

**Enumeration of Communal Establishments**  
**A General Register Office for Scotland Report**

## Table of Contents

1	Purpose.....	3
2	Background.....	3
3	Proposed Approach for 2011 .....	3
4	Issues which arose during rehearsal and how these are being addressed .....	4
5	Issues with specific types of Communal Establishment .....	5
6	Summary.....	7

## **Enumeration of Communal Establishments**

### **1 Purpose**

This paper is to inform Scotland Census Steering Group Committee (SCSC) about the proposals for enumeration of Communal Establishments (CEs) in the 2011 Census and how we plan to encourage participation and maximise response rates. It also examines the issues which occurred during the 2009 Census Rehearsal and sets out how we will address them in 2011.

### **2 Background**

A Communal Establishment (CE) is defined as "an establishment providing managed accommodation". The person in charge of a CE is required to complete a CE questionnaire. In addition each resident in a CE is required to complete a Communal Establishment Individual questionnaire. Types of CE include student halls of residence, hospitals, care homes, hostels, boarding schools and prisons.

Evaluation of the 2001 Census highlighted that the enumeration of CEs in 2001 was patchy at best. A number of reasons have been put forward for this – poor planning of CE enumeration; too complex for standard enumerators; a lack of engagement from CE managers.

To try to address these issues it was agreed that in 2009 we would appoint Communal Establishment enumerators (CEens) whose role would be to enumerate the 20 largest CEs in their district. The idea was that the CEens would be able to devote all of their time to the enumeration of these CEs, would develop a greater understanding of this type of enumeration and would be able to establish a rapport with CE Managers to explain the process and to assist with any queries.

Although this approach worked reasonably well in Lewis and Harris it was not successful in West Edinburgh. Evaluation indicates that this was largely due to the individual CEen concerned and suggests that it is therefore not advisable to invest this responsibility in staff at a junior level.

### **3 Proposed Approach for 2011**

This section will look at our proposed approach to the enumeration of CEs in 2011, highlighting issues which arose in the rehearsal and how our proposed approach will address these issues.

In 2011 we will use Census Team Leaders (CTLs) to enumerate all CEs. This will allow dedicated training, more engagement with CE managers and earlier delivery of questionnaires. Although it is expected that CTLs will normally enumerate those CEs which are in their own geographic area of responsibility, Census District Managers (CDMs) will have the flexibility to reallocate within their Census District therefore achieving a balanced workload for each CTL. We estimate that this should be no more than 12 Communal Establishments per CTL.

CTLs commence employment at the beginning of January 2011. During February they will be expected to make contact with the manager (or other named person) within each CE for which they are responsible, explain the purpose of the Census, the different types of questionnaires which will be issued and the procedures to be followed. They will also arrange a date to deliver the questionnaires. When they deliver the questionnaires they will arrange with their contact a date following Census Day when they will return to collect the questionnaires.

Questionnaires will be delivered during the first 2 weeks in March and follow-up will begin immediately after Census Day.

#### **4 Issues which arose during rehearsal and how these are being addressed**

4.1 CDMs made the initial contact with CE Managers in November. By the time the CEen delivered questionnaires in March many of the managers had no recollection of the visit in November or had moved on. Also it was often a different person on duty at each visit so there was no continuity.

By making the initial contact in February and by ensuring that dates for delivery and collection are agreed with a specific person, there should be better communication channels and the opportunity for the CTL to build a rapport with the CE Manager.

4.2 In the rehearsal, CEens were responsible for enumerating the 20 largest Communal Establishments in their Census District. Standard enumerators were expected to enumerate any smaller ones within their own Enumeration District. This caused confusion with much time being spent at training sessions answering questions about communal enumeration.

CTLs will be responsible for enumerating all CEs within their area. They will have dedicated training on how to enumerate CEs and will therefore develop a greater understanding of this type of enumeration. Standard enumerators will be able to concentrate on standard enumeration procedures (i.e. households).

4.3 Some CE managers, especially in the larger establishments, said they did not have enough time to distribute and collect all the Individual questionnaires

CTLs will start the enumeration process for Communal Establishments earlier and will concentrate on delivering the largest first.

4.4 There was a perceived lack of engagement from CE managers. They were given a number of Communal Establishment Individual forms and envelopes equating to the expected number of residents which they were then expected to distribute and collect. In the larger CEs this is a huge task.

