



Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists

Trip Report

Name: Mike Landen

Title of meeting or call: NAPHSIS Census 2000 State Adjustment Methodologies for Race and Ethnicity

Date of meeting or call: December 4, 2001

Date report filed: December 21, 2001

Sponsoring agency: NAPHSIS

Name and agency of person requesting CSTE representation/consultation: Tim Stephens, NAPHSIS

Number of participants in attendance: 20

Name of other organizations represented: NAPHSIS, CDC, NIH, University of Michigan, DHHS, State Offices of Vital Statistics

Report narrative: Meeting notes from Tim Stephens

Recommendations

- All states do not have funding to implement changes in systems to be able to collect multirace data. The comparability of race specific rates across states is dependent upon all states making the change. The federal government should take responsibility for identifying funds to ensure this minimum capability in all state systems. (NAPHSIS' VSCP committee has estimated the need for funding is \$5-6 million). This need is urgent, because population estimates will be more prone to error in the further out years.
- The NCHS plan to use backwards bridging, where multiple race category responses are reassigned back to the 1990 single race categories, was endorsed as the best national methodology.
- States should follow the NCHS bridging methodology. However, due to regional differences, or differences in race categorization or collection, states should feel able to choose other bridging methodologies, particularly where there is a need to produce data and reports before NCHS has completed its work.
- To improve the accuracy of state level tabulations the NCHS model should NCHS's model should force or control the county population estimates to each state's total

population. For post-censal population estimates there will be a need revise the model for those states developing their own state-level estimates.

- Some states develop their own state-level population estimates. Special regard for this group should be made by NCHS in developing the model, particularly in the post-censal years.
- The states are interested in providing validity data for the NCHS model. Citing the differences between states, their intimate knowledge of their demography, geographic distribution, immigrant status, and differences in collection methods, states and cities may be able to provide additional data that can modify and validate the model. Cities and the states without county jurisdictions (New England) were particularly cited in this regard.

Follow-up Actions

- NAPHSIS should conduct a quick survey to determine how states approaching the tabulation of rates by race. The survey should capture methods states are using, assumptions they are making about their populations, and dates they expect to publish. [SURVEY WAS SENT 12/6/01].
- There is a need for an additional meeting to discuss data collection methods.
- A list of the states and points of contact that use their “own” population estimates should be compiled by NAPHSIS. [STARTED AS PART OF THE SURVEY OF STATES ON TABULATION METHODS].
- NAPHSIS needs to do an environmental scan to see if there are other groups working on these issues, and include them in its reporting. [STARTED BY JAMIE RITCHEY].
- The current NHIS methodology for collecting race, using both the old and new categories should be retained. A letter from the group to this effect should be sent to Kathy Wallman at OMB.
- The proceedings from the 12/4/01 meeting and the subsequent recommendations should be sent to the HHS Secretary, NCVHS and the HHS Data Council.
- The issue of tabulation race rates and the committee’s recommendations should be raised at the March 2002 COPAFS meeting.

Unresolved areas

- Where funding is coming from to ensure that all states will be able to make the necessary system changes for collection?

- There is a necessity for data comparability between states. Is this just desirable, or does it trump other pressures at the state level?
- Appropriate tabulation groups for ease of understanding and balancing local meaningfulness with inter-state comparability (e.g. what's the best way to report Hispanics: 1) as a "race" as California has been doing with a single set of mutually exclusive categories with all Hispanics in one category or 2) in single mutually exclusive categories defined differently [i.e. keep all American Indians irrespective of Hispanic in a single group] or 3) tabulate race within Hispanic or 4) tabulate place of birth within Hispanic and/or other groups [e.g. Black] or 5) tabulate race irrespective of Hispanic with a separate tabulation of Hispanic as NCHS does etc.?)

Action to be taken: Consider a session on the ramifications of mixed race categories in population denominators. Continue to engage with NAPHSIS on this issue.

Were other CSTE consultants and team members involved collaboratively in crafting the CSTE advice? I discussed the meeting with Steven MacDonald

Which CSTE position statements provided guidance for the advice? None

Are new CSTE position statements needed to provide guidance for the advice given by the consultant(s) in this area? Yes, we need to address ramifications of the mixed race category in population denominators and consider recommendations regarding collection of mixed race data for reportable diseases and other surveillance databases.