

Sarasota County Community Data Collaborative Meeting Notes

October 17, 2012 – Twin Lakes Park Green Room

Colleen opened the discussion at 3:03pm. Colleen shared that the agenda was based upon the model that has been used within the collaborative.

Attendees provided self-introductions with indication of associated neighborhood. In attendance were:

First Name	Last Name	Neighborhood	Organizational Affiliation
Jim	Bennett	Sawgrass	Venice City Council
Aimee	Chouinard	Osprey	SCOPE
Nancy	DeLoach	Southfield	County HHS
Michael	Drennon		Sarasota County Health Dept
Tim	Dutton	Central-Cocoanut	Sarasota Community Studio
Kari	Ellingstad	McClellan Park	CHIP
Doug	Griffin	Palmer Ranch	SCOPE Volunteer
Bill	Lauzon	Venice	Sustainable Floridian
John	McCarthy	Proctor/Beneva	SCOPE
Trish	McConnell	Three Oaks	SCOPE
Colleen	McGue	Indian Beach Sapphire Shore	SCOPE
Trevor	Melderis	Southgate	Sarasota County GIS
Lisa	Nisenson	Siesta Key	Florida House
Allison	Pinto	Central-Cocoanut	Sarasota Community Studio
Tamara	Schells		Sarasota County Demographics
Pauline	Tracy		Health and Human Services
Jason	Winoker	Twin Lakes	Sarasota County GIS

Platform/Tech

John reported on status of contract with *Urban Institute*. Proposed changes provided to UI with indication that they would be back in touch with us soon. Tim asked about the changes made. John reported that the changes involved the correct name for SCOPE, aspects of the insurance requirements and revisions to the section regarding the sale of data. Tim expressed concerns about changing the provision preventing the sale of data. John indicated that the intent was to ensure that SCOPE would not be in non-compliance with other contracts, and that SCOPE from time to time may be asked to provide analysis on a fee system and should be able to do so.

Colleen reminded everyone that the Weebly website is available to all in the collaborative and encouraged folks to contribute.

by SCOPE

and requested that SCOPE edited the contract are the version of the collaborative prior to the contract being finalized.

AD
 comment:
 If this is what John was intending to communicate, it warrants further discussion at upcoming mtg.

The group discussed the need for data maintenance to keep the information up to date. Also discussion of a need for a way to asterisk and provide annotations to provide information needed to fully understand the data. Example given was FCAT scores (define FCAT for those who may not know).

Jim emphasized the aspect of constantly changing data and the need to regularly update the data. Some of the data providers will upload new data weekly, while some may be annual measures and thus not updated for a long period.

There was a suggestion to start a WIKI site for these annotations. Trevor cautioned against duplication of effort and suggested simply adding new columns to the spread sheet so that we are working within the same framework. Allison suggested that annotations loop back through the collaborative prior to being loaded to *Urban Institute*. Tim suggested that the annotation process could be a good way to engage the collaborative. Jason suggested differentiating between the provider of the data and the root source of the data, and suggested columns on the spreadsheet as a way to capture.

Jim raised the issue of research and the need to retrieve aged data as a comparative. He described some of his challenges with this issue on one of his neighborhood data projects. Jim asked about the opportunity for a "freeze page" or some other way to capture past data. It was agreed that we would discuss with the *Urban Institute* how to handle this.

Trevor asked if we would have a period of changes with the *Urban Institute* website to adjust symbology to get it the way we want it. It was agreed that this would be discussed with Urban Institute.

In response to a question, Colleen indicated a possibility of tutorials from the *Urban Institute* and will see if we can schedule this for us at a collaborative meeting.

Kari returned to the issue of aged data and indicated the important need to be able to compare over a span of time. Trevor indicated that he anticipates that we will be able to load historic data, and run reports over time. It was agreed that this would be discussed with the *Urban Institute*.

Data sets/ stewards

Colleen shared with the group that there has been recent progress on the School Board data and expressed thanks to Micki and Roy for their efforts.

