detailed data on education and other population characteristics.

I would like to go back now to the decennial data. Even though our Decennial School District Project provides detailed demographic, social, and economic data, that project has been criticized because the data will be old by the time they are released in 2003. If we implement the ACS beginning in 2003, it will provide the opportunity for us to obtain data for large school districts as early as 2006 and for all school districts by 2008, with annual updates after that. Instead of waiting a decade for the contextual data from the census long form, we will have the capacity to have these data updated annually. We see great value for our own uses and our users community in the annual availability of these State, county, and school district level data.

I would like to talk briefly about the ways the ACS can help enhance our current data collection capacity. There are a number of important education topics that are of interest to researchers and policymakers that involve relatively small or difficult to identify populations. As one example, there has been growing interest over the last decade or so in home schooling. While all reports suggest that this phenomenon is growing, it is still a rare enough event that it is difficult to measure with a typical household-based sample survey. Other examples of populations that can be difficult to measure include: pre-school learners, a topic of great interest to educators at this point, children and adults with limited English proficiency, Native Americans, and recent immigrants.

How can the American Community Survey help in this arena? We see great promise in using the ACS as a means of expanding the range of topics about which we collect data. The proposed sample size of the ACS ensures that sufficient numbers of households containing these rare populations could be identified throughout the decade. More extensive, targeted surveys could then be conducted in the households apart from the ACS using the households that are identified with the characteristic of interest.

Looking next briefly at the ways the ACS can help enhance the utility of our ongoing data collections. Sample surveys are likely to yield differences in estimates of basic population characteristics and are likely to have some under-representation of hard-to-enumerate demographic groups. Differences in estimates can be a source of confusion for some of our data users. One solution is to use the best estimates available for the population characteristic and post-stratify, or control, the population to these estimates.

How can the American Community Survey help us here? The official intercensal population estimates that you have heard about this afternoon are developed from the previous decennial census and are used for the controls in many surveys. In fact, we use them in some of our surveys. Once the ACS is fully operational, the methods that are used for official intercensal population estimates will be able to incorporate data from the ACS to improve these estimates that we use as population controls in many surveys.

And I would like to turn last to the topic of funds distribution. As the statistical agency within the Department of Education, we are asked to help prepare and run programs for the allocation of

education funds. Within the Department of Education, $12 billion are distributed, in whole or part, based on school district level estimates of the number of children ages 5 to 17 in families below the poverty level. These data are currently only collected on the census long form. In 2001, $8.6 billion of that $12 billion were appropriated for title I grants to local educational agencies. A number of other large formula programs also allocate funds based on a State's share of title I or on census poverty data.

Beyond the Department of Education, the distributions of funds amounting to another $9 billion from other Federal sources are also tied directly to census long form data. In addition, some States also use the census long form data as a component of their individual compensatory education formulas. This use of the long form data is critical to the education enterprise.

Again, looking at how the ACS can help us. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the use of updated estimates of children ages 5 through 17 in poverty at the school district level using the most recent census data approved by the Secretary of Education. Currently, the Census Bureau uses modelling techniques that were reviewed and recommended for use by the National Academy of Sciences to produce these counts. The availability of ACS average annual estimates of poverty data at the county and school district level has the potential for improving the estimates of counts of children in poverty that serve as the basis for the distribution of billions of education dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the importance and utility of data from the American Community Survey to the education enterprise in America. I am submitting for the record a document prepared by my agency that identifies the potential use of ACS data in fulfilling funds distribution and reporting responsibilities as specified in law for the Department of Education.

I would like to conclude by reiterating that NCES and the Department of Education have an ongoing need for data currently collected through the decennial census long form. We believe that if the American Community Survey becomes a reality we will have more current data at a finer level of geographic detail to use in a variety of important education applications.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your consideration and welcome the opportunity to provide additional information to you and the subcommittee, if you should desire. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. McMillen follows:]

STATEMENT OF MARILYN M. MCMILLEN
CHIEF STATISTICIAN
NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Before the
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Government Reform
Subcommittee on Census

June 13, 2001

INTRODUCTION

Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing on the American Community Survey (ACS). My name is Marilyn McMillen; I am the Chief Statistician at the National Center for Education Statistics within the Department of Education. In discussing my agency's use of data from the decennial census long form and anticipated uses of data from the American Community Survey, I would like to focus on four areas: statistical reporting on critical topics in education, the ways in which the ACS can help enhance our current data-collection capacity, the ways in which the ACS can help enhance the utility of ongoing data collections, and the importance of good data to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of funds for American education.

REPORTING

The National Center for Education Statistics is congressionally mandated to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States and other nations; to conduct and report on specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; and to assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems. To this end, the Center collects and disseminates data on all aspects of American Education from pre-school through adult education. Our collections range from universe or census surveys of basic data on enrollments, staffing, and expenditures; to cross-sectional sample surveys of educational institutions and their students and staff; to cross-sectional sample surveys of households; to assessments of student performance and adult literacy; to longitudinal studies that follow the progress of students across time. While our universe surveys collect and report basic data at fine levels of geographic detail, most of our sample surveys are restricted to national and, in a few cases, state-level data.

In addition to our own collections, NCES frequently uses Census sample survey data from the Current Population Survey to report on a variety of population-level measures such as: the percent of the population enrolled, years of school completed, dropouts, educational attainment, limited English proficiency, immigration status, disability status, employment, labor force participation, income levels, poverty status, single-parent households, parent's educational attainment, age, race/ethnicity, and gender, usually all at the national level. A number of these measures appear in our congressionally mandated report on the "Condition of Education," or in the annual "Digest of Education Statistics," or in the annual "Dropout Report."

One of the most frequent requests we hear is for more data at the state and local levels. NCES has used the decennial census data to fill this gap. Since 1980, data from the long and short forms of the decennial census have given the Center, state and local policy analysts, and education researchers a once-a-decade snapshot of the economic and social demography of individual school districts across the nation. This Decennial School District Project brings school district geographic boundaries and census data together to provide the basis for a set of special tabulations that describe the attributes of children, families, and households in individual elementary, secondary, and unified school districts. These tabulations are then combined with school district education data collected by NCES to give a more complete profile of the education enterprise in the United States. The data developed for the 2000 school district project will be made available early in 2003 through the NCES Web site. The data will be displayed through a geographic information system (GIS) that will allow comparisons between school districts. In addition, users will be able to download files of data tables for school districts, counties, and states for further analysis.

HOW CAN THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY HELP?

Most of the Census data that NCES uses, other than decennial data, come from the Current Population Survey (CPS). In many cases, the CPS data provide more information than the ACS long form data items, because the use of personal interviews allows for a more involved set of questions. However, in a number of cases, the overlap between the ACS long form and the CPS questions will allow us to "drill-down" to obtain data at lower levels of geography on key items. This can add richer detail to some of the CPS data. For example, the annual NCES report on dropouts draws heavily from CPS data. The ability to describe the young adult population out of school without a high school diploma or the equivalent at the state or school district level would complement this annual report. In addition, estimation models can be used to combine detailed data from the CPS, or other national household surveys, with data from the ACS to create reliable estimates for small geographic areas. Each of our reports using national-level CPS and decennial census data would benefit from the availability of more current and more geographically detailed data on education and other population characteristics.

Turning back to the decennial data, even though the Decennial School District Project provides detailed demographic, social, and economic data, the project has been criticized because the data will be "old" by the time they are released. The American Community

Survey provides the opportunity to produce more current "census-like" long-form data. Implementing the ACS, beginning in 2003, will provide the opportunity for NCES to obtain data for large school districts in 2006 and for all school districts in 2008. Updates of this information will then be available annually. Instead of waiting a decade for the contextual data from the Census long form, we will have the capacity to have these data updated annually. NCES sees great value for itself and its' user community in the annual availability of these state, county, and school district data.

ENHANCING CURRENT DATA COLLECTION CAPACITY

There are important education topics of interest to researchers and policymakers that involve relatively small or difficult-to-identify populations. For example, there has been growing interest over the past decade or so in home schooling. While all reports suggest that this phenomenon is growing, it is still a rare enough event that it is difficult to measure with a typical household-based sample survey. There has also been increased interest in the learning experiences of children before they enter formal schooling, but large samples of households are required to identify sufficient numbers of preschoolers to study their early learning experiences. Other examples of populations that can be difficult to measure include children and adults with limited English proficiency, Native Americans, and recent immigrants.

HOW CAN THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY HELP?

NCES sees great promise in using the ACS as a means of expanding the range of topics about which data are collected. The proposed sample size of the ACS ensures that sufficient numbers of households containing "rare populations" could be identified throughout the decade. One way of looking at this is that ACS could be used as a screener to identify households with these "rare populations." More extensive, targeted surveys could then be conducted in the households identified with the characteristic of interest at a later time.

ENHANCING THE UTILITY OF OTHER DATA COLLECTIONS

Sample surveys provide estimates of true population parameters. As a result, two different surveys, even conducted at the same time, are likely to yield differences in estimates of basic population characteristics. And, sample survey estimates are especially likely to have some under-representation of hard-to-enumerate demographic groups. Differences in estimates can be a source of confusion for data users. One solution used to avoid this confusion is to identify the best estimates available for the population characteristic and post-stratify, or control, the population to those estimates. The relationships measured between variables in the sample survey are all preserved, but they are controlled to represent the distribution of the basic population characteristic in a census or in a larger, more reliable sample survey.

HOW CAN THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY HELP?

