Last Revised: March 16, 2009 8:10 AM

Dates: Tuesday March 17 through Thursday March 19, 2009

Place: Bureau of Labor Statistics Conference Center, Postal Square Building, 2 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C. 20212

Sponsors: The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U.S. Census Bureau

Background

The Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Census Bureau will hold the thirteenth annual Federal CASIC Workshops at the place and time indicated above. This year's Workshops will be held about one week later in the year than last year's conference. This series of annual meetings was originally called the Federal CAPI Workshops but its focus was expanded in 1997 to include all forms of computer assisted survey information collection (CASIC).

Attendance is open to representatives of Federal agencies and Federal contractors who use computer assisted methods of survey data collection, capture, and processing. Agencies and agency contractors who plan to use CASIC methods or that provide software support to Federal CASIC surveys also are welcome to attend. There is no fee for attendance but advance registration is required for admission to the BLS Conference Center.

FedCASIC 2009 Coordination and Registration

These workshops are being planned and coordinated by Jean Fox (BLS) and Cheryl Landman (Census). The primary means of coordination will be through e-mail messages and a web site.

Registration will open about February 1, 2009.

Conference Program

Opening Day - Tuesday, March 17, 2009

Plenary Sessions (Tuesday 9:00 am to 12:00 noon)

The conference will begin with two 80-minute, consecutive, plenary sessions.

1. Opening Keynote Speaker

Envisioning the Survey Interview of the Future

Frederick Conrad
Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
Joint Program in Survey Methodology, University of Maryland

Survey interviews are not going away but they may look different in the future than they do now. They will likely be mediated by emerging technologies, e.g., desktop video, text messaging, and will become hard to distinguish from purely self-administered data collection: is it an interview or self-administration if a virtual (computer-animated) interviewer asks (speaks) questions, recognizes spoken answers and offers to help when respondents seem confused? In this talk I will discuss some of the dimensions on which interviews of the future might vary such as the degree to which new technologies create the sense of social presence (feel like someone else is present) and the degree to which they promote satisficing (respondent short-cuts). I will discuss recent research with interactive web questionnaires and virtual interviewers that may hint at where survey interviews are headed.

2. Plenary Panel

The Impact of the Economy on Statistical Agencies

Moderator: Cynthia Clark, US National Agricultural Statistics Service

Panelists:

Jo Edwards - UK Office for National Statistics

Lon Hoffman - Statistics Netherlands

Jane Gentleman - US National Center for Health Statistics

Susan Lensen - Statistics Canada

The panel, with representatives from statistical agencies in the US, The Netherlands, the UK, and Canada, will address how smaller budgets and the downturn in the global economy are affecting data collection. They will discuss how approaches to data collection have changed and how new technologies have helped reduced costs, along with other topics related to data collection today.

Concurrent Sessions (Tuesday 1:30-4:30 pm)

1. Recent Innovations at Participating Organizations

This session has replaced the traditional Round Robin Organizational Reports. Following the model of past year's approach, the organizational reports will be voluntary. Only organizations that have recent innovations to share with their colleagues are asked to report. Because presentations in this session are generally limited to 10 minutes each, we ask that they be focused on true innovations. Descriptions of new or continuing surveys using familiar CASIC methods may be distributed as handout supplements rather than part of the verbal presentation. The innovations can be in organization, types of surveys undertaken, software, hardware, communications, training, research, or what have you.

Schedule of Speakers:

Presenters	**Organization**	**Time**
Landman & Ahmed	BLS and Census Bureau – Introduction	1:30
Sean Curran	Bureau of Labor Statistics	1:35
John Mamer	Mathematica	1:47
Annie Cote-Steski	Statistics Canada	1:59
Patty Maher	SRC – Michigan	2:11
Martha Farrar	National Agriculture Statistics Service	2:23
Lon Hofman	Blaise – Statistics Netherlands	2:35
BREAK		2:50
Cheryl Landman	Census Bureau	3:05
Jane Shepherd	Westat	3:17
Karen Davis	Research Triangle Institute	3:29
Judy Petty	NORC	3:41
available slot	available slot	3:53
Tom Schnetlage	CASES – U.C. Berkeley	4:05
Shirin Ahmed	Census Bureau – Summary	4:20

Time remains for one additional organization to present. To participate in this session, please send the name of your spokesperson(s), their general topic area(s), and approximate time required for presentation to the coordinators listed below. If you plan to participate but can't supply the details yet, let us know so we can reserve a spot for you on the agenda.

