



## CAN Dashboard Steering Committee 02/01/2018

**Attendees:** Greg Cumpton (Ray Marshall Center), Caitlin D’Alton (Capital Metro), Tiffany Daniels (Workforce Solutions), Korey Darling (Travis County Health and Human Services), Hunter Ellinger (CAN Community Council), Kathy Green (Central Texas Food Bank), Caitlin Hamrock (E<sup>3</sup> Alliance), Louise Lynch (Integral Care), Noele Adele (Travis County Air Quality Project), Josh Rudow (COA Neighborhood Housing and Community Development), Pilar Westbrook (Del Valle ISD)

**Staff in Attendance:** Raul Alvarez, Carlos Soto, Jelina Tunstill

**Welcome and Introductions:** Louise Lynch, Chair of the Dashboard Steering Committee, called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m

**Approval of minutes:** The minutes of the 9/07/17 meeting were approved as submitted.

**Discuss Dashboard Steering Committee Chair Nomination:** The Dashboard Steering Committee Chair, the Executive Director, and the Research Analyst have discussed this issue. Louise Lynch, current Chair, described the responsibilities of the role: finding convening space, scheduling meetings, developing the agenda, and report yearly to the CAN Board of Directors. Anybody who is interested in serving as Chair, or knows another Committee member who is interested, can submit their nominations to the CAN Board of Directors by Feb. 22. Executive Director Raul Alvarez shared some ideas for the Committee to streamline the dashboard review process and leverage member resources. Early March is when CAN staff finalize any proposed changes, in order to have time to implement changes before the printing deadline. Korey Darling mentioned she liked the idea of having that kind of “big picture” conversations about the Dashboard, to complement the type of review we have performed in the past. Hunter Ellinger agreed having a framework would be helpful to guide tasks, as would having a discussion at the beginning of the year to determine one or two topics that may be particularly relevant and warrant increased attention. Ellinger also mentioned how the CAN Community Council’s is developing a subcommittee that will focus on the Dashboard, from the perspective of a user of the dashboard, to help build a deeper understanding of the type of information available and develop more effective ways to share and use it. Louise Lynch agreed, adding that it might be helpful for new Dashboard Steering Committee members to be provided a template or framework with information such as how the indicators were selected and criteria for new indicators, to help provide context on each issue and its history of discussion within the group, perhaps as part of a “welcome packet” to help new members get caught up.

**Consider indicator for “We are safe, just, & engaged” section:**

**Discussion:** CAN Research Analyst Carlos Soto provided a brief overview of Vision Zero presentation and presented some slides showing what the proposed Traffic Deaths indicator could look like. The indicator would be based off the Vision Zero report data as well as data from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Caitlin D’Alton said she liked the vision zero indicator, but pointed out how the “Our basic needs are met” section contains a Vision Statement that says “We have safe, affordable, accessible, and reliable transportation” and **asked whether we need to rewrite the vision statement so that the safety indicator can be placed in the Safety section.** The “We are healthy” section also has a vision statement containing the word “safe”, but the vision statements in the Safety section do not contain the word. There was agreement that the indicator could be on the dashboard. Does it belong in this section, or does it fit better in a different section? **Should we use the indicator as Vision Zero publishes it, or should we use rate?** As population changes, raw number becomes less meaningful. Baseline could be based off score 5 years ago. Vision Zero is standardized across many cities which allows users to make meaningful comparisons. If we want to maintain alignment, keep Number. Target: might be better to have a yearly reduction goal instead of an absolute reduction goal. Must ask Vision Zero about this. If goal is zero by 2025, approx. 10 death decrease per year would get us there. That can be turned into a rate. Having a zero as a goal might draw a lot of attention to it. **CAN Research Analyst will request further information regarding the baseline and target. A motion to recommend adding an indicator**

**measuring total traffic deaths was proposed by Caitlin D'Alton. Hunter Ellinger seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.**

**Review “We are healthy” section:** Carlos Soto discussed the results of the survey that was sent to Committee Members asking for feedback on the two remaining sections of the Dashboard. Soto provided answers to the requests for further information included in the survey responses. There was no motion for changes to this section.

**Discussion:** There was some concern about the Obesity indicator, and with BMI in general. BMI measures *body weight*, not *body fat*, so some individuals with higher than average muscle or bone mass may be flagged as having high BMI despite being healthy and fit. However, BMI levels are correlated with body fat and with future health risks, and the longstanding and widespread application of BMI contributes to its utility at the population level which allow comparisons over time, regions, and population subgroups. [Considerations when using BMI for children, adolescents, and adults \(CDC\)](#). **Perhaps it would be worthwhile to analyze and share statistics on related health risks, such as diabetes, or other indicators that might be more relevant.**

**Review “We achieve our full potential” section:** Carlos Soto discussed the results of the survey sent to Dashboard Steering Committee Members asking for feedback on the two remaining sections of the Dashboard. Soto provided answers to the requests for further information included in the survey responses. There was no motion for changes to this section.

**Discussion:** Raul Alvarez shared that part of the feedback he receives at presentations is that our Education indicators go from measuring High School graduation to measuring College graduation, skipping how many apply or enroll. There is interest in measuring enrollment. There is also the recurring concern about the Unemployment indicator, how low it is, and whether it continues to be useful to report. Our breakdown by Race allows us to see how this issue does not affect all our residents uniformly. Caitlin Hamrock mentioned that there is or will be some data coming out from Workforce Solutions about the alignment between the education that students are getting and how that aligns with job growth in the region. Being able to quantify that alignment might be informative. Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board has a wealth of data. Louise Lynch mentioned having a conversation about that but ran into difficulties measuring kids that go out of state or go to military. E3 produces enrollment numbers that include data from the National Student Clearinghouse, capturing students that enroll in higher education outside the state but then if you move out of the state and start working you're not captured. The military piece must be picked up somewhere because it is starting to be picked up in TEA data about school districts and students that will become part of the College and Career Readiness measures.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m.