Data from the NCES National Household Education Survey are currently post-stratified using CPS data. The CPS data are themselves controlled to the official intercensal population estimates that are developed from the previous decennial census. Once the ACS is fully operational, the methods used for official intercensal population estimates will be able to incorporate data from the ACS to improve the intercensal estimates that are used as population controls. For example, the methods that are currently used to develop county level population estimates do not reflect changes in the race or ethnicity of the population moving in and out of each county. ACS data can be used to improve these county level population estimates.

FUNDS DISTRIBUTION

As the statistical agency within the Department of Education, NCES has helped prepare data and run programs for the allocation of education funds. Within the Department of Education, $12 billion dollars are distributed, in whole or part, based on school-district-level estimates of the number of children ages 5 to 17 in families below the poverty level. These data are currently only collected on the Census long form. The $12 billion includes allocations under the Department's largest Federal elementary and secondary program, Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, which received an $8.6 billion dollar appropriation in fiscal year 2001. Many other large elementary/secondary formula programs allocate funds based on state shares of Title I or on Census poverty data. Included, for example, are programs such as Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Even Start and Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations, Eisenhower Professional Development, parts of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and Education for Homeless Youth and Children.

Beyond the Department of Education, the distributions of current and proposed funds amounting to another $9 billion from other Federal sources are also tied directly to Census long-form data. For example, e-rate discounts, Qualified Zone Academy Bonds, and 2001 funds for school renovation grants are all tied, in whole or part, to Census long-form data.

In addition, some states also use the Census long-form data as a component of their individual compensatory education formulas. Given that state governments provide approximately 50 percent of the education funding in this country, this use of long-form Census data is critical to the education enterprise.

HOW CAN THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY DATA HELP?

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, requires the use of updated estimates of children ages 5 through 17 in poverty at the school district level using the most recent census data approved by the Secretary of Education. Currently, the Census Bureau uses modeling

techniques that were reviewed and recommended for use by the National Academy of Sciences to produce these counts. These estimates are produced by first modeling data at the county level, and then using the decennial proportions of children in poverty to prorate these estimates to the school district level. The availability of ACS average annual estimates of the poverty data at the county and school district level has the potential for improving the estimates of counts of children in poverty that serve as the basis for the distribution of billions of education dollars.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the importance and utility of data from the American Community Survey to the education enterprise in America. I am submitting for the record a document prepared by my agency that identifies funds distributions and reporting responsibilities as specified in law for the Department of Education. I would like to conclude by reiterating that NCES and the Department of Education have an ongoing need for the data currently collected through the decennial census long form. NCES believes that if the American Community Survey becomes a reality we will have more current data at a finer level of geographic detail to use in a variety of applications.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your consideration and welcome the opportunity to provide additional information to you and the Subcommittee, should you desire.

Department of Education Uses of Census Data:
Prepared by the National Center for Education Statistics

This document was prepared in response to a request from the OMB sponsored Committee on the American Community Survey. It attempts to identify legal funds distribution and reporting requirements that the Department of Education can fulfill using data from either the long form or the American Community Survey.

The document is organized topically, with each topic linked to specific items on the American Community Survey. Each entry indicates whether the use if for funds distribution or reporting and the level of the data that are required (e.g. nation, State, school district). This information is followed by a citation to the relevant law, and then excerpts of the text of the law. The language that relates to the specific topic is highlighted.

Department of Education Uses of Census Data:
Prepared by the National Center for Education Statistics

Enrollment by Sector: ACS person questionnaire – Item 10a

1. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards, Part A - Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies, Subpart 1 - Basic Program Requirements, Sec. 6321. Participation of Children Enrolled in Private Schools
   4) Expenditures. Expenditures for educational services and other benefits to eligible **private school children** shall be equal to the proportion of funds allocated to participating school attendance areas based on the number of children from low-income families who **attend private schools**.

2. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter II – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Part B - State and Local Activities, Sec. 6643. Within-State Allocations
   (B) of the remaining amount –
   (i) 50 percent shall be distributed to local educational agencies –
   (I) for use in accordance with section 6650 of this title; and
   (II) in accordance with the **relative enrollments in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools** within the boundaries of such agencies; and
   (ii) 50 percent of such amount shall be distributed to local educational agencies –
   (I) for use in accordance with section 6650 of this title; and
   (II) in accordance with the relative amount such agencies received under part A of subchapter I of this chapter

3. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Part A - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs, Subpart 1 - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs, Sec.7113. State and local educational agency programs
   d) Local educational agency programs. (2) Distribution.
   (A) Of the amount distributed under paragraph (1), a State educational agency shall distribute –
   (i) 70 percent of such amount to local educational agencies, based on the **relative enrollments in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools within the boundaries of such agencies**; and
   (ii) 30 percent of such amount to local educational agencies that the State educational agency determines have the greatest need for additional funds to carry out drug and violence prevention programs authorized by this subpart.
   (B) Where appropriate and to the extent consistent with the needs assessment conducted by the State, not less than 25 percent of the amount distributed under subparagraph (A)(ii) for a fiscal year shall be distributed to local educational agencies located in rural and urban areas.

4. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VI – Innovative Education Program Strategies, Part A - State and Local Programs, Sec. 7312. Allocation to local educational agencies
   (a) Distribution rule. From the sums made available each year to carry out this subchapter, the State educational agency shall distribute not less than 85 percent to local educational agencies within such State according to the **relative enrollments in public and private, nonprofit schools within the school districts** of such agencies, adjusted, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary, to provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as -
   (1) children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families;
   (2) children from low-income families; and
   (3) children living in sparsely populated areas.
   (b) Calculation of enrollments
   (1) In general - The calculation of relative enrollments under subsection (a) of this section shall be on the basis of the total of -
   (A) **the number of children enrolled in public schools; and**
   (B) **the number of children enrolled in private nonprofit schools that desire that their children participate in programs or projects assisted under this subchapter**, for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

5. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VII– Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, Part C – Emergency Immigrant Education Program, Sec. 7544. State allocations
   b) Allocations. (1) In general. Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) of this section, of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year for this part, each State participating in the program assisted under this part shall receive an allocation equal to the proportion of such State's number of immigrant children and youth who are **enrolled in public elementary or secondary schools** under the jurisdiction of each local educational agency described in paragraph (2) within such state, and in **nonpublic elementary or secondary schools** within the district served by each such local educational agency, relative to the total number of immigrant children and youth so enrolled in all the States participating in the program assisted under this part.

6. **Funds Distribution –District level data**
   Citation: FY 2001, Class Size Reduction Program (as authorized under PL 106-554)
   (b) (1) Each State that receives funds under this section shall distribute 100 percent of such funds to local educational agencies, of which -
   (B) 20 percent of such amount shall be allocated to such local educational agencies in accordance with the relative **enrollments of children, aged 5 to 17, in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools within the boundaries of such agencies.**

Enrollment by Grade level: ACS person questionnaire – item 10b

1. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7266 Distribution of Assistance; Limitation on Costs
   a) Distribution of assistance. The Secretary shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, in approving grant applications under this part –
   (1) grants are equitably distributed on a geographic basis within each category set forth in section 7263(a)of this title[district enrollment];
   (2) the amount of a grant to a local educational agency or an educational partnership for a fiscal year is **proportionate to the extent and severity of the local school dropout problem;**

2. **Reporting – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7267 Reports
   (a)Annual reports. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report by January 1 of each year, beginning on January 1, 1995, . . . including statistical information for the number and percentage of elementary and secondary school students by gender, race, and ethnic origin **who drop out of school each year, including dropouts -**
   (1) throughout the Nation by rural and urban location as defined by the Secretary; and
   (2) in each of the individual States and the District of Columbia.

3. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VII– Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, Part A - Bilingual Education, Subpart 1 - Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants, Sec
   (1) In general. An application for a grant under this subpart shall contain the following:
   (A) A description of the need for the proposed program, including data on the number of children and youth of limited-English proficiency in the school or school district to be served and the characteristics of such children and youth, such as language spoken, **dropout rates,** proficiency in English and the native language, academic standing in relation to the English-proficient peers of such children and youth, and, where applicable, the recency of immigration.

4. **Funds Distribution –Regional, State, and Community level data**
   Citation: Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter IV – Student Assistance, Part A – Grants to Students in Attendance at Institutions of Higher Education, Community Scholarship Mobilization Act, Pub. L. 105-244, Sec. 814 Purpose; Endowment Grant Authority
   (b) Endowment Grant Authority. From the funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 816, the Secretary shall award an endowment grant, on a competitive basis, to a national organization to enable such organization to support the establishment or ongoing work of regional, State or *community* program centers that foster the development of local entities in high poverty areas to improve secondary school graduation rates and postsecondary attendance through the provision of academic support services and *scholarship* assistance for the cost of postsecondary education.

Section 813 – Definitions
(4) High poverty area. - The term 'high poverty area' means a community with a higher percentage of children from low-income families than the national average of such percentage and a **lower percentage of children pursuing postsecondary education than the national average of such percentage**.

Educational Attainment: ACS person questionnaire – item 11

1. **Reporting – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7267 Reports
   (a) Annual reports. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report by January 1 of each year, beginning on January 1, 1995, . . . including statistical information for the number and percentage of elementary and secondary school students by gender, race, and ethnic origin **who drop out of school each year, including dropouts -**
   (1) throughout the Nation by rural and urban location as defined by the Secretary; and
   (2) in each of the individual States and the District of Columbia.