Coordinators:

Cheryl Landman <cheryl.r.landman@census.gov>

Shirin Ahmed <shirin.anne.ahmed@census.gov>

2. Software and Application Demonstrations

This year we will continue to offer demonstrations of CASIC instruments and software in a mini exhibit hall setting, where attendees can move among exhibitors throughout the session.

Only representatives of Federal agencies or Federal survey contractors may make presentations. Software vendors may participate in demonstrations only when invited by a Federal agency or Federal survey contractor to assist in its presentation.

Coordinator
Louis Harrell <Harrell.Louis@bls.gov>

Technical Workshop Session Topics

March 18 and 19, 2009

The remaining sessions on March 18 and 19 will focus on specific CASIC topic areas in a workshop format. These workshops will consist of moderated half-day discussions led by experts in those areas. They are designed to maximize discussion among the presenters and with the audience. Four technical workshops will be held concurrently on Wednesday morning (March 18), on Wednesday afternoon, and on Thursday morning (March 19).

Wednesday Morning, March 18, 2009

1. Accessibility in CASIC Surveys

This session will cover topics relevant to accessibility and CASIC applications, including making web surveys accessible and usable, and developing an accessibility program.

Target audience: From survey managers to survey developers, not too technical.

508 Update / WCAG 2.0
Bruce Bailey, Access Board

Achieving 508 Compliance
Lisa Lawler, Census

Two for One: Addressing Accessibility Can Improve Usability
Kate Walser, CX Insights

Accessibility and Usability on the Web
Karen Brenner, Westat

Survey Accessibility Summary: Review & Design Recommendations for Blaise, CASES & More
David Hoffman, SSA

What! Accessible?: Decyphering Section 508 at the Bureau of Labor Statistics

Stephen Ferg, BLS

Coordinators:
Brad Edwards <BradEdwards@westat.com>

Jean Fox <Fox.Jean@bls.gov>

2. Web-Based Surveys

Web-based surveys continue to increase in popularity across many content areas. This session will discuss a variety of topics including, but not limited to: web-survey design, web-survey implementation, security regulations, respondent contact, and data processing.

Coordinator:
Andrew Zukerberg <Andrew.Zukerberg@ed.gov>

3. Using Paradata to Monitor and Control Survey Quality

This session will focus on how organizations are using paradata for survey quality assurance.

Using Paradata to Track the Incidence of Respondent Substitution and its Effect on Survey Quality
Carl Ramirez

PANDA – Using Paradata to Improve Survey Quality
Ariel Teichman

Overview of CATI Data Collection Research Focussed on Developing Operational Strategies for Process Improvement
François LaFlamme

Using Paradata to Monitor Survey Quality in Statistics Canada's Regional Data Collection MIS Reports
Mike Maydan

Using Paradata to Monitor Survey Processes: Lessons Learned and Future Directions
Sue Ellen Hansen

Coordinators:
Chris Stringer <Mark.c.stringer@census.gov>

Sue Ellen Hansen<SEHansen@isr.umich.edu>

4. Field defect detection, classification, and management

Survey organizations spend considerable time and effort in the lifecycle development of CAPI/ACASI/CATI software instrumentation. When an instrument is deployed to the field it may be impacted by defects (aka software "bugs") that went undetected during unit,

system, and integration testing. These defects may be caused by software, hardware, or other integrated equipment problems. Survey organizations utilize different methodologies to detect, analyze, fix, and track defects. Thus, this session will consider the methodologies that organizations use for detecting and characterizing field defects. This includes processes managing, tracking, and fixing defects; and characterizing defects in terms of their type, frequency, and patterns. Finally, presenters will describe lessons learned in defect detection and classification as a mechanism for influencing future instrumentation projects at their organization.

