



CAN Dashboard Steering Committee 10/04/2018

Attendees: Tracy Ayrhart, Central Health; Awais Azhar, Housing Works Austin; Maureen Britton, Children's Optimal Health; Greg Cumpton, University of Texas; Caitlin D'Alton, Capital Metro; Hunter Ellinger, Community Council; Caitlin Hamrock, E³ Alliance; Brooke W. Martin, Integral Care; Josh Rudow, City of Austin NHCD; Pilar Westbrook, Del Valle ISD.

Staff in Attendance: Raul Alvarez, Carlos Soto

Welcome and Introductions: Greg Cumpton, DSC Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:09. Members introduced themselves.

Approval of minutes: The 08/15/18 meeting minutes were reviewed. Approval was tabled until next meeting due to low turnout.

Executive Director Update: Part of what we were trying to do last time was rethink how the Dashboard Steering Committee works in terms of the process it follows throughout the year. At the moment, the process could improve by providing opportunity to share about what we're working on and what we have learned about what other cities are doing. We update the report every year, but do we need to have an indicator-by indicator review every year? Before the last meeting we had a survey asking members of the dashboard what do you think we should talk about, instead of forcing a conversation or trying to find something that's wrong with the report.

The other part of what we are trying to do involves feedback on specific indicators that we wanted to consider. How do we streamline or rethink the work, how many meetings will it take, how should we structure the conversation? In terms of CAN, we have a busy month coming up, including the Deliberative Dialogues on the Opioid Crisis, which included the moderator training we held last Saturday, September 20. There are 3 upcoming dialogues, scheduled for the 9th, the 13th and the 23rd of October. The next event on the CAN Calendar is the CAN Regional Summit scheduled for Thursday, November 8 at the San Marcos Convention Center in San Marcos. The overall theme for the November summit is expanding housing opportunities. Will do another in the spring about expanding workforce opportunities. This will be our 3rd regional summit, first was in Bastrop, and the second was in Round Rock.

Discussion and possible action regarding indicators that have been on the dashboard for less than 3 years: Committee chair Greg Cumpton brought attention to a sheet developed by the Committee in 2013, which contains specific criteria for selecting and changing indicators. For this next cycle we need to rethink process because we have a very short timeframe before we submit to the board this year, and we are also heading into the 2019 year where we will be setting goals for the 2020 dashboard. One of the things we could do with this in-between space we find ourselves in is rethink how this committee does its work. The process we have been using, which involves going indicator by indicator & goal by goal, may not be the most effective. An important aspect highlighted in the document is that there is strength in measuring indicators over time, such that changing indicators should be done rarely. There are a couple of indicators that are relatively new, such as Drove Alone to Work, and Number of Days with Good Air Quality. These indicators have been on the dashboard for less than three years. Perhaps it might be helpful to determine what the optimal amount of time needed before revisiting a newly added indicator is. This action might also help provide weight for the gravity a change might impose. How do committee members feel? A review cycle of 3 years seems timelier than 5 years, which could be too long. Might be good to outline exceptions, for example if there is a national crisis that might affect an indicator, pinpoint a few exceptions that give us the flexibility to respond appropriately. Another concern: we get this data from a number of organizations, if they change their indicator, we need to be able to reflect that. Take back: define a few general exceptions, "except for some circumstances along the lines of...", for example, national/state changes, or if the indicator source changes the indicator or methodology. Technological change (transportation, healthcare) might also affect the system, as well as how/what data is recorded and shared. Categories discussed: technological changes, advances in research change in data source, national crisis, or other external factors

beyond the DSC's control. For some of these items let's include a separate 1-pager for folks to get the highlights of things we've discussed capturing the diversity of opinions.

Discussion and possible action relating to the addition of new indicators to the dashboard:

With this being the 10th year of the dashboard, the EC had questions about broader engagement around the dashboard and what it looks like, what purpose it serves, is it still viable & relevant, and if there are any major changes. So, for next year focusing our work on having a community conversation, engaging some of the stakeholders and service providers around a broader conversation. If we will be doing that next year, which is only 3 months away, let's talk about what kind of process we want to undertake next year to get that feedback. Essentially we are due to provide recommendations for the next cycle by February. The idea is not that we as a committee may not engage in this work, but that the recommendations we provide the committee up to that point will probably not indicate to include additional indicators, unless for example there was some emergency that happened between now and then, instead we would delay that until the next cycle. So, we are considering if we can put off the broader conversation about adding or replacing existing indicators with others, instead focusing more on the goals, between now and February, especially since we will be publishing the 2019 Dashboard with 2020 goals. The attached sheet includes ideas about how that community engagement might look like.