2. **Reporting – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 44 – Vocational and Technical Education Subchapter I – Vocational and Technical Education Assistance to the States, Part A – Allotment and Allocation, Sec. 2323. Accountability
   (2) Indicators of performance. (A) Core indicators of performance. Each eligible agency shall identify in the State plan core indicators of performance that include, at a minimum, measures of each of the following: . . .
   (ii) **Student attainment of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, a proficiency credential in conjunction with a secondary school diploma, or a postsecondary degree or credential.**

3. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7266 Distribution of Assistance; Limitation on Costs
   a) Distribution of assistance. The Secretary shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, in approving grant applications under this part –
   (1) grants are equitably distributed on a geographic basis within each category set forth in section 7263(a)of this title[district enrollment];
   (2) the amount of a grant to a local educational agency or an educational partnership for a fiscal year is **proportionate to the extent and severity of the local school dropout problem;**

4. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VII– Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, Part A - Bilingual Education, Subpart 1 - Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants, Sec
   (1) In general. An application for a grant under this subpart shall contain the following:
   (A) A description of the need for the proposed program, including data on the number of children and youth of limited-English proficiency in the school or school district to be served and the characteristics of such children and youth, such as language spoken, **dropout rates,** proficiency in English and the native language, academic standing in relation to the English-proficient peers of such children and youth, and, where applicable, the recency of immigration.

5. **Reporting – National data**

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 33 – Education of Individuals with Disabilities, Subchapter IV – National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities, Sec. 1474 – Studies and Evaluations

(2) Authorized activities. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may support studies, evaluations, and assessments, including studies that –

(A) impact, **outcomes**, and results achieved by State educational agencies and local educational agencies through their activities to reform policies, procedures, and practices designed to improve educational and transitional services and results for children with disabilities;. . .

(C) assess educational and transitional services and results for children with disabilities from minority backgrounds, including

(III) the number of minority children who **graduated from secondary and postsecondary education programs**;

Total Population: List of Residents

1. **Funds Distribution – Nation and State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 33 – Education of Individuals with Disabilities, Subchapter IV – National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities, Sec. 1455 – Minimum State Grant Amounts
   (c) Factors. The Secretary shall set the amount of each grant under subsection (a) of this section after considering -
   (1) the amount of funds available for making the grants;
   (2) **the relative population of the State or outlying area**; and
   (3) the types of activities proposed by the State or outlying area.

2. **Funds Distribution – Nation and State level data**
   Citation: Title 29 –Labor, Chapter 16 –Vocational Rehabilitation and Other Rehabilitation Services, Subchapter I – Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Sec. 730. State Allotments
   (ii) an amount bearing the same ratio to 50 percent of such excess amount as the product of **the population of the State** and its allotment percentage bears to the sum of the corresponding products for **all the States.**

3. **Funds Distribution – Nation and State level data**
   Citation: Title 29 –Labor, Chapter 16 –Vocational Rehabilitation and Other Rehabilitation Services Subchapter VI – Employment Opportunities for Individuals with Disabilities, Part B – Supported Employment Services for Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities, Sec. 795h Allotments
   (a) In general. (1) States - The Secretary shall allot the sums appropriated for each fiscal year to carry out this part among the States on the basis of **relative population of each State**

4. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
   Citation: Title 29 –Labor, Chapter 16 –Vocational Rehabilitation and Other Rehabilitation Services Subchapter VI I – Independent Living Services and Centers for Independent Living, Subpart 2 – Independent Living Services, Sec.796e Allotments
   (a) In general. (1) States. (A) Population basis . . . the Commissioner shall make an allotment to each State whose State plan has been approved under section 796d-1 of this title of an amount bearing the **same ratio to such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.**

5. **Funds Distribution – Nation and State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 45 – Career Education and Career Development, Subchapter I – Career Education and Development Programs, Sec. 2502. Funding Requirements
   3)(A) Of the remainder of the sums appropriated, the Secretary of Education shall allot to each State $100,000, and of the remainder of the sums appropriated the Secretary of Education shall allot to each State an amount which bears the **same ratio to such sums for such year as the population of the State bears to the population of all States**, for purposes of carrying out section 2501 of this title.

Population by Age: List of Residents questionnaire – item 2

1. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 33 – Education of Individuals with Disabilities, Subchapter II – Assistance for Education of All Children with Disabilities, Sec. 1411 Authorization; Allotment; Use of Funds, Authorization of Appropriations
   (e) Permanent formula . . . Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall –
   (I) allocate to each State the amount it received for the base year;
   (II)allocate 85 percent of any remaining funds to States on the basis of their **relative populations of children aged 3 through 21 who are of the same age as children with disabilities** for whom the State ensures the availability of a free appropriate public education under this subchapter; and
   (III)allocate 15 percent of those remaining funds to States on the basis of their relative populations of children described in subclause (II) who are living in poverty.
   (ii) For the purpose of making grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use the most recent population data, including data on children living in poverty, that are available and satisfactory to the Secretary.

2. **Funds Distribution –State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 33 – Education of Individuals with Disabilities, Subchapter III – Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities, Sec. 1443 – Allocation of Funds
   (c) State allotments – ". . . the Secretary shall first allot to each State an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the **number of infants and toddlers in the State bears to the number of infants and toddlers in all States**."

3. **Funds Distribution – Nation and State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 44 – Vocational and Technical Education, Subchapter I – Vocational and Technical Education Assistance to the States, Part A – Allotment and Allocation, Sec. 2321. Reservations and State Allotment
   (2) State allotment formula. Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), from the remainder of the sums appropriated under section 2307 of this title and not reserved under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to a State for the fiscal year –
   (A) an amount that bears the same ratio to 50 percent of the sums being allotted as the product of the **population aged 15 to 19** inclusive, in the State in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States;
   (B) an amount that bears the same ratio to 20 percent of the sums being allotted as the product of the **population aged 20 to 24, . . .**
   (C) an amount that bears the same ratio to 15 percent of the sums being allotted as the product of the **population aged 25 to 65,**

4. **Funds Distribution – Nation and State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 44 – Vocational and Technical Education, Subchapter II – Tech-Prep Education, Sec. 2372. State Allotment and Application
   (a) In general. For any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot the amount made available under section 2377 of this title among the States in the same manner as funds are allotted to States under paragraph (2) of **section 2321(a)** of this title.

5. **Reporting - Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 68 – National Education Reform, Part A - General Provisions Regarding Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Sec. 6011. Office of Educational Research and Improvement
   (a) Declaration of policy regarding educational opportunity -
   (1) In general. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of race, color, religion, sex, **age,** disability, national origin, or social class. . .
   (3) Authorized activities. (A) Office - In fulfilling its purposes under this section, the Office is authorized to - . . . (iii) collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to education, and to library and information services;

6. **Funds Distribution – Census tract level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 69 – School-to-Work Opportunities, Subchapter II – School-to-Work Opportunities System Development and Implementation Grants to States, Part B - State Implementation Grants, Sec. 6145. Use of Amounts and Subchapter III – Federal Implementation Grants to Local Partnerships, Sec. 6177 "High Poverty Area" Defined
   The State shall not provide subgrants to local partnerships that have received implementation grants under subchapter III of this chapter, except that this prohibition shall not apply with respect to local partnerships that are located in high poverty areas, as such term is defined in section 6177 of this title.
   Sec. 6177. "High poverty area" defined - For purposes of this subchapter, the term "high poverty area" means an urban census tract, a contiguous group of urban census tracts, a block number area in a nonmetropolitan county, a contiguous group of block number areas in a nonmetropolitan county, or an Indian reservation (as defined in section 3202(9) of title 25), with a poverty rate of 20 percent or more among **individuals who have not attained the age of 22,** as determined by the Bureau of the Census.

7. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards, Part A - Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies, Subpart 2 – Allocations, Sec. 6333. Basic grants to local educational agencies
   c) Children to be counted. 1) Categories of children. The number of children to be counted for purposes of this section is the aggregate of -
   (A) the **number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive,** in the school district of the local educational agency from families below the poverty level as determined under paragraph (2);
   (B) the **number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive,** in the school district of such agency from families above the poverty level as determined under paragraph (5); and
   (C) the number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, in the school district of such agency in institutions for neglected and delinquent children (other than such institutions operated by the United States),

8. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High

Standards, Part A - Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies, Subpart 2 – Allocations, Sec. 6335. Targeted Grants to Local Educational Agencies

(a) Eligibility of local educational agencies. A local educational agency in a State is eligible to receive a targeted grant under this section for any fiscal year if the number of children in the local educational agency counted under subsection (FOOTNOTE 1) 6333(c) of this title, before application of the weighting factor described in subsection (c) of this section, is at least 10, and if the number of children counted for grants under section 6333 of this title is at least 5 percent of the **total population aged 5 to 17 years**, inclusive, in the local educational agency.

9. Funds Distribution – School district level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards, Part A - Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies, Subpart 2 –Allocations, Sec. 6336. Education finance incentive program

(a) Grants. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States from the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (e) of this section to carry out the purposes of this part.

(b) Distribution based upon fiscal effort and equity - (1) In general - Funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (e) of this section shall be allotted to each State based upon the **number of children aged 5 to 17**, inclusive, of such State multiplied by the product of - .

10. Funds Distribution – Nation and State level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards, Part B - Even Start Family Literacy Programs, Sec. 6362. Program authorized

d) State allocation. . . . (2) Allocations. Except as provided in paragraph (3), from the total amount available for allocation to States in any fiscal year, each State shall be eligible to receive a grant under paragraph (1) in an amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount as the **amount allocated under part A of this subchapter** to that State bears to the total amount allocated under that section to all the States.

11. Funds Distribution – State level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter II – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Part B - State and Local Activities, Sec. 6642. Allocation of funds

(b) State allocations - The Secretary shall allocate the amount available to carry out this part . . .:

(1) Fifty percent shall be allocated among such jurisdictions on the basis of their **relative populations of individuals aged five through 17,** as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data.