Lessons Learned from Process Data Defects
Rick Rogers, Fenestra Technologies Corporation

In this session, Rick Rogers describes Fenestra's experience with data defects experienced in the field. Fenestra has served as a contractor for the US Census Bureau to develop metadata-driven paper and electronic surveys since 1994, and the Census Bureau used Fenestra's Generalized Instrument Design System ("GIDS") to conduct both the 2002 and 2007 Economic Census. Even though data defects have been extremely rare, over the years Fenestra and the Census Bureau have experienced a few, and Mr. Rogers will discuss specific examples. There are three major categories of data defects: those which impact response data in a major way which must be fixed immediately, those which impact response data in a minor way which can be resolved through compensating algorithms, and those which impact process data. Of these three categories, the third – process data defects – has proven to be the most subtle and difficult to resolve. Mr. Rogers discusses a recent example of a process data defect from the US Census Bureau 2008 Annual Survey of Manufactures, and provides suggestions on how to minimize process data defects.

Characterizing Cyclical Software Defect Patterns on the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
Alan Fisher, Harris Corporation

The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, is a large and comprehensive health survey utilizing leading edge technologies to produce national estimates of health measures and the nutritional status of the United States population. NHANES has been in the field for ten years. Field error detection has evolved from manual logging during the first six years to an automated system that captures unusual field occurrence data that can be used to chart the temporal IT field error trends for this mature survey. With changes occurring on a two-year cycle, and numerous systems having undergone maintenance, it is reasonable to expect that systems are generating fewer errors over time. Furthermore, CDC can now accurately assess where IT errors are occurring and how these are linked to system enhancements.

Learning from our mistakes: Analysis of defects discovered in client side paradata, and its effects on future iterations of software design.
Alex Miroff and Kareem Brown, Booz-Allen Hamilton

Painstaking effort is taken to gather and categorize the types of errors that we experience during field data collection, but once we receive feedback, how does this information influence our future application design and development? We will start by briefly defining and discussing client side paradata while providing examples. We will then discuss how careful management and analysis of errors encountered during data collection impact future metadata authoring, user interface design, and testing procedures.

Developing Standards for Defect Detection: Establishing a Top Ten List
Lizza Miller, PhD

Despite all of the checks and balances put in place to detect, analyze, fix, and track defects, they are bound to occur. For each phase of a project there may be a different set of methodologies and a different set of standards and procedures. How does an organization achieve success across multiple phases? How can the different methodologies inform better performance across each phase? How can a collaborative culture of "bug pride" help an organization? We will present a proposed "Top 10" list based on our and our customers' experiences designing, developing, and deploying Web/CAPI/ACASI/CATI software instrumentation. From the cultural to the technological to the procedural, this list is sure to spark interest, agreement, and even some controversy.

Coordinator:
Lew Berman <lfb4@cdc.gov>

Wednesday Afternoon, March 18, 2009

5. Management Challenges in CAI Survey Organizations

This session will provide a venue for those grappling with management and administrative challenges in today's CAI environment to share their knowledge and learn from others. A panel of 4-5 management experts from government and industry will discuss several management challenges listed below. Audience participation in the form of questions and shared experiences will be encouraged. Session attendees will hear about the techniques used in different organizations to address key management issues, participate in a discussion of these issues, and have the opportunity to ask the panelists about effective approaches to common situations. Specific areas to be addressed will include:

- Security and Confidentiality Issues: How are organizations addressing the requirements and incorporating these activities into their annual workload? Discussion of current issues including staffing, technical and budget requirements.
- Project Management Issues: Discussion will focus on project management issues related to several topics, possibly including software development, quality control assessment, workforce planning, and risk management.

Coordinators:
Anne K. Stratton, NCHS <AStratton@cdc.gov>

Jane Shepherd, Westat <shephej1@westat.com>

Karen Davis, RTI <kdavis@rti.org>

6. Managing Generalized Systems for Establishment Surveys: Approaches and Best Practices

This session looks at how statistical organizations tackle the management of generalized systems and/or approaches across program areas. The management of generalized systems and/or approaches is challenging because of continual changes in technology, methods, and

user (customer) requirements. This session covers a variety of situations in using generalized systems and/or approaches, with emphasis on how organizations identify improvements, address competing needs, manage change and implementation, and meet customer satisfaction to ensure the effectiveness of programs and operations.