CTLs will be able to devote more time to the enumeration of CEs. They will therefore be able to establish a rapport with CE Managers, have more time to explain the process and to assist with any queries.

4.5 The response rate for Individual questionnaires was poor, although the voluntary nature of the rehearsal made it difficult to engage CE residents. In addition, as in the 2001 Census, individual questionnaires were distributed without an information leaflet.

Individual forms will now be distributed in packs containing an information leaflet.

## **5 Issues with specific types of Communal Establishment**

Response rates from the following types of establishment is traditionally low. This section outlines proposals which have been considered in addition to the measures above to encourage participation, and the agreed outcomes.

### **5.1 Student Accommodation**

To try to encourage returns from those in student accommodation the following options were considered.

- Extending the internet data collection system, which in order to keep things simple had not been designed to operate in CEs, so that it could be used in student halls of residence. This was rejected after study because it would introduce unacceptable risk to seek such a fundamental change to the internet data capture system at this stage in census planning.
- Include a postage paid envelope in the Communal Establishment Individual packs to enable students to return their questionnaires directly by post – this was ruled out because it would create reconciliation difficulties for the CE Manager/CTLs.
- Provide on-site "post boxes" - this was considered impractical for security reasons.

It has been agreed that targeted publicity and communication activities will be employed to try to maximise response from all students including those in student accommodation.

### **5.2 Prisons**

There was a proposal that we could use administrative data held by the Scottish Prison Service to obtain at least basic information on inmates. Some initial investigation and analysis work was done and it was agreed that it would be technically feasible.

However after discussion with Scottish Government (SG) Solicitors we were advised that this was not possible due to data protection and human rights issues.

We will therefore continue to enumerate prisons in the traditional manner, but again will look to have greater publicity within each establishment.

### 5.3 Ministry of Defence (MOD) Establishments

Although the response rate from MOD establishments traditionally appears to be low, detailed evaluation following the rehearsal in England and Wales has shown that this may not necessarily be the real situation. Communal Establishment Individual questionnaires are allocated on the number of bed spaces per establishment. For the purpose of MOD establishments, residents are defined as those who have already spent or expect to spend six months or more in the CE and who have no other usual permanent address in the UK. Therefore many of those who are staying in MOD establishments do not fall into this category as either they have a permanent family home elsewhere or they will not be in that establishment for 6 months or more.

However, to try to ensure maximum participation from those we want to reach we have held joint meetings with the MOD and Office for National Statistics (ONS). The outcome of these meetings is that the MOD will issue a Defence Instruction Notice (DIN) to all Commanding Officers detailing the procedures for the Census. We have also asked that we are given a named contact(s). In addition the MOD have agreed to display/distribute any publicity materials we provide.

### 5.4 Rough Sleepers

Rough sleepers can be defined as people sleeping, or bedded down, in the open air (on the streets, in doorways, parks or bus shelters), and people in buildings not designed for habitation (sheds, car parks, cars, derelict boats, stations or 'bashes').

Homeless persons staying in hostels etc will be enumerated as part of the communal establishment population by CTLs.

In recognition of the need not to detract from individual rights, and because we wish the enumeration of rough sleepers to be an integral part of the enumeration of the whole population, rough sleepers are asked to complete the same individual form as individuals staying in communal establishments.

In 2001 the count of rough sleepers was carried out by local authorities and evaluation suggests that in some areas rough sleepers were undercounted.

Our proposed approach for the enumeration of rough sleepers in 2011 is to employ as enumerators persons already working with rough sleepers, either in street teams (funded by the local authorities) or in voluntary organisations. The rough sleeper enumerators will be employed under Census legislation and will sign the same confidentiality undertaking as 'standard' enumerators.

The main advantages of this approach are seen as:

- the enumerators are likely to have local knowledge of the location of rough sleepers;
- the enumerators will be known to the rough sleepers, will be trusted by them and are more likely to obtain co-operation than an 'unknown' government official; and

- the enumerators will have experience of the group, know who to count and know the dangers that could be encountered.

## **6 Summary**

The enumeration of communal establishments is seen as a complex task by CE Managers and individuals because of the difficulty in understanding definitions (e.g. usually resident or visitor). The introduction of CTLs to enumerate communals; providing an information pack for CE residents; and increased publicity in these establishments should lead to better response rates than in 2001.