(2) Fifty percent shall be allocated among such jurisdictions in accordance with the relative amounts such jurisdictions received **under part A of subchapter I** of this chapter for the preceding fiscal year, or for fiscal year 1995 only, such part's predecessor authority.

12. Funds Distribution – School district level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter II – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Part B - State and Local Activities, Sec. 6643. Within-State Allocations

(B) of the remaining amount –

(i) 50 percent shall be distributed to local educational agencies –
(I) for use in accordance with section 6650 of this title; and
(II) in accordance with the relative enrollments in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools within the boundaries of such agencies; and
(ii) 50 percent of such amount shall be distributed to local educational agencies –
(I) for use in accordance with section 6650 of this title; and
(II) in accordance with the relative amount such agencies received under **part A of subchapter I of this chapter**

13. Funds Distribution – State and School district level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter II – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Part B - State and Local Activities, Part C - Reading and Literacy Grants, Sec. 6661d. Local Reading Improvement Subgrants

a) In general. (1) Subgrants. A State educational agency that receives a grant under section 6661b of this title shall make subgrants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies that either –

(A) have at least one school that is identified for school improvement under section 6317(c) of this title in the geographic area served by the agency;
(B) have the largest, or second largest, number of children who are counted under section 6333(c)**(children 5 to 17 in families in poverty)** of this title, in comparison to all other local educational agencies in the State; or
(C) have the highest, or second highest, school-age child poverty rate, in comparison to all other local educational agencies in the State.

For purposes of subparagraph (C), the term "school-age child poverty rate" means the number of children counted under section 6333(c) of this title who are living within the geographic boundaries of the local educational agency, expressed as a percentage of the **total number of children aged 5-17 years** living within the geographic boundaries of the local educational agency.

14. Funds Distribution – State level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter III – Technology for Education, Part A - Technology for Education of All Students, Subpart 2 - State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources, Sec. 6841. Allotment and Reallotment

(a) Allotment. (1) In general. Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State educational agency shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subpart for a fiscal year in an amount which bears the same relationship to the amount made available under section 6814(a)(1)(C) of this title for such year as the amount such State received under **part A of subchapter I of this chapter** for such year bears to the amount received for such year under such part by all States.

15. Funds Distribution – State level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter III– Technology for Education, Part E - Elementary Mathematics and Science Equipment Program, Sec. 6974. Allotments of funds

b) Allotment. (1) In general. The remainder of the amount so appropriated (after meeting requirements in subsection (a) of this section) shall be allotted among State educational agencies so that -

(A) one-half of such remainder shall be distributed by allotting to each State educational agency an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half of such

remainder as the **number of children aged 5 to 17**, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all States; and

(B) one-half of such remainder shall be distributed according to each State's share of allocations **under part A of subchapter I of this chapter.**

16. Funds Distribution – States level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Part A - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs, Subpart 1 - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs, Sec. 7111. Reservations and Allotments

(b) State allotments. (1) In general. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, for each fiscal year, allocate among the States -

(A) one-half of the remainder not reserved under subsection (a) of this section according to the **ratio between the school-aged population of each State and the school-aged population of all the States**; and one-half of such remainder according to the ratio between the amount each State received **under part A of subchapter I of this chapter** for the preceding year

17. Funds Distribution – State level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VI – Innovative Education Program Strategies, Part A - State and Local Programs, Sec. 7311. Allotment to States

(b) Allotment. From the remainder of such sums, the Secretary shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the **school-age population of the State bears to the school-age population of all States**, except that no State shall receive less than an amount equal to one-half of one percent of such remainder.

(c) Definitions - For purposes of this part:

(1) The term **"school-age population" means the population aged 5 through 17.**

18. Funds Distribution –District level data

Citation: FY 2001, Class Size Reduction Program (as authorized under PL 106-554)

(b) (1) Each State that receives funds under this section shall distribute 100 percent of such funds to local educational agencies, of which--

(A) 80 percent of such amount shall be allocated to such local educational agencies in proportion to the **number of children, aged 5 to 17**, who reside in the school district served by such local educational agency from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget… applicable to a family of the size involved for the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available compared to the number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all the local educational agencies in the State for that fiscal year;

Families: List of Residents questionnaire – item 3

See entries 1-14 under poverty and entries 2 and 3 under income.

Marital Status: ACS List of Residents questionnaire – item 4

1. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Adult Education and Family Literacy, Part A – Adult Education and Literacy Programs, Subpart 2 - State Provisions, Sec. 9224. State Plan Federal Provisions
   (10) a description of how the eligible agency will develop program strategies for populations that include, at a minimum -
   (A) low-income students;
   (B) individuals with disabilities;
   (C) single parents and displaced homemakers; and
   (D) individuals with multiple barriers to educational enhancement, including individuals with limited English proficiency;

Sex: ACS List of Residents questionnaire – item 1

1. **Reporting – Nation**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part B - Women's Educational Equity, Sec. 7236. Report
   The Secretary, not later than January 1, 1999, shall submit to the President and the Congress a report on the status of educational equity for girls and women in the Nation.
   During the 106th Congress new legislation was introduced by both houses in S.1264 and HR2505 as the "Educating America's Girls Act," Sec. 8. Women's Educational Equity:
   Part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7231 et seq.) is amended to read as follows: . . .
   Sec. 5206. Report.
   The Secretary, not later than January 1, 2004, shall submit to the President and Congress a report on the status of **educational equity for girls and women** in the Nation.

2. **Reporting – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7267 Reports
   (a)Annual reports. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report by January 1 of each year, beginning on January 1, 1995, . . . including statistical information for the number and percentage of elementary and secondary school **students by gender,** race, and ethnic origin who drop out of school each year, including dropouts -
   (1) throughout the Nation by rural and urban location as defined by the Secretary; and
   (2) in each of the individual States and the District of Columbia.

3. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20, Education, Chapter 28 – National Education Statistics, Sec. 9003. Duties of Center
   (4) collecting, analyzing, cross-tabulating, and reporting, to the extent feasible, so as to provide information by **gender,** race, socioeconomic status, limited-English proficiency, and other population characteristics when such disaggregated information would facilitate educational and policy decisionmaking;

4. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 68 – National Education Reform, Part A - General Provisions Regarding Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Sec. 6011. Office of Educational Research and Improvement
   (a) Declaration of policy regarding educational opportunity -
   (1) In general. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of race, color, religion, **sex,** age, disability, national origin, or social class. . .
   (3) Authorized activities. (A) Office - In fulfilling its purposes under this section, the Office is authorized to - . . . (iii) collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to education, and to library and information services;

Race: ACS List of Residents questionnaire – item 6

1. **Reporting**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 33 – Education of Individuals with Disabilities, Subchapter IV – National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities, Sec. 1474 – Studies and Evaluations
   (2) Authorized activities. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may support studies, evaluations, and assessments, including studies that –
   (A) impact, outcomes, and results achieved by State educational agencies and local educational agencies through their activities to reform policies, procedures, and practices designed to improve educational and transitional services and results for children with disabilities;. . .
   (C) assess educational and transitional services and results for children with disabilities from minority backgrounds, including
   (III) the **number of minority children** who graduated from secondary and postsecondary education programs;

2. **Reporting – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7267 Reports
   (a) Annual reports. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report by January 1 of each year, beginning on January 1, 1995, . . . including statistical information for the number and percentage of elementary and secondary school students by gender, **race,** and ethnic origin who drop out of school each year, including dropouts -
   (1) throughout the Nation by rural and urban location as defined by the Secretary; and
   (2) in each of the individual States and the District of Columbia.

3. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20, Education, Chapter 28 – National Education Statistics, Sec. 9003. Duties of Center
   (4) collecting, analyzing, cross-tabulating, and reporting, to the extent feasible, so as to provide information by gender, **race,** socioeconomic status, limited-English proficiency, and other population characteristics when such disaggregated information would facilitate educational and policy decisionmaking;

4. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 68 – National Education Reform, Part A - General Provisions Regarding Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Sec. 6011. Office of Educational Research and Improvement
   (a) Declaration of policy regarding educational opportunity -
   (1) In general. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of **race,** color, religion, sex, age, disability, national origin, or social class. . .
   (3) Authorized activities. (A) Office - In fulfilling its purposes under this section, the Office is authorized to - . . . (iii) collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to education, and to library and information services;

5. **Funds Distribution –National level data**
   Citation: Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter III, Institutional Aid, Part B – Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Sec. 1062. Grants to institutions
   (a) General authorization; uses of funds
   (4) Academic instruction in disciplines in which **Black Americans are underrepresented.**
   Sec. 1061, Definitions
   (4) The term "professional and academic **areas in which Blacks are underrepresented"** shall be determined by the Secretary and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, on the basis of the most recent available satisfactory data, as professional and academic **areas in which the percentage of Black Americans who have been educated, trained, and employed is less than the percentage of Blacks in the general population.**

6. **Funds Distribution –National level data**
   Citation Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter III, Institutional Aid, Part B – Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Sec. 1063. Allotments to institutions
   (c) Allotment; graduate and professional student basis. From the amounts appropriated to carry out this part for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each part B institution a sum which bears the same ratio to one-fourth of that amount as the percentage of graduates per institution, who are admitted to and in attendance at, within 5 years of graduation with a baccalaureate degree, a graduate or professional school in a degree program in **disciplines in which Blacks are underrepresented,** bears to the percentage of such graduates per institution for all part B institutions.

7. **Funds Distribution –National level data**
   Citation: Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter III, Institutional Aid, Part B – Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Sec. 1063b. Professional or graduate institutions
   (e) eligibility
   (2) Qualified graduate program
   (A) For the purposes of this section, the term "qualified graduate program" means a graduate or professional program that provides a program of instruction in the physical or natural sciences, engineering, mathematics, or other scientific discipline in which **African Americans are underrepresented** and has students enrolled in such program at the time of application for a grant under this section.