Mike shared that his data may not be available on a neighborhood level and that it could be made available on a census block group level. Allison shared that where the data has been aggregated we need to take it apart. Kari shared that because of the survey techniques, much of the important health data cannot be disaggregated. Allison expressed concerns with the widespread range of conditions within a given census tract, and sought the smallest geography where we can share the data while maintaining confidentiality. Mike emphasized that he could not provide the data in a smaller increment than the census block group level. Colleen indicated that there may be some School Board data that needs to be looked at for confidentiality as well. Tamara shared her understanding that the census bureau is concerned with confidentiality as well, and that is why the block groups are sized as they are. Tim shared that this is about where the people live and what they relate to- resident centric - not GIS

Note:
of terminology
"level"
vs.
"geography"
or "scale"
is an
impt.
distinction.
might
warrant
further
discussion
at future
mtg.

reiterated
the purpose
and process
of organizing
health data
by
nbhd.

can be
displayed

explained how local demographics vary significantly within block groups and census tracts, which is why we need to identify

centric, or census or institution-centric. Lisa shared that with the growing interest in data, we will need to work through this. Jim shared that this is a growing global discussion – “who can use what data and – how?” – a topic for the next 20 years. Jim added that soon you will be able to use *Google* to define and study a spacial area. Trevor shared that the ESRI “*community analyst*” software is available now and a tool for the collaborative to consider.

Colleen shared that a meeting is scheduled with Sheriff’s Office representatives later this month to cultivate their data set. Colleen also reported that she and John had met with Sarasota County Chief Information Officer Glenn Zimmerman and GIS Manager Kathy Solie who offered continued support for the collaborative.

Colleen asked for ideas regarding other data sets that we may wish to add. Mike suggested the *State Health Department* and the *Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services* and that he would provide contact information. Lisa suggested regional sources such as the *Metropolitan Planning Organization* – and that she would reach out to see what may be available. Jim suggested the Property Appraiser as a source of much information. Bill shared that he believes most of the Property Appraiser data is already on line. Aimee asked what indicators would be most relevant to attracting and retaining young professionals, such as the number of young people or the cost of housing in different areas. Allison recalled a woman involved in a real estate consortium that attended the Venice Data 2.0 - and suggested that a realtors group could be a good data-source. Allison observed that there were not many residents around the table and that we need more residents and residents groups involved. Jim suggested religious groups as a source of data that may be useful for homebuyers and others. The Young Professionals Group was also suggested as a possible data steward or member of the collaborative.

Colleen offered CDs containing all of the data in-hand and indicated the inherent obsolescence of a CD of ever -changing data. Trish reminded everyone that all of the data from the CD will be available on the community platform as well.

Quality of Life Indicators

Colleen reported on SCOPE’s recent presentations to the councils and commissions of each municipality and the county commission. These presentations by Tim and Allison reported on the Quality of Life Indicators work. Allison reflected that while the ~~sample~~ ^{group} set of participants was not ~~fully~~ representative – it was a good jumping off point and that the indicators that popped out are conversation starters for future phases. Allison cautioned about taking the information out of context and that such had already occurred in a local media report.

Colleen recognized Jim’s work in developing a draft of a data steward volunteer form, which was distributed to the group. Jim indicated that he did not base it on a national model – but had developed it around what he has heard and learned over the last year. Jim will email his draft to everyone for feedback. Allison suggested using “track changes” for their comments/edits.

of the
Community
Data
collab
over the
course
of
FY 2012.

of
local
community
demographics

data generated at the workshops

Reflection for Decision Making

Colleen recognized Lisa's article in *This Week in Sarasota* regarding open access to community data in New York City. Allison expressed concern that the article credited *SCOPE* and not the *Data Collaborative*,

reiterating the importance of collaborative partners taking up co-ownership of the collaborative's efforts.

Colleen reported a recent meeting with Doug G. regarding the power of stories to document the impact of data. Doug expressed that these testimonials are important to sharing the value of what we are doing. Doug shared an example of Mr. Lou Murray of Bethlehem Baptist in Newtown looking at data and having a whole new understanding of his congregation, and then acting on that new learning to implement a successful improvement program for youth. Trish offered Aimee's assistance in documenting testimonials. Allison suggested using an available button on the top of the website for the testimonials. Tim shared that he believed the New Mexico website had testimonials. Allison shared that this feature is built-in at the neighborhood level, which is different than a button for testimonials.

story + questions/reflections

Topics for Future Agendas

for Sarasota Community Studio

In response to an invitation, the group discussed holding the next meeting at the *Florida House*. Tim sees this as a way for a partner to be a part of building the collaborative. Allison expressed that there is value in moving the meetings around, and that it would be better to hold the meetings in the morning. Nancy expressed concern about moving too much and that we don't want to see a drop off of participants. Tim suggested that collaborations are challenging things so perhaps we should study successful collaborations. Tim also suggested that we should consider North Port and other areas for meetings. Colleen and John offered to look at alternative meeting locations, and suggest a schedule moving forward. Collaborative members were invited to suggest meeting locations to Colleen over email.

The meeting adjourned at 5pm.

minutes by: [name], [organization]