Address Canvassing Test

Draft as of February 8, 2016

Operation	Approving Official	Approving Official - Signature	Date approved
Address Canvassing	Evan Moffett		
Geographic Programs	Evan Moffett		
Content and Forms Design	Jessica Graber		
Communications	Kimberly Higginbotham		
Field Infrastructure (includes MDCP)	Alexa Jones-Puthoff		
IT Infrastructure	Pete Boudriault		
Decennial Logistics Management	Alexa Jones-Puthoff		
Decennial Service Center	Alexa Jones-Puthoff		
Approving all of the above	Deirdre Bishop		

Assumptions and Site Selection Criteria

Operations -- (Note - Support Operations have not test objectives or research questions.)

Address Canvassing

Assumptions and Site Selection Criteria

<u>Universe</u>

- 1. The Address Canvassing Test will occur in two sites within the United States, with each containing 4,000 contiguous non-zero housing unit blocks.
- 2. The Address Canvassing Test will occur in two sites in the lower 48 states (the test sites will not be in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico or the Island Areas).
- 3. The Address Canvassing Test sites will contain a variety of address styles, such as city-style addresses, non city-style address, and location descriptions (low priority).
- 4. The Address Canvassing Test will contain one site that has been through GSS-I Local File Updating (specifically through the Address Source Evaluation) and one site that has not.
- 5. The Address Canvassing Test will contain one site that has commercial file data available for updating and one site that has not.
- 6. The Address Canvassing Test will contain one site that is experiencing growth (≥1.7% based on 2010-2014 housing unit estimates) and one site that is experiencing decline (<0% based on 2010-2014 housing unit estimates).
- 7. The Address Canvassing Test will contain one site that contains geographic areas identified as potential In-Field Address Canvassing blocks (i.e., excludes preliminary Update Enumerate areas, blocks with 100% Delivery Sequence File coverage, and blocks that have not experienced any changes in the MAF inventory of addresses between 2010 and 2014).
- 8. The Address Canvassing Test sites will not contain Update Enumerate areas.
- 9. The Address Canvassing Test sites will not contain military areas.
- 10. The Address Canvassing Test will use the Basic Collection Unit (BCU) as the unit of geography to organize and manage work assignments.
- 11. All BCUs in the Address Canvassing Test sites will be canvassed in both the office and the field.

Assumptions and Site Selection Criteria

In-Field Canvassing

12. In-Field Address Canvassing will be conducted using Corporate Listing and Mapping Solutions (LiMA), Mobile Case Management, MOJO and UTS (i.e., CEDCaP systems).

- 13. In-Field Address Canvassing data collection will be conducted using a smartphone device.
- 14. In-Field Address Canvassing will conduct a second canvass of selected BCUs to perform a rudimentary quality estimation on those BCUs. If a large discrepancy rate is found between the two listings on the same BCU, it may imply one of the two listings was of poor quality, or the block was difficult to list. This information may be of use when resolving discrepancies between In-Office Address Canvassing and In-Field Address Canvassing.
- 15. In-Field Address Canvassing will not collect feature updates.
- 16. In-Field Address Canvassing results will update the MAF/TIGER database.

<u>Other</u>

17. In-Office Address Canvassing and In-Field Address Canvassing will inform the same management reporting system.

18. The Address Canvassing Integrated Product Team will review Lessons Learned from previous census tests and use them to guide the planning for the test if appropriate.

Address Canvassing Test

Test Focus	MeasMeasUnde	the test is: ure the effectiveness of In-Office Address Canvassing throu ure the effectiveness of In-Field Address Canvassing rstand the implications of moving from Assignment Area (a ction blocks and assignment areas.	-	nit (BCU), which encompass the characteristics of both
Milestone Schedule	Begin Fie Begin Fie Begin In- End In-Fi	Id Management Training August 29, 2016 Id Supervisor Training September 13, 2016 Id Representative Training September 26, 2016 Field Data Collection October 3, 2016 eld Data Collection November 15, 2016 Address Canvassing Test Analysis Report April 29, 2017		
Scope and Limitations	effective	ress Canvassing Test allows for the comparison of results fr ness of In-Office Address Canvassing procedures and proce f hired to support the Test will be Field Representatives an	esses. This test is not intended to measure ad Field Supervisors; we are not hiring staf	e or assess the coverage of the Master Address File.
		Operations with Test Ob	jectives and Research Questions	
Goals		Objectives	Success Criteria	Questions to Answer
Address Canvassing				
Measure the effective In-Office Address Canv		 Implement In-Office Address Canvassing processes. Including: Interactive Review Active Block Resolution (ABR) MAF Update Identification of the In-Field Address Canvassing workload 	 Update the MAF Collect production metrics Make use of resources provided by local governments and commercial third party data Collect data to directly compare In- Office to In-Field Address Canvassing results 	 How accurate are the results from In-Office Address Canvassing relative to In-Field Address Canvassing? Did In-Office Address Canvassing miss housing units that In-Field Address Canvassing identified? What types of units were missed (e.g., multi-units, trailers)? Did In-Office Address Canvassing identify