8. **Funds Distribution –National level data**
   Citation: Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter III, Institutional Aid, Part E - Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program, Sec. 1067a. Purpose; authority
   (b) Grant authority. The Secretary shall, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, carry out a program of making grants to institutions of higher education that are designed to effect long-range improvement in science and engineering education at predominantly minority institutions and to **increase the participation of underrepresented ethnic minorities,** particularly minority women, **in scientific and technological careers.**
   Subpart 2 - administrative and general provisions Sec. 1067k. Definitions.
   For the purpose of this part -

(2) The term **"minority" means American Indian, Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic (including persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Central or South American origin), Pacific Islander or other ethnic group underrepresented in science and engineering.**

(5) The term "underrepresented in science and engineering" means **a minority group whose number of scientists and engineers per 10,000 population of that group is substantially below the comparable figure for scientists and engineers who are white and not of Hispanic origin.**

Ethnicity: ACS List of Residents questionnaire – item 5 and Person questionnaire – item 12

1. **Reporting – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7267 Reports
   (a)Annual reports. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report by January 1 of each year, beginning on January 1, 1995, . . . including statistical information for the number and percentage of elementary and secondary school students by gender, race, and **ethnic origin** who drop out of school each year, including dropouts -
   (1) throughout the Nation by rural and urban location as defined by the Secretary; and
   (2) in each of the individual States and the District of Columbia.

2. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 33 – Education of Individuals with Disabilities, Subchapter IV – National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities, Sec. 1474 – Studies and Evaluations
   (2) Authorized activities. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may support studies, evaluations, and assessments, including studies that –
   (A) impact, and results achieved by State educational agencies and local educational agencies through their activities to reform policies, procedures, and practices designed to improve educational and transitional services and results for children with disabilities;. . .
   (C) assess educational and transitional services and results for children with disabilities from minority backgrounds, including
   (III) **the number of minority children** who graduated from secondary and postsecondary education programs;

3. **Funds Distribution –National level data**
   Citation: Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter III, Institutional Aid, Part E - Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program, Sec. 1067a. Purpose; authority
   (b) Grant authority. The Secretary shall, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, carry out a program of making grants to institutions of higher education that are designed to effect long-range improvement in science and engineering education at predominantly minority institutions and to **increase the participation of underrepresented ethnic minorities,** particularly minority women, **in scientific and technological careers**.
   Subpart 2 - administrative and general provisions Sec. 1067k. Definitions.
   For the purpose of this part -
   (2) The term **"minority" means American Indian, Alaskan Native, Black (not of Hispanic origin), Hispanic (including persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Central or South American origin), Pacific Islander or other ethnic group underrepresented in science and engineering.**
   (5) The term "underrepresented in science and engineering" means **a minority group whose number of scientists and engineers per 10,000 population of that group is substantially below the comparable figure for scientists and engineers who are white and not of Hispanic origin.**

National Origin: ACS Person questionnaire – item 7

1. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 68 – National Education Reform, Part A - General Provisions Regarding Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Sec. 6011. Office of Educational Research and Improvement
   (a) Declaration of policy regarding educational opportunity -
   (1) In general. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, **national origin,** or social class. . .
   (3) Authorized activities. (A) Office - In fulfilling its purposes under this section, the Office is authorized to - . . . (iii) collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to education, and to library and information services;

Immigrant Status: ACS Person questionnaire- items 7 and 8

1. **Funds Distribution – State and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VII– Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, Part C – Emergency Immigrant Education Program, Sec. 7544. State allocations
   b) Allocations. (1) In general. Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) of this section, of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year for this part, each State participating in the program assisted under this part shall receive an allocation equal to the **proportion of such State's number of immigrant children and youth** who are enrolled in public elementary or secondary schools under the jurisdiction of each local educational agency described in paragraph (2) within such state, and in nonpublic elementary or secondary schools within the district served by each such local educational agency, **relative to the total number of immigrant children and youth** so enrolled in all the States participating in the program assisted under this part.

Recency of Immigration: ACS Person questionnaire- items 7, 8 and 9

1. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VII– Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, Part A - Bilingual Education, Subpart 1 - Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants, Sec
   (1) In general. An application for a grant under this subpart shall contain the following:
   (A) A description of the need for the proposed program, including data on the number of children and youth of limited-English proficiency in the school or school district to be served and the characteristics of such children and youth, such as language spoken, dropout rates, proficiency in English and the native language, academic standing in relation to the English-proficient peers of such children and youth, and, where applicable, **the recency of immigration.**

Language Spoken at Home: ACS Person questionnaire – items 14a and 14b

1. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VII– Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, Part A - Bilingual Education, Subpart 1 - Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants, Sec
   (1) In general. An application for a grant under this subpart shall contain the following:
   (A) A description of the need for the proposed program, including data on the number of children and youth of limited-English proficiency in the school or school district to be served and the characteristics of such children and youth, such as **language spoken,** dropout rates, proficiency in English and the native language, academic standing in relation to the English-proficient peers of such children and youth, and, where applicable, the recency of immigration.

English Proficiency: ACS Person questionnaire – item 14c

1. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VII– Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs, Part A - Bilingual Education, Subpart 1 - Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants, Sec 7426
   (1) In general. An application for a grant under this subpart shall contain the following:
   (A) A description of the need for the proposed program, including data on the **number of children and youth of limited-English proficiency** in the school or school district to be served and the characteristics of such children and youth, such as language spoken, dropout rates, **proficiency in English** and the native language, academic standing in relation to the English-proficient peers of such children and youth, and, where applicable, the recency of immigration.

2. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Adult Education and Family Literacy, Part A – Adult Education and Literacy Programs, Subpart 2 - State Provisions, Sec. 9224. State Plan Federal Provisions
   (10) a description of how the eligible agency will develop program strategies for populations that include, at a minimum -
   (A) low-income students;
   (B) individuals with disabilities;
   (C) single parents and displaced homemakers; and
   (D) individuals with multiple barriers to educational enhancement, including **individuals with limited English proficiency;**

3. **Funds Distribution – School district level data (or town or city)**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I– Adult Education and Family Literacy, Part A – Adult

Education and Literacy Programs, Subpart 3 – Local Provisions, Sec. 9241. Grants and Contracts for Eligible Providers

(e) Considerations. In awarding grants or contracts under this section, the eligible agency shall consider - . . .

(12) whether the local communities have a demonstrated need for additional **English literacy programs**.

4. **Funds Distribution – State and County level data**

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter II – Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships - Sec. 1023. Partnership grants

(e) Allowable uses of funds. An eligible partnership that receives a grant under this section may use such funds to carry out the following activities:

(1) Teacher preparation and parent involvement. Preparing teachers to work with diverse student populations, including individuals with disabilities and **limited English proficient individuals**, and involving parents in the teacher preparation program reform process.

5. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**

Citation: Title 20, Education, Chapter 28 – National Education Statistics, Sec. 9003. Duties of Center

(4) collecting, analyzing, cross-tabulating, and reporting, to the extent feasible, so as to provide information by gender, race, socioeconomic status, **limited-English proficiency,** and other population characteristics when such disaggregated information would facilitate educational and policy decisionmaking;

Disability: ACS Person questionnaire – items 15 and 16

1. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 68 – National Education Reform, Part A - General Provisions Regarding Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Sec. 6011. Office of Educational Research and Improvement
   (a) Declaration of policy regarding educational opportunity -
   (1) In general. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of race, color, religion, sex, age, **disability,** national origin, or social class. . .
   (3) Authorized activities. (A) Office - In fulfilling its purposes under this section, the Office is authorized to - . . . (iii) collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to education, and to library and information services;

2. **Funds Distribution - State**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Adult Education and Family Literacy, Part A – Adult Education and Literacy Programs, Subpart 2 - State Provisions, Sec. 9224. State Plan Federal Provisions
   (10) a description of how the eligible agency will develop program strategies for populations that include, at a minimum -
   (A) low-income students;
   (B) **individuals with disabilities;**
   (C) single parents and displaced homemakers; and
   (D) individuals with multiple barriers to educational enhancement, including individuals with limited English proficiency;

3. **Funds Distribution – State and County level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter II – Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships - Sec. 1023. Partnership grants
   (e) Allowable uses of funds. An eligible partnership that receives a grant under this section may use such funds to carry out the following activities:
   (1) Teacher preparation and parent involvement. Preparing teachers to work with diverse student populations, including **individuals with disabilities** and limited English proficient individuals, and involving parents in the teacher preparation program reform process.

Urbanicity: ACS List of Residents questionnaire

1. **Reporting – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter V – Promoting Equity, Part C – Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems, Sec.7267 Reports
   (a)Annual reports. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report by January 1 of each year, beginning on January 1, 1995, . . . including statistical information for the number and percentage of elementary and secondary school students by gender, race, and ethnic origin who drop out of school each year, including dropouts -
   (1) throughout the Nation by rural and urban location as defined by the Secretary; and
   (2) in each of the individual States and the District of Columbia.

