

# **2009 Census Rehearsal Evaluation Standard Enumeration**

**December 2009**

---



**Table of contents**

1. Definition and scope for rehearsal.....	4
2. Evaluation findings .....	5
3. Other evaluation points .....	10

## **2009 Rehearsal – Standard Enumeration**

### **1. Definition and scope for rehearsal**

To define the standard enumeration procedures to be followed by field staff. The scope for the rehearsal was to define procedures for the enumeration of west Edinburgh (hand delivery of questionnaires) and Lewis and Harris (hand delivery and post out of questionnaires).

#### **What was tested:**

- enumeration procedures (including method for follow-up in post-out areas);
- Enumerator Record Books (ERB)s;
- distribution of enumeration materials to two field offices;
- Field Management Information System (FMIS) delivery and returns progress reports;
- field reporting system (recording of internet returns and fulfilment requests);
- Census District (CD) and Enumeration District (ED) maps; and
- collection and follow-up reminder cards.

#### **What could not be tested:**

- non compliance.

## 2. Evaluation findings

Pre – determined evaluation points

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
<p><b>1) Fulfilment requests</b></p>	<p><b>a) All requests actioned within agreed timescale.</b></p> <p><b>b) Lack of complaints/follow-up requests</b></p>	<p>Achieved:</p> <p><b>a) All requests which were passed on to the field via the Field Services Scotland website or the census helpline were actioned within the agreed timescale. However we have identified some useful enhancements for 2011.</b></p> <p><b>b) There were no complaints about non fulfilment of requests.</b></p>	<p>Enhancements to the Field Services Scotland website.</p>	<p>March 2011</p>
<p><b>2) Notification of internet/telephone completion</b></p>	<p><b>a) System available when specified.</b></p>	<p>Mostly Achieved:</p> <p><b>a) A system fault which meant that enumerators were unable to get access to the relevant area of the Field Services Scotland website for three days.</b></p>	<p><b>a) More robust monitoring procedures to be put in place with the technical contractors.</b></p>	<p>March 2011</p>

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
	<p><b>b)</b> Ease of use.</p> <p><b>c)</b> No unnecessary follow-up.</p>	<p><b>b)</b> Enumerators were able to access the information they required but some improvements have been identified.</p> <p><b>c)</b> There was no unnecessary follow-up due to lack of notification of Internet Data Capture (IDC)/telephone returns.</p>	<p><b>b)</b> Some enhancements to the Field Services Scotland website.</p> <p><b>c)</b> Retain method for 2011.</p>	<p>Sept 2009 – October 2010</p> <p>March 2011</p>
<p><b>3)</b> Post-out enumerators (workloads, follow-up arrangements)</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Measurement of the percentage of post-out return rates against hand delivery to ensure that post-out does not have a negative impact on return rates.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Was the workload manageable for the enumerator?</p>	<p>Achieved:</p> <p><b>a)</b> The return rate in Lewis and Harris as at 20 April 2009 showed a return rate of 45.2 per cent in post-out areas against 37.7 per cent in hand delivery areas.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Enumerators working in hand delivery areas were comfortable with their workloads. However, post-out enumerators felt that their Enumeration Districts (ED) s were too large and that the follow-up period should be extended.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Rehearsal response rates showed that post-out is a viable method for 2011. Proceed with proposed level of post-out (6 per cent) in 2011.</p> <p><b>b)</b> The follow-up period should be extended by seven to ten days</p>	<p>March 2011</p> <p>April 2011</p>

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
	<p><b>c)</b> Were the follow up arrangements satisfactory.</p>	<p><b>c)</b> Telephone follow-up was not popular (with field staff or the public) nor particularly beneficial in terms of encouraging a response. Field staff advised that posting the follow-up reminder cards proved a more successful method of encouraging householders to return their questionnaire.</p>	<p><b>c)</b> Telephone follow-up should be discarded. The follow-up method employed in post-out areas should consist of post out of follow-up reminder cards and physical visits to households (as required).</p>	<p>April 2011</p>
<p><b>4)</b> Reconciliation procedures</p>	<p>95 per cent of Enumerators Record Books (ERBs) reconciled correctly</p>	<p>Achieved:</p> <p><b>a)</b> 98 per cent of ERBs were correctly reconciled. This would suggest that enumerators found the guidance on how to carry out reconciliation straightforward and easy to follow.</p> <p><b>b)</b> There was no time factored into the schedule for the return of questionnaires for Census Team Leaders (CTL) s to check each enumerator’s questionnaire storage box so that any potential problems which may have impacted on the reconciliation check could</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Continue this method for the 2011 Census.</p> <p><b>b)</b> CTLs to check each enumerator’s questionnaire storage box on return to the field office in the presence of the enumerator.</p>	<p>March 2011</p> <p>April 2011</p>

Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
		have been dealt with in the presence of the enumerator.		
5) Suitability of maps	<p><b>a)</b> Enumerators able to find addresses.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Questionnaires delivered to correct address.</p>	<p>Achieved:</p> <p><b>a)</b> Enumerators appeared to have little difficulty in identifying those addresses which they were required to enumerate. Field staff provided some extremely positive feedback on the maps which were provided for the hand delivery areas. Feedback on the maps provided for the post-out areas was less encouraging, the field staff working in these areas preferred to use their local knowledge rather than the maps which were provided.</p> <p><b>b)</b> This won't be known until questionnaires are processed.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Continue with the same method in hand delivery areas in 2011. Although feedback from the debriefing sessions suggested that the Ordnance Survey maps were not used in post-out areas we think they may still prove useful so recommend they should still be provided in 2011.</p> <p><b>b)</b> As above depending on feedback from data processing site.</p>	<p>August 2010 for regional maps                      October 2010 for Census District (CD) maps                      February 2010 for ED maps</p>



Description	Success Criteria	Outcome against success criteria	Recommendation	Timeframe
<b>6)</b> Return rates (Paper, Internet Data Capture, Telephone Data Capture)	2 April – 15 per cent 4 April – 25 per cent 8 April – 35 per cent 4 April – 45 per cent 20 April – 50 per cent	Not achieved: <b>a)</b> Return rates were lower than the targets we had set for each report date. The latest response rate figure is 43 per cent.  <b>b)</b> The following factors had an impact on the return rate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rehearsal was voluntary;</li> <li>• pressure group negative publicity;</li> <li>• income question (Lewis and Harris);</li> <li>• perceived complexity and size of the questionnaire; and</li> <li>• non-delivery of advance leaflet.</li> </ul>	<b>a)</b> Increased publicity measures to encourage participation and to counter negative messages.  <b>b)</b> Address the perception of complexity by reviewing the design and layout of the questionnaire and by increasing positive publicity.  Advance leaflet to be included in the questionnaire pack.	January 2011  Aug 2009  March 2011

### 3. Other evaluation points

Description	Outcomes/issues	Recommendation(s)	Timeframe
7) Enumeration timetable	<p><b>a)</b> Field staff were content with the timescale which was allocated for the delivery of questionnaires. It should be noted however that there were very good weather conditions which cannot be guaranteed for 2011.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Field staff felt that the timeframe allocated to the follow-up period was insufficient.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Continue with the same arrangements in 2011.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Increase the elapse time allocated for the follow-up period by a minimum of seven to ten days.</p>	<p>March 2011</p> <p>April 2011</p>
8) Enumerator Record Books (ERB)	<p><b>a)</b> The requirement for page numbers on ERBs was not specified.</p> <p><b>b)</b> One ERB was printed incorrectly (a “training” record book was provided to an enumerator rather than the actual record book) and one was produced with the line numbers out of order (the first page of the record book started at line number 0511 as opposed to 0001).</p> <p><b>c)</b> On the whole, enumerators seemed content with their record books and found the “codes page” useful and easy to understand. There was a complaint raised about the</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Ensure that page numbers are included on ERB design for the printers.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Review level/process of quality assurance checks to ensure that all record books are printed correctly in 2011.</p> <p><b>c)</b> Keep the same format for 2011.</p>	<p>Dependant on print timetable</p>

