Sarasota County Data Collaborative Meeting Notes

March 20, 2013 – The Landings

Colleen McGue began the meeting at 10:05pm. She shared the outline of the agenda with the group and distributed a sign-in sheet.

I.   Introductions
   o   Attendees introduced themselves by name, neighborhood and organizational affiliation. In attendance were:

First Name	Last Name	Neighborhood	Organization
Jim	Bennett	Sawgrass	Venice City Council
Aimee	Chouinard	Arlington Park	SCOPE
Michael	Drennon	Gulf Gate	Florida Dept. of Health in Sarasota County
John	Lambie	Southgate	Florida House
Frank	Levey	Sarasota Golf	STF, BarCampSRQ, SproutCamp
Colleen	McGue	Indian Beach	SCOPE
Trevor	Melderis	Southgate	Sarasota County GIS
Allison	Pinto	Central-Cocoanut	Sarasota Community Studio
Lourdes	Ramirez	Siesta Key	CONA
Catherine	Wolfe	Uplands	SCOPE

II.   Review of February Meeting Notes
   o   Colleen asked if everyone had the opportunity to review the changes that Allison Pinto made to the meeting notes from February 20, 2013. No one indicated that they had.
   o   Lourdes stated that the name of her neighborhood was listed incorrectly in the meeting notes. She requested that the listed name of her neighborhood be changed from "Cranberry Gardens" to "Siesta Key."
   o   Approval of February notes tabled for next meeting.
   o   Catherine Wolfe from SCOPE volunteered to take the meeting notes again.
III.   Data Stewards
   o   Colleen provided an update on 1:1 meetings that SCOPE has held with two of Community Data Stewards on behalf of the Community Data Collaborative: the Sheriff's Office and the School Board.
   o   The Sheriff's Office has provided arrest data for January and February 2013.
   o   The School Board has provided a sizeable amount of data, however there are inconsistencies and potential errors within the dataset that need to be addressed with the School Board prior to that dataset being ready to load into the Community Platform. Due to the large workload at the School Board a meeting time has not yet been approved.

- o Jim Bennett asked whether the data was separated by such variables as grades, age, and gender. Allison stated that they were not. Some of the data files were divided by grades, but not all. None of the data are divided by age or gender.
- o Jim also questioned what would happen with data where only a small amount of students were represented. Colleen suggested that in datasets with less than 10 students a threshold could be used to describe the data such as "Less than 10 Students" rather than adding the actual number of students if those students could potentially be identified individually. Allison also suggested that thresholds for a small amount of students could change based on the set, the neighborhood, and other variables.
- o Further discussion ensued around the format in which the School Board has provided this information. Colleen explained that the addresses of students were aggregated by neighborhood by the School Board using ArcGIS in order to protect anonymity of the students. This data was then analyzed by the School Board using another type of software that generated Excel spreadsheets listing the number of students in each neighborhood for each indicator of well-being that was requested by the Data Collaborative. These spreadsheets have required further processing in order to be ready for upload to the Community Platform. For some of the data the information presented is unclear and therefore further discussion with the School Board over this data is needed before the data should be presented online on the Community Platform.
- o Allison stated that the Sarasota Community Studio has processed this learning data from the School Board already for their use. She explained that she sent the processed data to the School Board to see if they had any concerns about the validity of the data. As the School Board never responded, the Sarasota Community Studio assumed that their processing of the data was accurate. They have been using this data in their materials.

IV. Discussion of the Collaborative Agreement
- o Background
    - i. There was disagreement on the necessity of a background section to the agreement. Some felt that it would be informative for new members. Others felt that it was not necessary and that parts of this section in the current document were inaccurate. Someone suggested that there could be a "one-pager" that describes the background of the Collaborative for distribution along with the agreement.
- o Purpose
    - i. There was disagreement as to who would be signing this document. Some thought the Agreement was meant to be a broad document for any person interested in participating in the Collaborative. Others thought this document was intended for the Data Stewards to sign, rather than residents and individuals representing neighborhood. There was discussion as to whether or not there should be different agreements for individuals and for organizations participating as data stewards. For individuals, members of the Collaborative felt it was important that the agreement be user friendly, perhaps as a function

of the platform, and reflect the voluntary nature of the Community Data Collaborative. For organizations, members seemed to agree that having a designated representative (or two) would be desirable to establish a point of contact within such organization.

 ii. Determining who was "in" to sign the Agreement and become part of the Collaborative was more difficult. Questions concerning what responsibilities each member might have, whether there would be an attendance policy, and the duration of participation were all listed as items that should be addressed when someone agreed to become a member of the Collaborative.

 iii. Some Collaborative members also focused on the "marketing" of the Data Collaborative. When more people know about the Collaborative they can express what they want to see in the Community Platform and then we, as a Collaborative, can better know what to provide. Outreach is a critical part of identifying who would utilize the Community Platform.