		Collect data to determine if the identification of the In-Field Address Canvassing workload was accurate	 housing units that In-Field Address Canvassing missed? What types of units? O Did In-Field Address Canvassing take actions (adds, deletes, changes, moves) that appear to be consistent with other sources of data (e.g., DSF status, GSS-I local file update status)? Can we identify the kinds of housing situations in which In-Office Address Canvassing performs as or more effectively than In-Field Address Canvassing and vice versa? Did In-Office Canvassing accurately identify the BCUs that required In-Field Address Canvassing work?
Measure the effectiveness of system integration for In-Field Address Canvassing	• Integrate multiple information technology applications (LiMA, MCM, MOJO, MOCs, MAF/TIGER, UTS and CEM) to create one seamless operational data collection, control, and management system	• The appropriate data were passed from system to system in order to implement In-Field Address Canvassing processes	N/A
Measure the effectiveness of In-Field Address Canvassing	• Implement In-Field Address Canvassing on a small platform device	 Data were collected to assess the effectiveness of listing on a small platform device Data were collected to assess whether there is an impact on field staff 	 Can listing effectively be completed on a small platform device? What are the impacts on field staff?
Measure the efficiency of In- Field Address Canvassing	Collect operational paradata	 Data are summarized to inform field cost factors for future budget estimation Data are collected from systems to inform future operational planning activities 	 How much time did FRs spend doing each of the following tasks: O Driving to the assigned block? O Conducting work in the assigned block?

Assess management of Address Canvassing using the NRFU approach to alerts	 Refine and expand alerting capabilities related to Address Canvassing activities 	• Newly developed alerts are deemed effective. Refinements to existing alerts are deemed potentially effective	• What are the most effective set of alerts for field supervisors to stay aware of potential issues in the Address Canvassing operation?
Test methods to train Field Staff to effectively conduct In- Field Addressing Canvassing	 Evaluate the effectiveness of: Field Representative and Field Supervisor <u>Online training</u> Field Representative <u>Classroom training</u> utilizing Field Supervisors who will be trained on facilitation skills and subject matter. Field Supervisors <u>Classroom training</u> utilizing Field Managers who will be trained on facilitation skills and subject matter 	• Field Representatives and Field Supervisors demonstrate competency and application of knowledge and skills to perform at desired level	 To what degree do Field Representatives and Field Supervisors react favorably to the Online and Classroom training To what degree do Field Representatives and Field Supervisors acquire the intended knowledge and skills based on their participation in the Online and Classroom training To what degree so Field Representatives and Field Supervisors apply what they learned during training when they are on the job
Understand the implications of moving from Assignment Area (a grouping of blocks) to Basic Collection Unit (BCU), which are the equivalent of blocks.	• Use BCUs as the lowest level collection geography used for canvassing	• The operation is successfully completed using BCUs	 What was the impact of using BCUs? Did the field staff successfully canvass the BCUs?

Support Operations		
Geographic Programs		
N/A		
Content and Forms Design		
N/A		
Communications		
N/A		
Field Infrastructure		
N/A		
IT Infrastructure		
Multiple devices, including iOS and Android, will be fielded under the Device-as-a-Service capability.		
Further testing of field data collection automation in a disconnected state.		
Further testing and paradata collection related to GPS point collection.		
Decennial Logistics Management		
Decennial Service Center		
Identifying and cataloging the types of Service Desk tickets/issues associated with an In-Field Address Canvassing operation		