Description	Outcomes/issues	Recommendation(s)	Timeframe
	space available to record notes and a suggestion to include some means of recording where personal contact had been made at follow-up.		
<p><b>9) FMIS, delivery and returns progress reports</b></p>	<p><b>a)</b> The reports were found to be too restrictive to allow further enhancements as the business requirement evolved during the field operation.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Field managers found the delivery and returns progress reports straightforward to complete online.</p> <p><b>c)</b> Census District Managers (CDM) s and CTLs did experience difficulties in obtaining reports from some enumerators. This had a knock-on effect on the timely submission of management information (MI) reports to Census Headquarters (CHQ).</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Ensure that any new system incorporates these requirements.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Retain the same method for reporting in 2011. Review the reporting process.</p> <p><b>c)</b> Review the process for obtaining MI from field staff.</p>	<p>September 2009 – July 2010</p> <p>April 2011</p> <p>October 2010</p>
<p><b>10) Collection and follow-up reminder cards</b></p>	<p><b>a)</b> Field staff confirmed at the debriefing sessions that the follow-up reminder cards appeared to be effective in terms of encouraging a response from non-responding households.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Continue to use follow-up reminder cards as a means of encouraging householders to respond to the questionnaire</p>	<p>April 2011</p>

Description	Outcomes/issues	Recommendation(s)	Timeframe
	<p><b>b)</b> Enumerators advised that there was minimal/no need to use collection reminder cards.</p> <p><b>c)</b> The following issues were raised by enumerators on reminder cards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No text on card to cover for situations where the householder may have responded since the card was posted.</li> <li>• No text on cards to say that the questionnaire can be completed online (pre-addressed questionnaires only).</li> <li>• Follow-up reminder card one is not appropriate in post-out areas as the text mentions the possibility of arranging for the questionnaire to be collected.</li> <li>• Enumerators got frustrated at having to write their mobile number on each reminder card that they issued; and</li> <li>• Reminder cards were “too flimsy”.</li> </ul>	<p><b>b)</b> We will retain the collection reminder card for 2011 as enumerators may still be required to collect questionnaires.</p> <p><b>c)</b> Recommendations for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert text on the follow-up reminder cards to advise householders to ignore the reminder if they have already responded.</li> <li>• Add text to the follow-up reminder cards to flag up the online completion option for pre-addressed questionnaires.</li> <li>• Take out the reference to collection of the questionnaire on follow-up reminder card one.</li> <li>• Insert the census helpline number on reminder cards as opposed to asking enumerators to write their census mobile number on the card.</li> <li>• Use a stronger type of card for the follow-up reminder cards.</li> </ul>	<p>July 2009</p> <p>All design changes to be agreed by December 2009</p>

Description	Outcomes/issues	Recommendation(s)	Timeframe
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General - Publicity team to consider using blank side of the follow-up reminder cards to promote the benefits of completing a census questionnaire.</li> </ul>	
<b>11)</b> Census questionnaires	Field Operations Branch (FOB) did not have adequate opportunity to comment on the design of all questionnaires prior to them being finalised.	FOB Branch should be included in the quality assurance process for all census questionnaires.	July 2009
<b>12)</b> Collection of questionnaires from households	Field staff confirmed at the debriefing sessions that they were asked to collect very few questionnaires from householders.	<p><b>a)</b> The option to collect will not be part of the doorstep routine. However enumerators will still collect if this is requested.</p> <p><b>b)</b> A section on “collection” will be retained in the enumerator handbook providing guidance on what action enumerators are required to take on the limited number of occasions this situation is expected to arise.</p>	<p>October 2010</p> <p>October 2010</p>
<b>13)</b> Envelopes	<p><b>a)</b> CD/ED and line numbers were not visible through the window of the delivery envelope.</p> <p><b>b)</b> No privacy envelopes were supplied to provide to people who wished to complete an Individual questionnaire.</p>	<p><b>a)</b> Review the design of the outbound envelopes.</p> <p><b>b)</b> Review process for return of household individual questionnaires.</p>	<p>December 2009</p> <p>September 2009</p>

Description	Outcomes/issues	Recommendation(s)	Timeframe
	<b>c)</b> Around 30 per cent of returned questionnaires had been inserted into the return envelope incorrectly.	<b>c)</b> Review design of return envelopes.	December 2009
<b>14)</b> Census Coverage Survey (CCS)	CCS staff began delivering introductory letters to households advising them about the upcoming CCS whilst census rehearsal staff were undertaking follow-up. This created confusion amongst householders and led to additional work for enumerators who had to explain the difference between the two surveys on the doorstep.	CCS to start later to ensure it does not overlap with the census.	July 2009