



CAN Dashboard Steering Committee 1/31/2019

Attendees: **Awais Azhar**, Housing Works Austin; **Tracy Ayrhart**, Central Health; **Greg Cumpton**, UT Ray Marshall Center; **Caitlin D’Alton**, Capital Metro; **Korey Darling**, Travis County HHS; **Emily DeMaria**, Central Texas Food Bank; **Caitlin Hamrock**, E³ Alliance; **Brooke W Martin**, Integral Care; **Jackie Nirenberg**, Capital Metro; **Adele Noel**, Travis County Air Quality Project Manager; **Sarah Seidel**, Austin Public Health; **Pilar Westbrook**, Del Valle ISD

Guests: Edwin Marty, Office of Sustainability

Staff in Attendance: Raul Alvarez, Carlos Soto,

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

Approval of minutes: The 12/06/18 meeting minutes were reviewed. Caitlin D’Alton moved to approve the minutes, Korey Darling seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Executive Director Update: Raul Alvarez welcomed members and thanked them for being here. This year we are trying to end the Dashboard review cycle earlier. Last year we approved a change that wasn’t approved by the Board, they would like to have time to send the draft back to committee for discussion before being sent back to the Board for approval. Also Executive Committee would like to weigh in before having the draft go to the Board. This year will be the 10th version of the dashboard, and we have discussed an engagement plan around the Dashboard itself. The Annual Report highlights some of the work we’ve done, including beefing up the language access toolkit. Another project last year was the Deliberative Dialogue series around the opioid crisis, for which we designed a local issue guide including an information sheet on the crisis as it has unfolded locally. CAN also organized and hosted a Regional Summit around housing opportunities, exploring issues around housing in the Central Texas region. In previous years we covered workforce development and transportation. We also hosted a Legislative Forum, together with the Community Council, to learn what they are planning to support and what we ought to be looking out for in terms of issues that affect us locally. CAN also focused work around institutional racism, including collaborating on the anti-displacement taskforce, the School Renaming task force, and the Beyond Diversity training, in partnership with Leadership Austin. Beyond Diversity is a race equity training that a number of partner organizations are using. Since June 2018 we have trained and signed up over 900 people. Alvarez also mentioned the work of the Language Access Action Team, which will meet next week for the first time this year. The LAAT meets to develop shared resources around Language Access. This year the main focus will be around the Dashboard, including a series of Safety Net Forums. We will have a 2 or 3 hour forum for each one of the issue areas where we look at the data, what it tells us, highlight some work being done on it, and also challenges in doing that work. In the spring we plan to look at the health section and the basic needs section, and the other two sections after the summer. The idea is to have these input sessions, and then review the feedback in our Dashboard Steering Committee meetings. This year will be a little different in the sense we will have that input.

In terms of our schedule moving forward, March is marked as a tentative date. If the Executive Committee accepts changes, we won’t need to meet. The May meeting date would happen after our initial safety net forum so it will be an opportunity to discuss the results. A lot of our work today will be focused on indicator target and target date.

Review proposed changes to “We are safe, just & engaged” and “We achieve our full potential” targets. Previously there has been discussion about updating the target dates for the indicators on the Dashboard. Do we keep year at 2020 or update to 2023 (or another year)? We have typically set the goal to be met at 5 years from present. Perhaps we should keep the goal at 2020 to be able to address that in the 10 year anniversary. Korey Darling suggested that maybe we should keep the current goals and consider developing guidelines on the process to follow when updating goals. Maybe over the next year. If we are

going to have conversations with the community, it would be interesting to hear the answers to that question. Do we know why we are changing the target? What's the value of changing or not? Some of the goals for certain indicators have been met. For data where targets were met, we addressed on a case by case basis. On the second page of the handout, none of those goals have been met, so no harm in keeping them and the year the same while we wait for feedback from the community. A motion to keep target year unchanged, made by Greg Cumpton was approved unanimously.

Discussion and possible action, “Our Basic Needs are Met” targets: Edwin Marty mentioned that an issue with putting a target on food insecurity is that you're not really tracking quality of life, what you're tracking is actually displacement. In order for a more nuanced understanding of what it is we are looking at, we will need other pieces of data that are currently unavailable. Emily DeMaria echoed Marty's comments, adding that although the numbers for the Food Bank are different since they track the entire region, she agrees that a better way to make sense of the displacement is invaluable. Marty mentioned the State of the Food System report, which contains an important page discussing the triangulation of housing, transportation and food. Affordable housing and good transportation are critical to the conversation of food security. This might be a broader conversation than necessary at this time. Marty mentioned that they have had good conversations with Dr. Gandhi at the People's Clinic about a survey tool they developed for tracking the social determinants of health with the intent of trying to create a unified tracking tool, inspired by the perception that there are lots of people tracking different stuff and not much sharing/integration. The survey has one question on it about food security, contextualized in 9 other measures of the social determinants of health. How can we weave the indicators together in a way that creates a more comprehensive picture? The UT school of public health got a grant to track households over time (3 years), and evaluate them against food access programs that the City was funding. Ideas about combining metrics were mentioned.

Makes sense to keep the targets in this section unchanged as only one or two of the targets have been met, and reevaluate metrics. For example, lots of research on the stigmatization of people who are overweight, changing perceptions, and how there might be more useful metrics than obesity. Housing Cost Burdened is also difficult for similar reasons to Food Insecurity. It's a challenge because it sounds alarming when we say that it's ok to have 1/3 of residents not really afford to be here. Ideally it should be zero, which brings us back to the discussion about the nature of the targets: should these be actionable, achievable, or aspirational? If we don't go with aspirational we need to ensure we are engaging as a group to do the work to move that needle. Members like the idea of an aspirational goal, but this needs to be done with the right metric, maybe just not across the board. Would it be useful to, instead of targeting the reduction, have the goal be an incremental change over time? Something like that is what we do for Crime Rate, and we talked about doing that for Arrest Disproportionality. It may be something we can do for other indicators.

To prevent working on something that might be discarded, Greg would like for us to come up with a document at the end of each meeting and send it to Executive Committee and Board of Directors to know where the decision might go. There doesn't seem to be much interest in changing the targets at this time. Azhar mentioned that it is a good idea to defer these changes until next year, but if we postpone the task to next year, we need to ensure we have an effective process in place. Greg would propose to have more meetings, perhaps subcommittee meetings. Caitlin voiced support for subcommittees. Make a list of these things we are planning to do next cycle and get that to Board of Directors and Executive Committee. Is there a way to ask the Board whether the targets ought to be aspirational, or actionable, etc.? Greg Cumpton made a motion to keep targets unchanged, and if E3 alliance updates targets, approve to update CAN Dashboard targets accordingly. Awais Azhar seconded the motion, and the vote was unanimous.

Discussion and possible action, “We are Healthy” goals: Deferred until next review cycle as decided on the three other sections discussed today.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.