

**TABLE OF CONTENTS TO MEMORANDUM FROM J. SCANLAN TO HUD
SEPTEMBER 22, 2020 EXPERT PANEL PARTICIPANTS**

	Page
Introduction	1
A. Problems in the Analyses of Demographic Differences in Outcome Rates by Measures That Tend to Be Affected by the Prevalence of an Outcome and Description of a Measure That Is Not Affected by the Prevalence of an Outcome	15
1. Description of the Patterns by Which Standard Measures Tend to Be Affected by the Prevalence of an Outcome and the Way Failure to Understand the Patterns Has Undermined Virtually All Analyses of Demographic Differences	15
2. Some Illustrations of the Misunderstanding of Racial Disparities Issues in the Minneapolis, Minnesota Area	24
3. A Simple Illustration of Problems in Identifying Which of Two Decisionmakers Is More Likely to Have Engaged in Discrimination Using Measures that Yield Opposite Conclusions	27
4. An Explanation of a Method of Quantifying a Demographic Difference Reflected by Favorable or Adverse Outcome Rates With Some Illustrations Based on Data Recently in the News and 2019 Urban Institute Study of Changing Patterns of Disparities in Uninsurance Rates	34
B. The Particular Measurement Problems of Paired Tester Studies	40
Addendum – HUD’s Final Rule on the Fair Housing Act’s Disparate Impact Standard	46
Table 1. Illustration of effects of lowering a test cutoff on measures of differences in test outcomes	29
Table 2 White and Hispanic insurance and uninsurance rates for 2010, 2013, and 2017, and white and black insurance and uninsurance rates for 2010, 2013, and 2016, with measures of difference	38
Table 3. Callback and no callback rates of members of black and white tester pairs without and with a criminal conviction on their resumes, with measures of difference	41
Table 4. Illustration of effects on indicators in Table 1 (and EES) of fact that half the persons in each group received no attention whatever from any decisionmaker	44