2. **Funds Distribution – Census tract and County level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 69 – School-to-Work Opportunities, Subchapter II – School-to-Work Opportunities System Development and Implementation Grants to States, Part B - State Implementation Grants, Sec. 6145. Use of Amounts and Subchapter III – Federal Implementation Grants to Local Partnerships, Sec. 6177 "High Poverty Area" Defined
   The State shall not provide subgrants to local partnerships that have received implementation grants under subchapter III of this chapter, except that this prohibition shall not apply with respect to local partnerships that are located in high poverty areas, as such term is defined in section 6177 of this title.
   Sec. 6177. "High poverty area" defined - For purposes of this subchapter, the term "high poverty area" means an urban census tract, a contiguous group of urban census tracts, a block number area in a **nonmetropolitan county,** a contiguous group of block number areas in a **nonmetropolitan county,** or an Indian reservation (as defined in section 3202(9) of title 25), with a poverty rate of 20 percent or more among individuals who have not attained the age of 22, as determined by the Bureau of the Census.

3. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Part A - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs, Subpart 1 - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs, Sec.7113. State and local educational agency programs
   d) Local educational agency programs. (2) Distribution.
   (B) Of the amount distributed under paragraph (1), a State educational agency shall distribute –
   (i) 70 percent of such amount to local educational agencies, based on the **relative** enrollments in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools within the boundaries of such agencies; and
   (ii) 30 percent of such amount to local educational agencies that the State educational agency determines have the greatest need for additional funds to carry out drug and violence prevention programs authorized by this subpart.
   (B) Where appropriate and to the extent consistent with the needs assessment conducted by the State, not less than 25 percent of the amount distributed under subparagraph (A)(ii)

for a fiscal year shall be distributed to local educational agencies **located in rural and urban areas.**

4. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VI – Innovative Education Program Strategies, Part A - State and Local Programs, Sec. 7312. Allocation to local educational agencies
   (a) Distribution rule. From the sums made available each year to carry out this subchapter, the State educational agency shall distribute not less than 85 percent to local educational agencies within such State according to the relative enrollments in public and private, nonprofit schools within the school districts of such agencies, adjusted, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary, to provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as -
   (1) children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families;
   (2) children from low-income families; and
   (3) **children living in sparsely populated areas.**
   (b) Calculation of enrollments
   (1) In general - The calculation of relative enrollments under subsection (a) of this section shall be on the basis of the total of -
   (A) the number of children enrolled in public schools; and the number of children enrolled in private nonprofit schools that desire that their children participate in programs or projects assisted under this subchapter, for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

5. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter II – Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships - Sec. 1025. Administrative provisions
   (b) Peer review.
   (2) Priority - In recommending applications to the Secretary for funding under this subchapter, the panel shall -
   (A) with respect to grants under section 1022 of this title, give priority to eligible States serving States that –
   (iii) involve the development of innovative efforts aimed at reducing the shortage of highly qualified teachers in high poverty **urban and rural areas;**

Poverty: ACS List of Residents questionnaire – item 3 and Person questionnaire – items 40 a-h and 41

1. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 33 – Education of Individuals with Disabilities, Subchapter II – Assistance for Education of All Children with Disabilities, Sec. 1411 Authorization; Allotment; Use of Funds, Authorization of Appropriations
   (e) Permanent formula . . . Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall –
   (I) allocate to each State the amount it received for the base year;
   (II)allocate 85 percent of any remaining funds to States on the basis of their relative populations of children aged 3 through 21 who are of the same age as children with disabilities for whom the State ensures the availability of a free appropriate public education under this subchapter; and
   (III)allocate 15 percent of those remaining funds to States on the basis of their relative populations of children described in subclause (II) who are **living in poverty.**
   (ii) For the purpose of making grants under this paragraph, the Secretary shall use the most recent population data, including data on children **living in poverty,** that are available and satisfactory to the Secretary.

2. **Funds Distribution –Census tract level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 69 – School-to-Work Opportunities, Subchapter II – School-to-Work Opportunities System Development and Implementation Grants to States, Part B - State Implementation Grants, Sec. 6145. Use of Amounts and Subchapter III – Federal Implementation Grants to Local Partnerships, Sec. 6177 "High Poverty Area" Defined
   The State shall not provide subgrants to local partnerships that have received implementation grants under subchapter III of this chapter, except that this prohibition shall not apply with respect to local partnerships that are located in high poverty areas, as such term is defined in section 6177 of this title.
   Sec. 6177. "High poverty area" defined - For purposes of this subchapter, the term **"high poverty area"** means an urban census tract, a contiguous group of urban census tracts, a block number area in a nonmetropolitan county, a contiguous group of block number areas in a nonmetropolitan county, or an Indian reservation (as defined in section 3202(9) of title 25), with a poverty rate of 20 percent or more among individuals who have not attained the age of 22, as determined by the Bureau of the Census.

3. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards, Part A - Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies, Subpart 2 – Allocations, Sec. 6333. Basic grants to local educational agencies
   c) Children to be counted. 1) Categories of children. The number of children to be counted for purposes of this section is the aggregate of -
   (A) the number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, in the school district of the local educational agency from families **below the poverty level** as determined under paragraph (2);

(B) the number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, in the school district of such agency from families **above the poverty level** as determined under paragraph (5); and
(C) the number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, in the school district of such agency in institutions for neglected and delinquent children (other than such institutions operated by the United States),

4. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards, Part B - Even Start Family Literacy Programs, Sec. 6362. Program authorized
d) State allocation. . . . (2) Allocations. Except as provided in paragraph (3), from the total amount available for allocation to States in any fiscal year, each State shall be eligible to receive a grant under paragraph (1) in an amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount as the amount allocated **under part A of this subchapter** to that State bears to the total amount allocated under that section to all the States.

5. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter II – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Part B - State and Local Activities, Sec. 6642. Allocation of funds
(b) State allocations - The Secretary shall allocate the amount available to carry out this part . . .:
(1) Fifty percent shall be allocated among such jurisdictions on the basis of their relative populations of individuals aged five through 17, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data.
(2) Fifty percent shall be allocated among such jurisdictions in accordance with the relative amounts such jurisdictions received **under part A of subchapter I of this chapter** for the preceding fiscal year, or for fiscal year 1995 only, such part's predecessor authority.

6. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter II – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Part B - State and Local Activities, Sec. 6643. Within-State Allocations
(B) of the remaining amount –
(i) 50 percent shall be distributed to local educational agencies –
(I) for use in accordance with section 6650 of this title; and
(II) in accordance with the relative enrollments in public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools within the boundaries of such agencies; and
(ii) 50 percent of such amount shall be distributed to local educational agencies –
(I) for use in accordance with section 6650 of this title; and
(II) in accordance with the relative amount such agencies received under **part A of subchapter I of this chapter**

7. **Funds Distribution – State and School district level data**
Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter II – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program, Part B - State and Local Activities, Part C - Reading and Literacy Grants, Sec. 6661d. Local Reading Improvement Subgrants

a) In general. (1) Subgrants. A State educational agency that receives a grant under section 6661b of this title shall make subgrants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies that either –

(A) have at least one school that is identified for school improvement under section 6317(c) of this title in the geographic area served by the agency;

(B) have the largest, or second largest, number of children who are counted under section 6333(c)(children 5 to 17 in families **in poverty)** of this title, in comparison to all other local educational agencies in the State; or

(C) have **the highest, or second highest, school-age child poverty rate,** in comparison to all other local educational agencies in the State.

For purposes of subparagraph (C), the term "school-age child poverty rate" means the number of children counted under section 6333(c) of this title who are living within the geographic boundaries of the local educational agency, expressed as a percentage of the total number of children aged 5-17 years living within the geographic boundaries of the local educational agency.

8. **Funds Distribution – State level data**

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter III – Technology for Education, Part A - Technology for Education of All Students, Subpart 2 - State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources, Sec. 6841. Allotment and Reallotment

(a) Allotment. (1) In general. Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State educational agency shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subpart for a fiscal year in an amount which bears the same relationship to the amount made available under section 6814(a)(1)(C) of this title for such year as the amount such State received **under part A of subchapter I of this chapter** for such year bears to the amount received for such year under such part by all States.

9. **Funds Distribution – State level data**

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter III– Technology for Education, Part E - Elementary Mathematics and Science Equipment Program, Sec. 6974. Allotments of funds

b) Allotment. (1) In general. The remainder of the amount so appropriated (after meeting requirements in subsection (a) of this section) shall be allotted among State educational agencies so that -

(A) one-half of such remainder shall be distributed by allotting to each State educational agency an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half of such remainder as the number of children aged 5 to 17, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all States; and

(B) one-half of such remainder shall be distributed according to each State's share of allocations **under part A of subchapter I of this chapter.**

10. **Funds Distribution – State level data**

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter IV - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Part A - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs,
Subpart 1 - State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs, Sec. 7111. Reservations and Allotments

(b) State allotments. (1) In general. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, for each fiscal year, allocate among the States -

(A) one-half of the remainder not reserved under subsection (a) of this section according

to the ratio between the school-aged population of each State and the school-aged population of all the States; and

(B) one-half of such remainder according to **the ratio between the amount each State received under part A of subchapter I of this chapter** for the preceding year

11. Funds Distribution – State and County level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter II – Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships, Sec. 1025. Administrative provisions

(b) Peer review.

(2) Priority - In recommending applications to the Secretary for funding under this subchapter, the panel shall -

(A) with respect to grants under section 1022 of this title, give priority to eligible States serving States that –

(iii) involve the development of innovative efforts aimed at reducing the shortage of highly qualified teachers in **high poverty** urban and rural areas;

12. Funds Distribution –State and County level data

Citation: Title 20 – Education, Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter II – Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships, Sec. 1023. Partnership grants

(a) Grants. From amounts made available under section 1030(2) of this title for a fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to award grants under this section, on a competitive basis, to eligible partnerships to enable the eligible partnerships to carry out the activities described in subsections (d) and (e) of this section.

