

Sarasota County Community Data Collaborative
Notes / Minutes of the Monthly Meeting

Date: January 16, 2013

Time: 9:30 – 11:00 a.m.

Location: Sarasota County Administration Building

First draft of the meeting notes written by: Allison Pinto

Corresponding audio recording by: Nita Hester

Final draft of meeting notes posted by: Colleen McGue

In Attendance:

First Name	Last Name	Neighborhood	Organizational Affiliation
Jim	Bennett	Sawgrass	Venice City Council
Aimee	Chouinard	Sunnyside	SCOPE
Nancy	DeLoach	South Field/Bee Ridge	Sarasota County Health & Human Services
Tim	Dutton	Tahiti Park / Central-Cocoanut	Sarasota Community Studio
Ron	Flynn	Siesta Key	Siesta Key Association
Jane	Grogg	Park East	Sarasota Neighborhoods
Nita	Hester	Country Club Ridge, North Port	City of North Port GIS
John	Lambie	South Gate/Phillipi Creek	Florida House
Katie	Leonard	University Park	Sarasota County Health Dept
John	McCarthy	Marshall Manor	SCOPE
Colleen	McGue	Indian Beach/Sapphire Shores	SCOPE
Trevor	Melderis	South Gate	Sarasota County GIS
Allison	Pinto	Central-Cocoanut	Sarasota Community Studio
Tamara	Schells	Venice	Sarasota County Planning
Shells	Siskin	Laurel Park	Living in Community
Kathy	Solie	Deer Hollow	Sarasota County GIS
Jason	Winoker	Twin Lakes	Sarasota County GIS

- I. Introductions
 - Those present introduced themselves by name, neighborhood and organizational affiliation.

- II. Review of Notes / Minutes from Past Meeting
 - Nita Hester moved to approve the notes.
 - Nancy DeLoach seconded.
 - Notes were approved.

III. Procedure for Email Communication

- Colleen McGue noted that Basecamp is set up as a means for Collaborative participants to communicate with one another online. She will send out an email for people to add BaseCamp to their safe senders list, as some have noted that the messages are being directed to their spam folders.

IV. Discussion of Partnership Commitment Form

- Copies of the Commitment Form drafted by Jim Bennett, the original Partnership Agreement form drafted by Allison Pinto, and a sample MOU provided by Kari Ellingstad were distributed.
- Colleen stated that this is an important form with regard to the commitment that people are making as participants in the Collaborative, and that we need a decision by the whole group about what people are willing to sign on to. She proposed that a hybrid of the three sample documents might be appropriate.
- Jim explained that he drafted the Commitment Form to give people some idea of what the group does, and that this form is intended to coordinate with the original Partnership Agreement section that delineates the contributions of each Data Steward. He noted that he does not believe the Collaborative should be more formal, as a collaborative is typically more informal than a formal partnership, which has all sorts of legal consequences. He said that in an organization like this Collaborative you don't want to lock people in, but for people to stay involved because they are excited and enthusiastic, with enough protection but not with a collective liability due to involvement. He noted that formality can be stultifying.
- Colleen suggested that it would be helpful for the form to reflect that if someone is providing data, they are saying the data are accurate to that person's knowledge and they are taking responsibility to update it.
- Trevor Melderis reminded that group that the master spreadsheet indicates who is providing which data, accuracy information, and dates of updates.
- Kathy Solie said that County Government staff has a responsibility to their organization to keep the data updated, and Sunshine Law requires that they will freely provide the data. Nita noted this is true of city government as well.
- Jane Grogg suggested that individuals participating in the Collaborative on behalf of a government agency might feel more comfortable relying on annual contracts already in place to commit to official contributions of staff time, etc., rather than the Collaborative agreement form. The Collaborative form could be less formal and more voluntary.
- John McCarthy stated that if the intent is for all to be contributing to the Collaborative, then the document could be an expectation document that says you'll keep your stuff fresh, good, participate when possible, help with transition if you move out of your neighborhood, and designate a back-up person.
- Jim noted that a secrecy agreement (i.e. confidentiality agreement) might be a helpful form to consider as well, in order for Collaborative participants to share neighborhood-

specific examples of identified correlations, as an example, in cases when residents have not given permission to have their identity shared.

- Discussion was tabled due to scheduled phone consultation with Urban Institute. To be continued at the next meeting.