- o Values/Beliefs
  - i. Members generally agreed that the values and beliefs section should be stricken from the document.
- o Responsibilities
  - i. Distribution of responsibilities among Collaborative members was another contentious point. Some members felt that the word "responsibilities" was too bureaucratic for the Collaborative Agreement because participation is voluntary. Many of the members at the meeting felt that they were in a position to support the Collaborative by supplying data, acting as a representative of the Collaborative to a different group, or bringing in more members. However, whether or not people felt they were part of the Data Collaborative and could devote the time and energy necessary to take on the types of responsibilities that SCOPE currently takes on as facilitator of the Collaborative was less certain.
  - ii. Discussion of subcommittees came up a few times as a means of allocating responsibilities and creating more avenues of communication within the Collaborative. The creation of subcommittees worried other members. While responsibilities should be shared and subcommittees are helpful, the diversity of different types of members (such as resident members and "technical support" members) working together face-to-face is good for the whole group.
  - iii. Some members felt it was important to acknowledge that the Collaborative is more than information sharing and more than a product (i.e., the data platform). It was agreed that this Collaborative also wanted to supply a way for people in neighborhoods to network, examine indicators of quality of life in their neighborhoods, participate in the local economy of their neighborhood and reflect on data for decision-making.
- o Agreement Duration
  - i. Though there was not much discussion on this part of the Agreement, most felt that this section of the document was unnecessary.

        ii.   It was agreed that SCOPE, as facilitator of the Data Collaborative meetings, would re-draft a Collaborative Agreement given the changes proposed by Data Collaborative partners during the meeting and will present it at the next meeting.

V.   What is a Collaborative?

- o Allison began the conversation noting that the monthly Collaborative Meetings felt more like meetings of an advisory board to a SCOPE project than meetings of a collaborative. She felt that the Collaborative meetings acted as advisory meetings in which members were simply providing comments on how SCOPE should continue to work on a project that is "theirs" and not "ours." Discussion centered on SCOPE's role as a facilitator.
- o Colleen facilitated this discussion by taking notes on whiteboard, and then provided a general overview of what she was hearing during the discussion. She promised to send the notes taken on the whiteboard to the Collaborative electronically. Two questions seemed to be unanswered and particularly pressing: "What is a collaborative?", and "What is our purpose?" Some members felt that more clarity around the term "Collaborative" was necessary.
- o Allison suggested that Tim Dutton could serve as a resource on collaboration. John Lambie asked if Tim might be able to present for ten minutes about collaboration at the beginning of the next meeting. Colleen agreed that this presentation would be valuable to inform the decision about the Collaborative Agreement and volunteered to ask Tim if he would be willing to prepare something for the next meeting.

VI.   Closing Questions

- o Aimee revisited the Sheriff's data from January. She wondered what information is provided about the arrested person: ethnicity, for example. Colleen explained that ethnicity of people arrested within the Sheriff's data is divided into either black and white, a problematic method of identification in terms of comparing this dataset to others as people who identify as Hispanic or Latino are not specified in the data.
- o Another question addressed if people arrested at their home address were part of the dataset. Colleen stated that arrests are identified by the location of the arrest and that the home address of the person arrested was not information that the Sheriff's Office was willing to share because of concerns about accuracy of this data and potentially violating the privacy of the relatives of the people arrested by displaying their address online.

VII.   Announcements

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

II.   Next Meeting

- o The next meeting will be at the Health Department on April 24th from 10AM to 12PM.
- o Meeting adjourned at 12pm.

Meeting minutes drafted by Catherine Wolfe for Data Collaborative approval.

Minutes approved by Data Collaborative on May 22, 2013 with recognition that audio recording was limited/inadequate to supplement.