

Sarasota County Data Collaborative Meeting Notes

February 20, 2013 – North Port City Hall

Colleen McGue began the meeting at 2:05pm; the meeting concluded at 3:30. She shared the outline of the agenda with the collaborative and passed around a sign-in sheet. She asked everyone to introduce themselves.

I. Introductions

- Attendees introduced themselves including neighborhood and organizational affiliation. In attendance were:

First Name	Last Name	Neighborhood	Organization
Jim	Bennet	Sawgrass	Venice City Council
Tim	Dutton	Central Cocoanut	Sarasota Community Studio
Ron	Flynn	Siesta Key	Siesta Key Association
Lynette	Herbert	Cranberry	Sarasota County Health & Human Services
Nita	Hester	Country Club Ridge	City of North Port GIS
John	McCarthy	Marshall Manor	SCOPE
Colleen	McGue	IBSSA	SCOPE
Jane	Paquette	Desoto Acres	Desoto Acres Neighborhood Association (VP)
Allison	Pinto	Central-Cocoanut	Sarasota Community Studio
Lourdes	Ramirez	Cranberry Gardens	CONA
Brad	Schuette		North Port IT
Catherine	Wolfe	Uplands	SCOPE

II. Review of January Meeting Notes

- Nita Hester begins the conversation with a question about not having received graphic design images from Urban Institute. Colleen stated that the issue will be addressed later in the agenda.
- Nita moved approval of the January Meeting Notes.
- Lynette seconded.
- No discussion
- Notes approved.
- Catherine Wolfe, Community Data Intern at SCOPE, volunteered to take the meeting notes.

III. Platform & Technologies

- Colleen introduced the platform. She discussed changes that have been made such as graphics, navigation, and the scale of the Sarasota County Map.
- Allison Pinto suggested that the maps and data navigation tabs should be subsumed under the neighborhoods page.
- Tim Dutton noted inconsistencies in the map such as accuracy of National Center for Charitable Statistics Data.

- Lynette Herbert seconded this concern.
- Tim suggested that the neighborhood will have to modify inconsistencies as it sees fit.
- Ron Flynn was curious if the map would have a drag-and-drop icon similar to the icon in Google maps. Colleen said that she would find out if this is possible.
- Colleen stated that the back-end of the site was still under construction, hence some of the inconsistencies on the map. As a remedy to such issues that may occur in the future, each neighborhood might have a representative with administrative capabilities to edit the map. She agreed that merging the non-profit data map with the neighborhood map was a good idea and would ask UI to do this.
- Colleen again addressed the differences between the Urban Institute platform design and our design. Sarasota's focus on the neighborhood is different from the standard UI platform focused on nonprofit data and requires significant work behind the scenes.
 - i. Changes to the graphic design would be made when Mark from UI returned from vacation.
 - ii. Four datasets are ready to be added to the platform: registered voter party affiliation & demographics, neighborhood demographics, impervious surfaces, and boundaries.
- Allison asked why so few changes had been made since September. Colleen noted that the data on community well-being contributed from data stewards are frequently not in an ArcGIS compatible format, and so have to be re-formatted to be analyzed in GIS by neighborhood and then reformatted again for uploading into the Urban Institute Community Platform. Allison asked if SCOPE staff had been working on the platform for 20 hours a week since September. Colleen assured her they had.
- Tim reflected that in September the decision was made to try the UI platform for a year as a trial.
- Colleen mentioned that the architecture of the platform must be redesigned to allow an end user to retrieve data for areas that are not defined as neighborhoods. The ability for a user to draw their own neighborhood and retrieve data about that geographic area is not yet built into the platform. One way to do this would be for us to create neighborhood polygons for the entire Sarasota County, a topic that the Collaborative has discussed in the past.
- Lynette asked if the Census data could be used as a foundation for retrieving data on the platform.
- Allison stated that the data ought to be representative of how people self-organize. Tim and Allison agreed that using the data that is aggregated by the existing neighborhood boundaries file would be the best way to get information on the platform sooner.
- John observed a concern that as new neighborhoods self identify, that all data sets will need to be uploaded for that geography, and that we should look for alternatives to having to manually add the data.

IV. Datasets and Data Stewards

- Colleen updated the collaborative on 1:1 meetings with three data stewards. Supervisor of Elections agreed to provide a monthly report of information. The Sheriff's Office agreed to provide arrest information by address on a monthly basis. The Sarasota County Health Department is not comfortable information at the neighborhood level due to concerns over HIPPA violations, but has provided SCOPE with a contact in Tallahassee where we might be able to get such data. Open Green Map has agreed to provide updated information from the datasets in the OGM platform.
- Allison added that Sarasota Community Studio has had a good experience working with the contact that the Health Department provided them with in Tallahassee.
- Lourdes Ramirez questioned how the Health Department information would violate HIPPA regulation, asking which data they were asked to provide at the neighborhood scale.
- Colleen answered information such as death rates, birth rates and low birth weight has been requested. The concern on the health department side was about privacy for residents of smaller neighborhoods and potential difficulty comparing rates across neighborhoods. Twenty small neighborhoods from the file the Collaborative had been using were determined to be "unusable" based on the number of people living the neighborhood and have been deleted from the file.
- Ron asked what was the number of people in a neighborhood that was considered too small to be usable? Colleen was not sure of the exact number but would get back to him.