(b) Definitions

(1) Eligible partnerships - In this subchapter, the term "eligible partnerships" means an entity that -

(A) shall include –

(i) a partner institution;

(ii) a school of arts and sciences; and

(iii) **a high need local educational agency [defined as a high percentage of individuals from families below the poverty line]**;

13. Funds Distribution –District level data

Citation: FY 2001, Class Size Reduction Program (as authorized under PL 106-554)

(b) (1) Each State that receives funds under this section shall distribute 100 percent of such funds to local educational agencies, of which--

(A) 80 percent of such amount shall be allocated to such local educational agencies in proportion to the number of children, aged 5 to 17, who reside in the school district served by such local educational agency **from families with incomes below the poverty line** (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved for the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available compared to the number of such individuals who reside in the school districts served by all the local educational agencies in the State for that fiscal year; and

14. Funds Distribution –Regional, State, and Community level data

Citation: Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter IV – Student Assistance, Part A – Grants to Students in Attendance at Institutions of Higher Education, Community Scholarship Mobilization Act, Pub. L. 105-244, Sec. 814 Purpose; Endowment Grant Authority

(a) Purpose. It is the purpose of this part to establish and support regional, State or ***community*** program centers to enable such centers to foster the development of local entities in **high poverty areas** that promote higher education goals for students from **low-income families** by -

(1) providing academic support, including guidance, counseling, mentoring, tutoring, and recognition; and

(2) providing ***scholarship*** assistance for the cost of postsecondary education.

(b) Endowment Grant Authority. From the funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 816, the Secretary shall award an endowment grant, on a competitive basis, to a national organization to enable such organization to support the establishment or ongoing work of regional, State or ***community*** program centers that foster the development of local entities **in high poverty areas to improve** secondary school graduation rates and postsecondary attendance through the provision of academic support services and ***scholarship*** assistance for the cost of postsecondary education.

Section 813 – Definitions

(4) High poverty area. - The term **'high poverty area' means a community with a higher percentage of children from low-income families than the national average of such percentage** and a lower percentage of children pursuing postsecondary education than the national average of such percentage.

Income: ACS Person questionnaire – items 40 a-h and 41

1. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 68 – National Education Reform, Part A - General Provisions Regarding Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Sec. 6011. Office of Educational Research and Improvement
   (a) Declaration of policy regarding educational opportunity -
   (1) In general. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every individual an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, national origin, or **social class. . .**
   (3) Authorized activities. (A) Office - In fulfilling its purposes under this section, the Office is authorized to - . . . (iii) collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to education, and to library and information services;

2. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards, Part A - Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies, Subpart 1 - Basic Program Requirements, Sec. 6321. Participation of Children Enrolled in Private Schools
   4) Expenditures. Expenditures for educational services and other benefits to eligible private school children shall be equal to the proportion of funds allocated to participating school attendance areas based on the **number of children from low-income families** who attend private schools.

3. **Funds Distribution – School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter VI – Innovative Education Program Strategies, Part A - State and Local Programs, Sec. 7312. Allocation to local educational agencies
   (a) Distribution rule. From the sums made available each year to carry out this subchapter, the State educational agency shall distribute not less than 85 percent to local educational agencies within such State according to the relative enrollments in public and private, nonprofit schools within the school districts of such agencies, adjusted, in accordance with criteria approved by the Secretary, to provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child, such as -
   (1) **children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families;**
   (2) **children from low-income families; and**
   (3) children living in sparsely populated areas.
   (b) Calculation of enrollments
   (1) In general - The calculation of relative enrollments under subsection (a) of this section shall be on the basis of the total of -
   (C) the number of children enrolled in public schools; and
   (D) the number of children enrolled in private nonprofit schools that desire that their children participate in programs or projects assisted under this subchapter, for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

4. **Funds Distribution – State level data**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 70 – Strengthening and Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Subchapter I – Adult Education and Family Literacy, Part A – Adult Education and Literacy Programs, Subpart 2 - State Provisions, Sec. 9224. State Plan Federal Provisions
   (10) a description of how the eligible agency will develop program strategies for populations that include, at a minimum -
   (A) **low-income students;**
   (B) individuals with disabilities;
   (C) single parents and displaced homemakers; and
   (D) individuals with multiple barriers to educational enhancement, including individuals with limited English proficiency;

5. **Reporting – Nation, State, and School district level data**
   Citation: Title 20, Education, Chapter 28 – National Education Statistics, Sec. 9003. Duties of Center
   (4) collecting, analyzing, cross-tabulating, and reporting, to the extent feasible, so as to provide information by gender, race, **socioeconomic status,** limited-English proficiency, and other population characteristics when such disaggregated information would facilitate educational and policy decisionmaking;

See also entries 1-14 under poverty.

Occupation/Industry: ACS Person questionnaire items 34-39

1. **Reporting -Nation**
   Citation: Title 20 – Education, Chapter 45 – Career Education and Career Development, Subchapter I –Career Education and Development Programs, Sec. 2505. Grants or contracts
   (a) Information gathering; **analysis of career trends and options**; publication of periodic reports and reference works; conduct of seminars, workshops, etc. The Secretary of Education shall provide, either directly or by grant or contract, for -
   (1) the gathering, cataloging, storing, analyzing, and disseminating information related to the **availability of**, and preparation for, **careers in the United States**, including information concerning current career options, future career trends, and career education;
   (2) the ongoing **analysis of career trends and options in the United States**, using information from both the public and private sectors, including **such sources as** the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the **Department of Commerce**, the United States International Trade Commission, economic analysts, labor unions, and private industry;
   (3) the publication of periodic reports and reference works using analysis prepared pursuant to this section and containing exemplary materials from the career education field, including research findings, results, and techniques from successful projects and programs, and **highlights of ongoing analyses of career trends in the United States**;

2. **Funds Distribution –National level data**
   Citation: Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter III, Institutional Aid, Part B – Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Sec. 1062. Grants to institutions
   (a) General authorization; uses of funds
   (4) Academic instruction in disciplines in which Black Americans are underrepresented.
   Sec. 1061, Definitions
   (4) The term "**professional and academic areas** in which Blacks are underrepresented" shall be determined by the Secretary and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, on the basis of the most recent available satisfactory data, as professional and academic areas in which the **percentage of Black Americans** who have been educated, trained, and **employed is less than the percentage of Blacks in the general population.**

3. **Funds Distribution –National level data**
   Citation Title 20 Education, Chapter 28 – Higher Education Resources and Student Assistance, Subchapter III, Institutional Aid, Part B – Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Sec. 1063. Allotments to institutions
   (c) Allotment; graduate and professional student basis. From the amounts appropriated to carry out this part for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall allot to each part B institution a sum which bears the same ratio to one-fourth of that amount as the percentage of graduates per institution, who are admitted to and in attendance at, within 5 years of graduation with a baccalaureate degree, a graduate or professional school in a degree program in **disciplines in which Blacks are underrepresented,** bears to the percentage of such graduates per institution for all part B institutions.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. Let me thank all of you for being here today. I did read your statements last night and thank you for the effort you went to to prepare those statements.

You are basically a cross-section of the data user community. Dr. McMillen is from the Federal Government side. How would you rate, and how do you think your peers rate, the cooperation that the Census Bureau has used in developing ACS, that you are allowed to provide input and they are adjusting it accordingly? Do you and Dr. Voss feel comfortable from the small data concerns that both you raised? Does it need to be more? Do you have other specific recommendations of what the Bureau can do better to keep close working relationships with the data user community?

Mr. VOSS. Well I will start with a brief answer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that line of communication has been superb and I say that on the basis of first-hand experience. In my testimony I give three or four examples of where conversations between data users and the staff developing the ACS within the Bureau led to changes that improved the ACS design, and those lines of communication remain open. I am very pleased with that level of communication. I as a data user know who to call within the Census Bureau; I do not go through a large hierarchy of permissions to talk with the staff, I know who those people are. We have good conversations and I think out of those conversations comes for the data user community a better understanding of some of the difficulties the Census Bureau is facing, and on their part, some of the needs of the data user community. I rank their cooperation in that regard very highly.

Mr. MILLER. Would someone else care to make a comment?

Ms. GAGE. I would, Mr. Chairman. I would like to concur with what Dr. Voss has said. Perhaps it is because the survey is in development, but the ACS staff has been excellent in seeking user input and accepting it.

Mr. MILLER. Dr. Hernandez, you had a comment?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I would certainly concur in that judgment as well. I think the Census Bureau is very open and responsive to the needs and interests of the user community. I would like to reiterate that in view of the complexity and magnitude of the evaluation task before the Census Bureau for the ACS that we do have specific recommendations for creating a process which would maximize the amount of information that the Bureau receives and help to ensure that the Bureau makes the best possible decisions in the evaluation process and in providing information back to us as users and to the Congress.

Mr. MILLER. For the other statistical agencies within the Federal Government there has always been a good relationship, I think.

Ms. MCMILLEN. Yes. Yes. Most of the statistical agencies sit on an OMB-organized committee that participates on a regular basis in meetings.

Mr. MILLER. A question I raised with Mr. Barron is whether this is duplicating, and I know we have to wait to fully evaluate ACS. But do you envision the possibility, without a significant increase in the number of questions, of combining—we keep referring to the Current Population Survey—of combining other surveys into this? Mr. Barron said in the report that just came out that it is an $11

billion estimate for the 2010 census. A lot of money. But one way some of my colleagues will look at it is to say, well, if we are going to be able to consolidate some reports. Do you envision that is possible if this is successful and after we have a chance to evaluate it? I guess the earliest we can evaluate it is probably 2008.