V. Review of Community Data Platform in development with the Urban Institute

Re-Acquainting Everyone with the Platform/Overview for New Members:

- The group was joined by phone by Rob Dana of the Urban Institute, the Lead Developer of the Community Platform for the National Center for Charitable Statistics, in order to review the latest developments regarding the online platform. He indicated that Tom Pollak was unable to join due to travel difficulties.
- Rob reviewed the various sections of the data platform that were created in 2012, explaining that they are still in the proof-of-concept stage. He also reviewed standard features of the UI Community Platform, including the sections on calendars, events, knowledge base, shared resources and mapping interface. He reviewed the selection system for community indicators that has been developed for the State of New Mexico platform and said that this system will be available for inclusion in the Sarasota County platform soon. He indicated that Mark, the Lead Designer at the Urban Institute, will go through the Sarasota County platform in the next couple of weeks and finish updating the platform with regard to the various design elements. Rob commented that he likes the way the Sarasota County platform is designed to start at the neighborhood scale because it provides a warmer, more personal feel.
- Tim asked for clarification that the state and county indicators that Rob was featuring on the New Mexico site were intended by way of example, rather than as a proposal that the indicator selection system of the Sarasota County community platform be organized by county/state scale rather than neighborhood scale. Rob confirmed that these examples were offered by way of example.
- Allison noted that the Sarasota County community platform is no further along with regard to its development and the inclusion of local data than it was 3 months ago in September 2012. She asked for clarification from Urban Institute and SCOPE as to why it appears progress has not been made.
- Rob noted that Tom Pollak is the person who could respond from Urban Institute.
- Colleen said that as the local Collaborative partner serving as the local platform administrator, SCOPE is still working on cleaning the data. She explained that there is work being done on the back-end of the site that is not visible to all site users.

Overview of Process to Upload Data:

- Rob reviewed the back-end process for uploading data to the platform, which can be accessed at <http://nccsweb.urban.org/communityplatform/sarasota/communityadmin/newindicator>

- Colleen noted that any person in the county can register as a user of the platform, and it is necessary to be a user in order to upload data and access the back end of the platform.
- Allison asked for clarification of the intention in presenting the back-end process for uploading data – was it in order for Collaborative participants to understand it, or was this intended as a proposal that each data steward would be uploading the data they are contributing? Colleen said this is a proposal that each data steward would be uploading directly. It could also be the case that a few Collaborative members are uploading directly, or that Colleen uploads all local data. Allison noted that a proposal for each data steward to be uploading their data would warrant further discussion / decision-making by the Collaborative.
- Trevor asked if there will be a way to create some more sophisticated symbology. Rob confirmed that there will be, and said he would love feedback.
- Rob explained that the plan is to make it possible for users to be able to customize ranges of indicator data, in terms of defining quantiles. Colleen asked whether symbols could be customized by the user. Rob indicated that this was not planned for. Trevor suggested that this might not be advisable.
- Jim asked whether, if we don't have a really good administrator to whom we can relay questions, the program is able to keep users from messing up one another's work. Rob noted that most community platform efforts have only 2 or 3 community administrators. He also said certain datasets could be set as public or private and tagged to a particular data steward so that only that data steward could change it.
- Tim asked for clarification of: What datasets are nearly ready to load right now, what are the barriers, and what can the Collaborative do to get the data up? Colleen indicated that demographic data, registered voter data and school district data are almost ready. The school district data takes a lot of time to clean because of the way it is organized in the spreadsheets that are generated by the school district.
- Nita suggested that a discussion for an upcoming meeting could be for everybody to run the data in ways that are most helpful for getting the data uploaded.
- Colleen suggested a technical meeting of people with datasets before the next monthly meeting of the Data Collaborative. She will contact people to set up a meeting.
- Jim noted that everybody needs to play with the platform and write down challenges encountered – we need to actually be using it in order to talk about it.
- Colleen noted that there will also be data uploaded by neighbors. Rob mentioned that the organizational upload tool in addition to the “add an asset” and “add a photo / story” features will be available for these purposes.
- Jim noted that we need to get clear about the concept of time – what people need to be able to access the data for and by when, as well as how long it takes to get the data prepared and accessible.
- Tim asked Colleen to provide an update from Tom Pollak regarding the date by which the platform will be launched and available. She indicated that it will be by February

20th, in time for the next meeting of the Collaborative. Graphic design images for the platform will be sent out to everyone by email before the meeting.

VI. Announcements

- The meeting had reached its scheduled end time and no announcements were shared.

VII. Next Meeting

- Next meeting will be held in North Port on February 20th at 2:00 p.m., hosted by Nita Hester and the North Port GIS / IT Division.