V. Community Data Collaborative Agreement Discussion

- Colleen distributed copies of the Agreement to Collaborative members. She stated an e-mail was sent to all members with a draft of the agreement.
- Nita questioned the use of "active" in the Agreement Duration section. Tim continued this line of questioning and stated that the object should be easy entrance and exit into the Collaborative. In addition, he recommended that the values section be removed and that the purpose of the Data Collaborative be the focal point of the agreement.
- Nita suggested the decision not be made until the next meeting. Not all members were present and she felt a more representative decision could be made at the next meeting.
- Jim proposed that "active" be replaced with "remains interested." Tim agreed. Allison commented on the values and behaviors as seeming too bureaucratic. She suggested the section be eliminated.
- Jim anticipated that next meeting would be a better time to respond to the Agreement.
- Approval of the Agreement tabled.
- Nita suggested an e-mail should be sent out to members asking pointed questions regarding the agreement in order to get feedback on the agreement in anticipation of the next meeting. Colleen agreed to out an email to that respect before the next meeting.

VI. Results of Collaborative Survey

- Colleen presented the results of the Collaborative survey. She singled out three questions as particularly interesting and important for discussion.
 - i. The first question asked whether or not “the members of the Community Data Collaborative represent a cross section of those who have a stake in what we are trying to accomplish.” The majority response was in disagreement with this statement. Colleen suggested that members continue to think about who else needs to be present in the Collaborative.
 - ii. The second question addressed “when the collaborative group makes major decisions, there is always enough time for members to confer with colleagues about what the decision should be. One response indicated that there is “too much time wasted on “collaborating” and discussing decisions” and that we should “set up different committees focused on specific areas to make decisions.” Colleen wondered whether or not members would prefer to break off into separate committees in between monthly meetings.
 - iii. The third question asked whether or not “the agenda(as organized by quadrants of Datasets & Stewards, Platform & Technologies, Quality of Life Indicators and Reflection for Decision-making) creates the right structure for monthly collaborative meetings.” The results of this were inconclusive, although one person suggested that meetings should be more “task force oriented, rather than all inclusive.”
- In response to the survey, Allison asserted that little has changed with the Sarasota County Community Platform. Tim added that action would garner more participation.
- Colleen noted that the survey only went out to those most active in attending meetings and providing data.
- Jim noted the quality of response was strong and response rate was very high. He observed that this is a very good target at this stage.
- Colleen stated that another survey would be sent out in due time to chart the progress of the meetings and assess satisfaction with SCOPE as the facilitator of these meetings.

VII. Quality of Life Indicators

- John introduced Community Data 2.1 sessions, stating that there will be three aspects of the sessions: an opportunity to share back what was gathered last year, an opportunity to further refine community indicators, and reveal the power of the Community Platform. SCOPE will be working with Sarasota County Health & Human Services on planning for these sessions. A firm schedule is not in place and will be shared in a future meeting.

VIII. Reflection for Decision Making

- Tim and Allison presented on the work of Central Coconut Neighbors at Sarasota Community Studio. They brought “data postcards” that the Studio had created for neighbors to learn more about indicators of well-being as relates to Central-Coconut as well as the other neighborhoods in Sarasota, to put their neighborhood in context. They

expressed the Studio's focus on neighborhood well-being, housing, economic opportunity, education, and social justice. The neighbors are currently undertaking a housing survey of the neighborhood in order to determine which houses are uninhabited. Neighbors will come together to discuss the results of the survey afterwards and will then decide what they want to do about their findings. Tim and Allison stated the importance of a looking at both the lived experience and data to illustrate what is going on within the neighborhood.

- Lourdes was curious how the Studio would update their information and how to keep their information current in order to compare to other neighborhoods.
- Tim said that, so far, they are the only neighborhood undertaking this type of project. In the future, the neighborhoods will have to keep an eye on each other.

IX. Announcements

- The meeting has reached its scheduled end time and no announcements were made.

X. Next Meeting

- Time and place of the meeting will be announced at a later date. The agreed tentative meeting place was the Sarasota School Board office. An e-mail would be sent out in regards to this issue as well as devising a system for note taking.
- Meeting adjourned.

Meeting minutes drafted by Catherine Wolfe for Data Collaborative approval.

Minutes accepted by Data Collaborative on May 22, 2013 with recognition that members in attendance were not all present for this meeting.