Target Audience: Managers or project leaders of systems or processes

Management of the Standard Economic Processing System at the U.S. Census Bureau
Anne Russell, U.S. Census Bureau

Use of Generalized Systems for Processing Annual Business Surveys at Statistics Canada
Daniela Ravindra, Statistics Canada

The Agricultural Census is Not Just a Big Survey
Asa Manning, National Agricultural Statistics Service

Plans for Developing a Generalized Framework for Internet Collection at the Energy Information Agency
Stan Freedman, Energy Information Administration

Coordinators:
Deb Stempowski <Deborah.m.Stempowski@census.gov>

Shirin Ahmed <shirin.anne.ahmed@census.gov>

7. New Technologies for Surveys

Coordinator:
Liz Dean <edean@rti.org>

8. Survey Uses of Metadata

Metadata are data that describe other data or processes. They are used to document design decisions and to drive processing in an automated fashion. For users of data, the metadata are the record of how those data were produced and what the data mean. As Phil Rones, Deputy Commissioner of BLS, puts it, metadata are analogous to the work you had to show when solving a math problem in high school. In order to understand the data a survey produces, you must know the steps that were taken to conduct that survey.

Metadata can be simple, not convey a lot of information, and be relatively easy to capture. On the other hand, they can be detailed, convey much information, and be hard to capture. How does a statistical agency get over the hump and begin to capture "enough" metadata? And, how does the agency decide what is enough?

Simple or complex, metadata usually don't help the person tasked with capturing them. They are used by others farther in the survey life-cycle. Therefore, altruism is required to obtain metadata. How does the agency make it worthwhile for survey workers to capture metadata?

Users may want to compare data and metadata from multiple sources, but the data may be defined and organized differently across those sources. The metadata exist to help the user understand each data set and work on analyses or harmonization. Does the same problem need to exist for the metadata, too? Do the metadata need their own metadata to understand them? Metadata standards can solve this problem, but much cooperation is required.

Survey work provides many opportunities to use metadata fruitfully, throughout the survey life-cycle. This session will explore some of these, motivated by the questions above. Since the possibilities are so many and varied, this session can focus on only a few each time. Examples include survey conceptualization, data, tables, designs (sample, question, or database), definitions, classifications, and others.

Coordinator:
Dan Gillman, BLS <Gillman.Daniel@bls.gov>

Thursday Morning, March 19, 2009

9. New Approaches to Data Management – Validation, Editing, Dissemination

This session will focus on new system designs, and new technologies, which can allow more timely processing of survey and multiple reporting site data. Topics of interest include: metadata-based validation at system entry point, streamlining the data correction process to lower burden on editors and reporters, and tapping into the data management system for real-time tracking of data quality and the timeliness of data processing.

Target audience: From managers to technical staff involved in data management. However, I expect the presentations will be primarily technical.

Automating Data Management for Complex Survey Processes
Mary Laidlaw and Craig Ray, Westat

This presentation will focus on data management systems and methods for integrating the multiple processes involved in managing survey data from the point of collection through delivery. The challenges of working in multi-project environments with varying platform and systems requirements will be discussed. Automation of processes becomes critical in rapidly moving data through the processing streams, and integration between system components facilitates efficient and timely data editing and delivery requirements.

Transforming Data Management through Technology
Elizabeth Miller, DatStat

New challenges in survey research including decreasing response rates, increasing survey costs and greater emphasis on mixed-mode strategies demand new and improved systems for managing participants, surveys, and data across multiple projects and modes of data collection. To date, the field has lacked effective systems that enable researchers to implement and manage data from multiple sources, modes, and diverse populations. In order to produce high quality, affordable results, new approaches to data management must be defined, implemented, and measured.