Mr. Hernandez, I will start down at your end.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I think the issue does require substantial scrutiny. But based on my experience to date, I think it would be very difficult to eliminate any other particular survey because of the level of duplication. Although there is some duplication between the long form and the CPS, for example, the two data collection systems serve very different purposes. The ACS, the long form data, provide a lot of very valuable information for local areas, whereas the national surveys are focused at the national level and can provide detailed information for only some of the larger States. Because the national surveys with which I am familiar, including the Current Population Survey, go far beyond the ACS or the long form in their topical content, it is hard to imagine, how it would be possible to obtain the information that has proven so valuable from the CPS, if the CPS were eliminating without drastically expanding the ACS or the long form content, which would be problematic for a variety of reasons.

Mr. MILLER. Anyone else care to comment? Dr. McMillen.

Ms. MCMILLEN. In the case of my agency, we actually are in a situation where one of our projects is being melded into the ACS. In 1980 and 1990, we had to undergo a major effort to remap each decade all the school district boundaries in order to have the data and then go to special efforts, at a considerable cost to the Government, to have the Census Bureau tabulate the data to the school district boundaries. In part, because of the requirement that we have biannual estimates of children in poverty to satisfy title I funding allocations, we now are updating those boundaries on a regular basis. Because those are there, that information is being incorporated into the ACS and they are now treating school districts, as they did in the 2000 census, school districts are being treated as a level of geography so it is no longer a special tabulation. We will be getting data now, once the data come on line, we will get data on a regular basis.

So there is one small example of a project that has been enhanced. We have better data more often and we will not have this considerable buildup of cost and effort every decade in order to get these data.

On the topic of the Current Population Survey, I think they are very different surveys. The Current Population Survey can ask questions in much more detail because of the nature of the survey. It is, albeit over the phone, a personal interview. But I think there is real value of having the two combined. As I said in my prepared comments, if you have rich data from CPS on something like dropouts at the national level but you do not have district or county or really State level data, then you can take the variable that overlaps and drill down on that item to give the detail at the geographic level. That is sort of the basic way you can use it. I think there also is a lot of potential down the road as the data become available for doing modelling at the national level with CPS and then

combining those data with the ACS data to get a better idea of how some of those things might be occurring at the local level.

Mr. MILLER. Ms. Gage.

Ms. GAGE. Mr. Chairman, we do not use a lot of the national surveys because they do not provide small area data. My concern with trying to combine those data collections would be that the burden would increase on the ACS and stress the number of questions that are being asked of the public.

Mr. VOSS. I agree with the panelists in what they have said. You did ask I think right at the end of that set of questions about when we can sort of evaluate the ACS. I thought I would respond to that part. Certainly, we do not have to wait till 2008. The ACS is already under evaluation in a very small group of counties. The year 2002 will be a very important year because the evaluation of the ACS-like national supplemental survey can be compared with the long form. That will be the first time we will have for the Nation and for States and other large areas the opportunity to really compare the kind of data that the ACS delivers under slightly different procedures and residence rules than does the long form. So 2002 will be important for large areas from that survey. And then from around the country the 39 test sites will be able to use the ACS data that has been gathered in recent years on an intensive basis to compare against the long form for very different kinds of counties. They were very carefully selected so that different issues that arise—for example, the ones that I am most interested in, counties with highly seasonal populations, what does it mean when you are looking at data that has been gathered over the course of a year from a slice in time in April where Wisconsin counties are not as populated as they are in the summer.

So those are the kinds of issues we will be able to look at in 2000. A phase-in will begin in 2003 and there will be data coming out from the ACS every year. It will only be 2008 before the full phase-in is brought in place.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Clay.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is I guess for the entire panel. Why is the ACS not as precise as possible? If somebody could take a stab at that, at why do you think it is not as precise as it could be. I heard you, Mr. Voss, make the comment.

Mr. VOSS. Let us agree on what we mean by precise. I used the words "precise" and "reliable" in my testimony in several places. And what I basically mean by that is the level of confidence you have in an estimate that comes from that survey. In polling terms, an estimate that comes from a poll of 30 percent plus or minus 2 percent is a more precise estimate than 30 percent plus or minus 5 percent. So it is the level of confidence, the level of uncertainty in that estimate.

The reason the ACS is not going to deliver estimates as reliable or as precise as the long form is because the sample is not as large. Right now, the long form went to roughly, I cannot remember, 1 in 6 I think.

Ms. MCMILLEN. Seventeen percent.

Mr. VOSS. Seventeen percent. Roughly 1 in 6 of the population. Right now, with 3 million addresses per year, we are at about 1

in 8 in terms of the sampling fraction. And the sampling size and the sampling design largely dictates precision and confidence and the ACS simply is not as large, Mr. Clay.

Mr. CLAY. Thank you. Let me ask Ms. Gage a question. Ms. Gage, would you prefer the long form versus the ACS?

Ms. GAGE. I do not have an opinion at this time. In California we do have two counties participating in the ACS. I have done some very rudimentary examination of those data and as I compare them to the Census Bureau's current estimates that are controlled by age, gender, and race-ethnicity, they are faring better on some variables than others. They are not faring well on total population, they are not faring well on the race-ethnic distribution in those counties, and they are not faring well on the age distribution of our younger populations.

So at this time, without an evaluation and track record of the ACS, I would prefer a data collection that is comparable and equitable for all levels of jurisdictions.

Mr. CLAY. And a question that may be somewhat specific to California. It is my understanding that the residency rules for the ACS require a person to be living at an address for 2 months to be counted. Migrant laborers often are not at a single address for 2 consecutive months. Do you believe that the procedures in the ACS are adequate to capture the migrant labor population in California?

Ms. GAGE. I do not know at this time, Mr. Clay. That is something we are certainly very concerned about. And although Tulare County was chosen as a county with seasonal population, there has not yet been enough study of those data.

Mr. CLAY. I see. Thank you.

Dr. McMillen.

Ms. MCMILLEN. To add to that. It is 2 months or if you have no other usual place of residence you are counted at the place you are at at the time. So that should help with the migrant labor problem.

Mr. CLAY. Well, some migrants do not have a permanent address.

Ms. MCMILLEN. That is my point. If they do not have a permanent—it is 2 months or if you do not have a permanent residence you are counted where you are at the time. So that should help with that.

Mr. CLAY. I see.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask another question about the questions on the survey. You heard Mr. Barr raise the issue and, as you know, there was a little controversy when the long form came out originally. There is always the pressure to add more questions to get more data. As data users, I am sure you would love to add a few more questions. But it does affect response rates I believe, potentially it could affect response rates, and there is the cost factor. How do you feel about the controlling of the number of questions asked and the limitations on that? I think a couple of you would love to have more questions asked.

Dr. Voss.

Mr. VOSS. Well I will try. I found Mr. Barr's questions interesting. The questionnaire length is very long. And I mean no disrespect to Mr. Barr in this answer because I agree with him that it has to be looked at. But the reason that the ACS form is 24

pages is not because each of us has to answer all 24 pages, it is long in length so that families with many members will have an opportunity to essentially count all of their members. In my household where there are two of us, I think I probably would have to answer, if I answered fully, four or five of those pages.

So to count pages is not to really condemn the length of it. I think if the major——

Mr. MILLER. It is a privacy question also that Mr. Barr was raising.

Mr. VOSS. Well, I agree. I think I will not try to speak to the privacy issue. I have several points on this. Let me make one more. I think it was 1978, I may be off by a year, when OMB at the last moment slashed the long form by about I think a third. And I recall the outcry that came from that; that a long form that omitted that many questions could not meet the demands of the Federal Government, of the laws that subcommittees like your own, Mr. Chairman, had put into place. I think from that experience we learned that cutting even a few questions is very difficult. And the voices that were heard came not only to the Census Bureau but to the oversight committee at the time. It was not an easy time because it was so late in that decade coming into the 1980 census.

The questions are there because there are laws behind them. And making the questionnaire briefer is a challenge for everyone.

Mr. MILLER. Is the 2000 census the shortest one for the long form questions? It is shorter than the 1990 census. Do you know if it is going to be, of course, we do not have the data yet, but is that going to cause any problems that we are aware of right now? I am not sure what questions we may drop, but we did drop some questions. The only one that was added was the one about grandparents taking care of grandkids or something that was a requirement of the Welfare Reform Act.

We do have a vote going on. Let me see if anyone else wants to add a comment at all, a concluding statement.

Mr. VOSS. The questions that were dropped for 2000 were largely on the housing side. I think that the users of those data have figured out that there is other ways that they might make use of them. That is an example of how questions can be dropped. But a question on marital status was dropped from the short form and then immediately the Census Bureau was criticized for having slipped that over to the long form. So it is a process that must be done in consultation with the Congress.

Mr. MILLER. Let me conclude the hearing by saying, since there is a vote on the floor, thank you all very much for coming today and responding to our questions.

Before I conclude, Jane Cobb, sitting to my left, who is staff director, is leaving at the end of this week and moving to another part of the Federal Government, over in FEMA, actually. She has served a decade on Capitol Hill and she has done a great job. She has been an invaluable member of the subcommittee and I appreciate her and wish her well at FEMA. I hope there are no disasters that you help bring about over there. [Laughter.]

Let me say thank you again for coming.

I ask unanimous consent that all Members' and witnesses' opening statements be included in the record. Without objection, so ordered.

I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record the written testimony of Robert Hunter, executive director of Hillsborough County, FL County/City Planning Commission; and Greg Williams, State demographer of Alaska; and Tom Gallagher of the State of Wyoming's Department of Employment.

In case there are additional questions that Members may have for our witnesses, I ask unanimous consent for the record to remain open for 2 weeks for Members to submit questions for the record and that witnesses submit written answers as soon as practical. Without objection, so ordered.

Thank you again. The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:08 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

○