Delaying the adding of indicators makes sense especially if what's on the table is a broader conversation of how this will be used and its effects. That could really change what we want to focus on and how we want to track it. There's also the idea of bringing Ready by 21 into the conversation, since CAN is tasked with pulling the data and revising the RB21 Dashboard. Brief background on RB21, coalition, and dashboard project. Another idea involves comparing CAN dashboard with other dashboard projects. In the Dashboard Presentations, has staff received feedback of the nature why are you not looking at this or why do you continue doing that?" Usually feedback consists of questions about the Equity Analysis, or about disaggregated data. An issue that comes up is the lack of an indicator for middle school. Graduation rates might be artificially high because it's missing the students who dropped out from 8th to 9th grade. One of the underlying things that's happened over the 10 years of publishing the dashboard, it seems like at the beginning of the process there was a lot of concern about how things were, in general (2008). Nowadays, lots of people feel things are fine in general, but not fine in every particular. If the focus is data to inform action, then we need data on the aspects that need to be acted upon. Part of what there may be more appetite for is a bit more explicit orientation towards (particulars) where it's "not working". The structure might be better served by framing it in the longer term. In a certain sense what we should be thinking about is the 2025 dashboard, while considering how to connect with users of the dashboard to offer better richer functionality.

In terms of the purpose of the dashboard, our conversations have highlighted using it as a snapshot needs assessment to determine areas/issues we are struggling with, and using it as an evaluation tool to incentivize people to action and track their progress. It would be useful to know with more specificity who and where an indicator affects most. Perhaps a column on the dashboard specifying where (what group) the greatest inequity was, or perhaps a separate table with the greatest inequity for each indicator. Perhaps questions like that are more for the long-term. In-depth analysis like that gives us a greater purpose as a body to inform the CAN board of what are the things that maybe should be focused on when we look at those cross-references of the data that give us information. We appear data rich, but are we actually connecting the dots to make informed decisions for communities to provide support for the people in the community? Going back to the purpose of the dashboard, which is to point at underperforming areas by looking at community indicators, we consider questions such as "where is a community response required?", and "what kind(s) of community response(s) exist(s)?" to help determine what role we can play to help address the parts that aren't happening. For example there are many collaborations around early childhood, so it doesn't make sense for CAN to start something new around early childhood. So instead let's look at an arena that doesn't have as much focus. Is there a place where we present areas for further research that might help the community? Such a space could also be an opportunity for people to step up and share the work they are doing in that field. Listening to this conversation, one thing that might be missing is something like an executive summary. Something that tells me what the 4 big things are that I need to take away from this report.

An important thing to know is who (individuals, groups, etc.) is reading and using the dashboard that really drives how the data and analysis should be presented. An Executive Summary might be something more geared towards the public or a general audience. Right now the dashboard strikes a good balance, can't do everything. The current CAN survey doesn't inform on these aspects for the dashboard. Polling users might be a good project for next year. From a community standpoint it's very useful if people know about it. Ultimately it's a balancing act between what our partners need from the Dashboard and how the Dashboard can enrich the community. Might be helpful to highlight areas of the community where we know we are data poor.

Regarding the proposal to switch to a periodic review cycle, please read the proposal and then maybe in the future we could submit with our indicator recommendations a second document... kind of a recommendation of how to move our work forward. Actually reached 7, (said yes throughout conversations). Action item 5 it seems like we have agreement that we do not want to take action on any indicators, perhaps we can keep it open as a discussion item but not an action item. Caveat: what we are trying to do this year is just address the goals themselves, half this meeting half next meeting, working with the partners who helped us establish the goals. Action item 6 still needs decision. Probably will want a committee on Equity Analysis.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:36 p.m.