Unique Data Quality, Verification and Dissemination Strategy in a Restricted Environment
Maria Hobbs and David Forvendal, RTI International

How is data quality achieved in the face of the daily challenges that survey research presents? Furthermore, how do you accomplish successful data verification measures while conducting survey interviews in highly secured correctional facilities that allow no Internet or wireless communications of any kind? This session will show how an extremely complex study, commissioned by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, was able to collect survey data in highly secured jail and prison systems while accomplishing data verification through a 3 dimensional approach. Daily results were published to the project website within 12 hours for project management and logistics review. This process not only accomplished data verification and dissemination, it also automated a manual logging and tracking process. By automating this process, an additional layer of data integrity was employed through data validation prior to the data transmission process. This strategy allowed project management to simultaneously monitor the interview results from approximately 100 interviewers dispatched to 10-15 correctional facilities each week during data collection.

Coordinator:
David Uglow <duglow@rti.org>

10. Audio Recording within Survey Instruments

Target Audience: Survey designers, field operations managers, technology staff, call center managers

NORC's first year in the field with CARI: lessons learned during 2008
Kyle Fennell, Kymn Kochanek, John Sokolowski, NORC

During FedCASIC 2008, we summarized the work done to prepare for our use of CARI during two major studies fielded in 2008. Since then, NORC has deployed CARI on both studies and recorded over 10,000 interviews. Even though one of these studies is still in the field, we are now able to discuss our experiences and lessons learned since FedCASIC 2008.

Uses of CARI by Statistics Canada: Recent Experiences with Data Collection and CAPI Interviewer Monitoring
Lecily Hunter, Caroline Pelletier, Joanne Bachelor, Anne Lostracco, Statistics Canada

Over the past year, Statistics Canada has been investigating the use of CARI for monitoring interviewer performance in the field, and as an alternative method of collecting data. In December 2008, the Healthy Aging survey began collection, after an earlier pilot in Nov/Dec 2007; this survey uses CARI to record responses to a cognitive test. During November and December 2008, a pilot project to monitor CAPI interviewers was conducted; pre-determined blocks of questions were recorded and monitors working from our regional offices listened to the audio files and provided feedback to the interviewers. This presentation will share our experiences with using CARI technology, the results of the pilot projects, and our plans for the future

CARI - A Tool for Training, Pretesting and Evaluation
Wendy Hicks, Westat

CARI Monitoring: Current Issues and Responses
Kristin F. Miller, Susan Kinsey, Orin Day, Courtney Gainey, RTI International

During the past year, a core group of researchers at RTI have been investigating the operational benefits and challenges of implementing a standardized CARI monitoring protocol and feedback process across field and telephone studies. This presentation will highlight the key issues that we have been looking at as well as the responses to those issues, which are currently being explored.

Coordinator:
Rita Thissen <rthissen@rti.org>

11. Security in Data Collection Organizations

Data and systems security is a growing and never ending issue. It is hard, often boring and extremely critical. I'm reminded of an old pilot's maxim, "Flying is hours and hours of boredom punctuated by seconds of sheer panic." In this session we will examine some of the more recent issues and challenges related to securing data and systems, attempt to get a reading on how organizations are faring with these challenges and hopefully assist each other by sharing things that seem to be working well for us.

Target audience: From managers to individuals who provide system security. However, the presentations will be primarily technical.

Coordinator:
Bill Connett <BConnett@isr.umich.edu>

12. Multimode Data Collection

This session will focus on data collection using two or three survey modes including CATI, CAPI, Web, and mail. Topics include comparisons of data collected in various modes, instrumentation challenges, survey management, and impact of multimode administrations on cooperation and nonresponse bias.

Multiple Modes in the Michigan Study of Young Women
Gina-Qian Cheung, University of Michigan.

The Michigan Study of Young Women is designed to study the correlations between interpersonal relationships, contraception, and unintended pregnancy in a multi-wave survey of 1000 young women, aged 18-19, residing in one Michigan county. Respondents complete a 50 minute baseline survey in-person, including a self-administered section, and then they complete a 5 minute web-based journal. After the initial baseline and enrollment journal, respondents complete weekly journals via computer (their computer or one we provide) or by calling into the interviewers to complete the journal as a phone interview for 130 weeks. This session will describe the data collection systems, processes, and how they are managed across departments and modes. Modes of data collection employed by this project include in-person interviewing, web-based journaling, phone interviews and in-depth case studies.

