



CAN Dashboard Steering Committee 4/2/2015

Attendees: Megan Cermak (Central Health), Caitlin D’Alton (Capital Metro), Tiffany Daniels (Workforce Solutions), Darla Gay (Community Justice Council), Kirsha Haverlah (Community Council), Jennifer Lee (Center for Public Policy Priorities), Lawrence Lyman (Travis County), Louise Lynch (ATCIC), Vanessa Metzger (City of Austin), Nic Moe (for Maureen Britton, Children’s Optimal Health), Amy Price (211)

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.

Review and approve minutes of the 2/5/14 meeting: The minutes of the February 5, 2015 minutes were approved by consensus.

Review Draft 2015 Dashboard Draft: Kevin Paris shared the “Dashboard at a Glance” page from the draft report. The food security and college success indicator data is not yet available. We ascribe status of better, worse or unchanged based on a five year trend line and five years ago we were at the height of the Great Recession, so there is notable movement toward “better.”

Review Vulnerable Populations Section: The vulnerable populations pages on the CANcommunitydashboard.org website have been expanded for this year. Louise Lynch asked whether we have reached out to the IDDACT folks for input. Stakeholders have expressed dissatisfaction with the current title and structure, so CAN staff would like input on revisions to this section. Megan Cermak recommended using the term “at-risk populations” rather than “vulnerable populations.” There is a concern that people who visit the website may not know to check under “vulnerable populations” to find information for these populations. DSC members agreed that the term describing the populations needs to be more strength-based. At a past DSC meeting, the term “disproportionately impacted populations” was suggested. DSC suggestions for alternate titles included: “at-risk populations”, “populations who are disproportionately impacted”, and “people disproportionately impacted.” It was also suggested that staff change the title to “select populations” and explain why these groups were selected on the web page.

Lawrence Lyman asked if the Dashboard Steering Committee agrees that the term “vulnerable” should be changed. Members agreed that more strength-based terms are better, and if a stakeholder groups are uncomfortable with the term, it should be changed. It was noted that if these groups are disproportionately impacted, maybe that is how they should be characterized. If that is the case, we should use “people who are disproportionately impacted.” These populations were chosen because they are disproportionately impacted, not because they are vulnerable. Vanessa Metzger made a motion to use “select populations” and describe why these populations were selected and to note that the list is not comprehensive. Louise Lynch seconded her motion. Darla Gay said she would have to abstain, because she would want to meet with difference groups to see how the new terminology works for them. The DSC voted in favor of the motion. Lawrence Lyman noted that the DSC can revisit the list of special populations at a future date.

Review best and promising practices for indicator projects and indices from national and local organizations to inform CAN’s Dashboard: Kevin Paris shared information about the original purpose and use of the Dashboard from the 2009 work of the Dashboard Steering Committee. He also shared a Dashboard survey that staff plan to add to the Dashboard website to gather information about how the Dashboard is used by people in the community, and how they would like to see it changed. He reviewed other Dashboard examples from across the nation. Some, like the County Health Rankings and Kids Count, are data-focused. Some of these indicator projects have good search functions. The Sustainable Indicators Project adds a local survey, which provides information and data not available from other sources. The Opportunity Index collapses several indicators into one measure of opportunity for several categories. The

other projects, such as DiversityDataKids.org and the Kirwan Opportunity Mapping project, are associated with universities. Winnipeg Canada's mypeg.ca does a good job of showcasing the relationships between different indicators. The Minnesota Compass is most similar to CAN. It is supported by funding entities. Like CAN, it includes both data and information about what is being done to improve the indicator, but it also adds a Best Practices and research section. Coastal Georgia Indicators Coalition has a specific dashboard just for disparities. Coastal Georgia's Project uses the same data platform that Central Health, Travis County, and the City of Austin will use for their health dashboard. Portland's indicator project includes a specific focus on equity. Spokane's dashboard is associated with Eastern Washington University, and they contract to manage indicator projects for other communities. Victoria Vital Signs is run by a community foundation, and their project consists mostly of a written report. Another issue to consider is how to connect to individual stories. Peg does this by adding a "Related Stories" item to each indicator that includes a video interview with a community member impacted by that indicator.

What is unique about the CAN Dashboard: CAN's Dashboard isn't just about data. The report and web version highlight collaborative initiatives and local plans and policies that can help to move the indicator in the right direction.

Paris recommended that the DSC consider whether to add a new section to highlight equity issues.

Lawrence Lyman asked whether making structural and significant changes to the CAN Dashboard website are within the purview of the DSC. Mary Dodd responded that the DSC is the entity to recommend changes to the Board of Directors. She said the survey will help the Committee understand who is using the Dashboard and for what purposes.

Lyman said there are two items that need to be clarified at future meetings.

- 1 How do we get to those select populations that have been identified?
- 2 How do we decide which local efforts to include?

Additionally, the DSC could decide to recommend other improvements.

Darla Gay noted that, if the purpose of the dashboard is to motivate action, then the survey should ask whether it is doing this. How did you use the information? How is this dashboard driving change? Travis County just applied for a MacArthur grant to examine disproportionality in jail bookings. The grant application notes that the CAN Dashboard has proportionality of jail bookings as a community indicator, but notes that CAN does not tell them what to do about it.

Criteria for including local efforts to improve the indicator: Efforts included will be...

- Collaborative initiative or a planning authority
- Directly or indirectly influence the indicator
- Focus on local initiatives
- Research-informed or evidence-based

It was noted that these criteria would exclude national or state policies that have a local impact. These policies have been included in previous reports.

For the June meeting, the DSC will review a final draft of the survey and will consider again the criteria for including local initiatives and policy. Also, the group will consider the select populations sections to refine the section and the sub-populations included .

Adjourn: Lawrence Lyman adjourned the meeting at 4:30 pm.

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:

- June 4
- August 6
- October 1
- December 3