CAN Dashboard Steering Committee 6/4/2015

Attendees: Fred Blood (CAPCOG), Tiffany Daniels (Workforce Solutions- Capital Area), BiNi Foster (Ready by 21), Darla Gay (Community Justice Council), Jennifer Lee (Center for Public Policy Priorities), Lawrence Lyman (Travis County), Louise Lynch (Austin Travis County Integral Care), Caitlin Shea (CPPP Intern), Shawn Thomas (E3 Alliance)

Staff in Attendance: Mary Dodd and Kevin Paris

Welcome and Introductions: Lawrence Lyman called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm. Dashboard Steering Committee members introduced themselves. Kevin Paris reviewed the media results from the CAN Dashboard 2015 report. The on-line versions of each section of the Dashboard were released in the weeks leading up to the release of the report. There were noticeable spikes in Twitter, Facebook and website activity. The full report is available at:

Review and approve minutes of the 4/2/15 meeting:. Not Discussed.

Final Review of Dashboard User Survey: Kevin Paris shared a draft of a user survey. He said the intent is to send the survey to everyone on the CANews list serve. There is also a link to the survey on the Dashboard website. Jennifer Lee mentioned that CPPP did a webinar on one of their research tools to walk people through the data resource and then followed-up with a survey. The long, full survey will be shared through the CAN list serve. A shorter, 2-3 question survey will be provided on the CAN Dashboard website. A third track is hosting a users' focus group to discuss how and whether they are using the Dashboard and how it can be improved. This should start with the CAN partners, since they are the entities funding the effort. Darla Gay suggested that the on-line survey ask the question: How did you use the Dashboard today? Question #7 of the survey could serve this purpose.

Review criteria for select populations featured on Dashboard: The intent was to focus on populations that face negative outcomes on Dashboard Indicators. Kevin Paris reviews three recommended criteria:

1. Sub-Populations who may experience negative outcomes on Dashboard indicators, often due to relatively unchangeable population characteristics

2. Vulnerability to negative outcomes can be determined from national studies or studies from other communities, or local data and studies, when available

3. Existing local community plan or planning coalition

It was noted that the racial and ethnic disparities and differing outcomes by income groups will be included for each indicator, where available. This is why African American and Hispanic and Asian were not added as "select" populations. Steering Committee members expressed discomfort with the phrase unchangeable population characteristics and suggested removing it from the critieria.

Sometimes these population-wide indicators indicate that the population is doing relatively well, but when we look at some sub-populations, that is not the case. Some populations have additional barriers to overcome. What is the benefit of selecting a population rather than analyzing differences for each indicator? It was suggested we look at differences by geography and where services are provided. Where data is able to be disaggregated by age and race and ethnicity, the Dashboard should and does do this. However, there are some outcomes for sub-populations that are more difficult to uncover. Perhaps we should think of this as two different products. First, there is a standard set of community wide indicators and data. Then, have a parallel process to highlight more qualitative data and analysis for groups for whom we do not have rich data. It may not be necessary to have a set group or number of "select" populations that are highlighted in the

report each year, but rather produce accessory reports that highlight various sub-populations every now and then. Others did not like the idea of removing the "select" populations pages and data.

Some members liked the definition in the report. These are populations that face greater risks that are not otherwise represented in the report.

Lawrence Lyman summarized:

1. In addition to race and ethnicity, are there standard data categories we want to include in the indicators? (gender, age, geography)

2. Sub-population disparities and barriers that do not reveal themselves in the population wide data, such as veterans, people with disabilities, etc. should be highlighted separately.

Select populations do need to still be a part of this. We still need to work on how we "select" them, and use data to better determine who is included. It was suggested that we better make the "case" for including each sub-population. It was mentioned that the paragraph about vets did not explain why and how they are especially challenged.

Review Safe, Just, and Engaged Indicators: Not discussed. Will be reviewed at August 6th meeting. Kevin noted the biggest issue for this is what to do about next year's voting indicator because there will not be a major election. So, what tact should we take? For the "Basic Needs" indicators, there has been some concern that looking at the % of households that pay 30% or more of their income for housing is too low and perhaps the indicator should be changed to the % of households that pay 50% or more of their income on housing. It was suggested that a sub-group be assembled to provide input on this question.

2015 Meetings: Meetings will be held in the Lone Star Room at Workforce Solutions (6505 Airport Blvd) from 3:00 to 4:30pm on the first Thursday of even numbered months. The 2015 meetings dates are:

- August 6
- October 1
- December 3