The Redesign of the Canadian Survey of Household Spending
Terrence Riley, Statistics Canada

The Survey of Household Spending (SHS) has been collected since 1938 (in various incarnations). This CAPI survey measures the expenditures of Canadians and is also used to update the basket of goods and services and their relative weights for the Consumer Price Index (CPI) program.

In 2005, a five year redesign started that moves this survey from annual to monthly collection and adds a two week food diary (essentially integrating the Food Expenditure (FOODEX) survey into the SHS). Also, the questionnaire has been redesigned to ask for expenditure information in a manner that takes into account how respondents actual spend their money (e.g. monthly, weekly, annually, last payment). Finally, permission for Statistics Canada to link to income tax files was asked for the first time.

This presentation will provide an overview of the year long pilot that was completed in 2008 and the implementation for 2009 collection (both versions of the survey, annual and monthly, will be collected in 2009 and 2010). The focus will be on the collection challenges, including the lessons that were learned and the many changes that were made between the pilot and the main survey.

The pilot evaluated the integration of the two modes into one survey and how to take advantage of the best of each (as well as the move to monthly continuous collection). The implementation of the food diary was a particular challenge and many options were proposed, tested, discarded until the current solution was found. The CAPI application applies edits to resolve FOODEX issues after data have been collected on paper. The willingness of Canadians to complete the FOODEX survey over the web is also measured.

What it Means to Specify in Multiple Modes

Mark Pierzchala, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) has conducted multimode surveys for several years. One of the most challenging aspects of such a survey is in the specification, especially when the specification writer is used to operating in just one mode. This presentation will take the case of the combination of CATI, Web, and paper modes as a vehicle of illustration. First to be discussed is the primary specification decision: that is, whether to (1) optimize the specification for each mode individually or (2) specify each mode at the same time in order to have a near-as-possible specification across each mode. Second, the presentation will discuss the concept of *disparate modes* for some kinds of questions. These are profound differences between modes brought about by fundamental aspects of the different modes. Third is a summary of these fundamental mode aspects such as interviewer- vs. self-administration, aural vs. visual presentation, and passive (paper) vs. dynamic (electronic) survey media. Fourth, in summary, the presentation will discuss information that specification writers could have to ease the burden of multimode specification as well as procedures and form of specification.

Recent Developments in Address Based Sampling

Mansour Fahimi, Marketing Systems Group

Increasingly, researchers are considering address based sampling (ABS) methodologies for survey administration and related commercial applications. Essentially, there are three main factors for this change: evolving coverage problems associated with telephone-based methods; eroding rates of response to single modes of contact; and on the other hand, recent improvements in the databases of household addresses available to researchers. This presentation provides an assessment of these three factors, which in turn provide a compelling argument in favor of the multimode methods of survey administrations. An overview of the *Delivery Sequence File* (DSF) of the USPS will be provided for construction of ABS frames that serves as a natural platform for design and implementation of multimode surveys. Moreover, key enhancements available for the DSF will be discussed that aim to reduce undercoverage bias and enable researcher to develop more efficient sample designs as well as broaden their analytical possibilities through an expanded set of covariates for hypothesis testing and statistical modeling tasks.

Relative Costs of a Multi-frame, Multi-mode Enhancement to an RDD Survey

Sherman Edwards, Westat; J. Michael Brick, Westat; David Grant, UCLA Center for Health Policy Research

The 2007 California Health Interview Survey implemented both an area sample in Los Angeles County to assess nonresponse bias and statewide samples of landline and cellular telephone numbers to produce estimates for individuals in households with telephones. While these kinds of enhancements may improve RDD-based estimates, the per-case costs of interviewing from area and cell phone frames are typically higher than from landline RDD frames. This paper draws upon the CHIS 2007 experiences to compare the relative costs of interviewing from landline, cellular, and area sample frames in a mixed-mode design. It will consider interviewer time and related expenses; supervisory, management, and processing costs; the marginal costs of adding a frame or mode. Finally, it will explore the optimal allocation of sample to frames with various assumptions about the contribution to variance of each frame.

Coordinators:

Brad Edwards <BradEdwards@westat.com>

Mark Pierzchala <Mpierzchala@Mathematica-Mpr.com >

Debra Wright <Dwright@Mathematica-Mpr.com>