CAN Dashboard Steering Committee 1/30/2020

Attendees: Brittany Alderman, Integral Care; **Tracy Ayrhart, Ph.D.,** Central Texas Food Bank; **F. C. Caranikas,** Austin Community College; **Dan Brown**, Children's Optimal Health; **Korey Darling**, Travis County HHS; **Nancy Gilliam**, CAN Community Council; **Ashley Levulett,** Children's Optimal Health; **Shavone Otero,** Housing Works Austin; **Angela Sommers**, City of Austin Neighborhood Housing and Community Development;

Staff in Attendance: Raul Alvarez, Carlos Soto,

Welcome and Introductions: Greg Cumpton DSC Chair called the meeting to order at 2:08 pm. Members introduced themselves.

Citizen Communication: Ara Merjanian discussed alignment with the CAN Strategic Plan in terms of community indicators, capital, and engagement. Merjanian also recommended to add an indicator on community engagement. Annette Strauss Center publishes a composite measure.

Approval of minutes: The 11/21/2019 meeting minutes were reviewed. Greg Cumpton moved to approve the minutes. Brooke Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, with one abstention.

Executive Director Update: Raul Alvarez updated members on recent CAN events and activities. Alvarez recently traveled to Japan to present about community indicators. The draft Strategic Plan was presented at the December Board Meeting. Some discussion about the Strategic Plan relates to Dashboard 2.0. There's a meeting tomorrow with the Executive Committee, and we should be ready to act on the Strategic Plan sometime in February.

5. 2020 Dashboard Report: CAN Staff reviewed the changes discussed in previous meetings. These changes include shifting the language of the income indicator to measure "Low-Income" (defined as 200% of the Federal Poverty Level) instead of "poverty" (100% of Federal Poverty level). Regarding Crime, perhaps include raw numbers in drilldown. Drop in property crime seemed drastic. Could it be an anomaly? Could reporting changes account for the drop? Regarding Low Income, the Austin Metro Area Master Community Workforce Plan has as an objective that 10,000 residents living at or below 200% of poverty will secure middle-skill jobs by 2021. Across our materials, it must be clear and consistent whether the measure refers to individuals, households, families, etc. With a change like this, it might be important to inform/educate users about it, perhaps an information campaign, a printed insert. A glossary could cover this and other clarifications. In terms of the target, there may be an issue with the idea of setting a target to reduce low-income population, because as it is currently measured there is no way to distinguish whether it is the result of displacement or an increase in earnings. Perhaps in the future we might want to consider grouping this indicator with other community "need" or "status" indicators where local authorities/organizations don't have as much capacity to effect change. Another option may be to set a holistic goal instead of a numerical target. These could be aspirational goals such as decline in poverty and low income. Some of these issues are better served without a firm target. Conversation about goals might be what we need for next round. School Readiness Action Plan pulled child poverty goal out because of the inability to influence it, but the plan can influence school readiness.

Greg Cumpton moved to vote to change the income indicator from Poverty to Low Income. Allison Bentley seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously. Suggestion to adopt Low Income goal but bring up issue with board that some have identified that goal may not be useful. Greg Cumpton moved to set Low Income target to 24% in 2020. Korey Darling seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous.

Before this goes to the board, we should work on language that mentions that there are some places where we would want to remove targets, and other items we would like to tackle, and perhaps send it back to the steering committee, then draft it into a letter we all sign.

6. 2021 Dashboard : Raul Alvarez mentioned that the Dashboard 2.0 conversation falls under Goal 1 of the Strategic Plan, which is Enhancing Awareness of Community Needs, and also falls under opportunities to engage around these issues. Engagement came up in the Strategic Plan discussion, in terms of how to raise that to the same level of the Dashboard. Part of what we will look at for the 2021 dashboard is informed by the Strategic Plan goals and the feedback from the Safety Net forums. Instead of one big 48-page report, the concept for Dashboard 2.0 includes a more streamlined Dashboard Report together with several smaller focused publications. These may include a demographic profile, local efforts, and equity analysis. The Dashboard then becomes more of a discussion guide for action around the issues. Smaller reports can be updated more readily. A shorter Dashboard and shorter reports are also more practical to write, edit, and print. This change would help elevate the work being done in our community and raise equity to a higher level. Another possibility is to bring Austin Area Sustainability Indicators or Texas 2036 into our conversations to determine potential opportunities for collaboration. The DSC serves several functions, one is to provide input from the perspective of each member's area of expertise, but also one of oversight of what we are presenting… Are we presenting what we should be presenting for the community? This is a great idea and could be very useful. However, the Dashboard is a very narrow charge. Looking at the Dashboard 2.0, it's important to make sure the Committee's work is constrained or to at least have a clear understanding of what the goals for the Committee are on those other reports that would supplement the Dashboard. Keep clear what the Steering Committee's role is and how the Committee can most effectively support CAN's work.

7. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.