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Existing regional surveys: <https://www.neighborhoodindicators.org/nnip-and-community-surveys>

**Context: Atlanta’s Panel Survey**

* Sense that for years, we are collecting the same data, and it all looks the same
* There is more and more need of what the community needs for their situations, further than the traditional work that they do
  + Interest in a regional panel survey to collect this information
  + 700-person panel this year, with 80% completion
* Trying to build something like the Pew Research Center, but for Metro Atlanta
  + Break it down by demographics
  + For 9 years, has been an annual phone survey, but wanting to turn it into a panel survey before relevant events (State legislature, regional planning)
* Panel is the best way to do that, but thinking about ways to do it
* Nexus often produces dashboards that people don’t use
  + To combat this, already had partners (journalists, school boards) make commitments to use these findings

**Other Groups to Look at outside of NNIP?**

* Honolulu: Hawaii Data Collaborative is doing work on this issue
* Philadelphia: Be Heard Philly
  + Opt-in cell phone survey
  + Responds to real-time issues
    - E.g. sanitation slowdowns
  + Very granular
  + Based out of Temple Institute for Survey Research
* ANES
  + Really good response rate for surveys
    - Could be attributed to $100 gift card for respondents
* NYU Poverty Tracking Survey
  + Linking to administrative data to get a handle on economic mobility on COVID
  + Costs are higher than expected
  + Gets a lot of depth
* Existing survey research centers in many states
  + Conduct QOL surveys
  + NNIP partners could influence what they are asking about
  + Unclear what they’re asking about already
  + NJ, Mass, NY
  + Sometimes conducted by media companies
    - I.e. NYT
  + Often does regional surveys, but could request local ones

**Challenges**

* ACS
  + Quality has gone down, even with a massive budget
  + States might need to supplement it
* OSU
  + Has been administering surveys for years
  + Trying to figure out how to get social services out to people
  + AT OSU, have run into issues at times because people feel like they’re getting so many surveys
    - To combat that, have started asking people first: when was the last time you were surveyed, who does that?
    - Similar issues experienced in Atlanta - very annoying

**Fun ways to get people involved**

* + Some sort of competition
  + Ex: In ATL, having teams based on Chattahoochee watershed creeks, competing based on that

**NNIP Partners to highlight**

* Milwaukee
  + Researchers do the product development at work, but residents are the ones that share out with the community
  + Not all residents are paid there
  + As a good way to get residents involved, even if they’re not part of the surveys
* Grand Rapids
  + After 2019, couldn’t find consistent funding source for it
    - Convenience sampling wasn’t very effective, random was more effective
  + In 2020/2021, produced a concept paper and presented to funders
    - People picked up on the data dashboard, rather than the data collection aspect
    - Still have not gotten the survey piece funded
  + Have had success jumping onto other survey projects
    - Community Health Needs survey
* New Haven
  + Survey cost has gone up 400% in past few years
  + Interviewing over 50,000 people
  + Will call people back from specific demographics for qualitative data
    - Offer gift cards
  + 90% Cell phone/landline, 10% internet
    - Random digit dial seems to be the best approach
  + Advertising a little bit with billboards
    - Not really evidence that it helps
  + 30 hospital systems all use the same surveys
  + Multiple funders; otherwise one funder wouldn’t cut it
  + Worked with a local Community-based organization
    - Small and hard to reach, but helpful
* Child Poverty Action Lab
  + Ready to field a neighborhood-level survey soon
    - At pilot right now
    - Trying to collect data in multiple settings (SFR, MF, Mobile Home)
  + Has a University partner interested in surveying neighborhoods in what they consider to be their service area
    - Allowing CPAL to do what they wanted to do, just in the areas where the Universities want the data collected, and using the University’s money
  + Trying to connect to other projects
    - Integrated approach with other studies
    - Trying to fit in with other studies’ purposes to maintain continued, diverse funding
      * Also generating revenue by asking a series of questions, and then selling them to parties conducting studies
    - Also on a Stanford project: Rapid
  + Collecting information, but also wants to connect people to resources
* Just Communities
  + Survey collection until August 2022
  + Getting residents involved by hiring community leads: paying them for their insights (a good wage) and knowledge in local conversations
    - Talking to people that they know have heavy experience in the wards of Tuscon
    - They can be closer to the ground than Just Communities
      * JC is the latest in a long list of orgs that comes into communities saying that they can help: and others haven’t
      * Not a great deal of trust in the orgs
      * Recognizing that they have valuable insights
    - This was effective
      * Around 1,200 responses in a few months
      * Campaign was more successful than it otherwise would have been
    - Wrote survey, got community leads invested from the jump by having them review the surveys
    - Being on the ground means a lot, even in HOT summers “sharing the desert sun”
  + Defaulted to trusted leaders first, but did connect with residents at certain times
    - Events, etc. with the insights of the community leaders
  + EVERYTHING offered in English and Spanish
    - People wouldn’t respond if it wasn’t in their language
  + Conducting work in fun environments
    - Getting together to write holiday cards for incarcerated people
    - Can be really helpful, especially for more morose subjects
    - More conducive to real answers
  + Dashboard is really important
    - Was already built prior to the survey
    - Helps to show residents: this is what your data is being used for
      * Better than going into a “cloud-based void”
  + **Key point: community engagement does not end there**
    - Initial push came from City of Tucson grant, so report was done for that
    - Real followup: survey draft report for the people of the city
      * Will be distributed to the people, put up on the dashboard
      * Hosting community collaborative sessions
        + Will support conclusions taken from the data
        + Way to make sure that researchers don’t interpret without them
        + Need resident interpretation

This part is not paid

* West Philly Promise Neighborhood
  + Working at the Urban Health Collaborative
  + In a heavily-researched area (Penn, Drexel), but researchers never did a good job of giving back any of what was taken
    - Long history of mistrust from residents of West Philly, specifically towards Penn
    - View that Universities are takers - coming in, taking, not looking back
  + Made sure to involve community residents from the beginning
    - Paid them
      * Residents checked them too - “Why are we not getting raises?”
    - Residents reviewed surveys
    - This helped get into doors that Universities never would have gotten into
      * Residents are FAR more likely to listen to other residents
    - Researchers didn’t go out at all
      * Trained them as pairs of 2 researchers
* Columbus
  + Having residents review grant proposal
  + Picked a central location where people could come on certain dates and share their stories
    - At the end of each session, gathered stories about:
      * Who was involved? Who was not?
      * For example, found out:
        + People didn’t know the reporting process when a building was unsafe
  + Ended up moving locations to the farmers market where they knew people were going
    - People didn’t want to share full stories at the farmers market, so adapted to make sharing easier
      * Sticky notes
  + Nice to know both sides of the story
    - Would give the data back to the people within a few weeks
    - Makes it so that people are more willing to work
* Seattle
  + Random population-based sample (pulled from birth data and school records) focused on families with kids
  + Very proud of how representative the survey is
    - 7 languages
    - Paid community liasons
    - Bilingual survey administrators
  + However, have been hearing consistently that communities still don’t feel like they’re being represented by the data
    - 7 languages doesn’t apply to everything
    - Respondents from refugee communities that may have lower levels of literacy
    - Mistrust in surveys
  + To communicate the value of the survey
    - This survey will be valuable because it gets the information that iwll help your community
  + They feel like this is a good survey
    - Going forward, have split funding
    - 2/3 for the survey
    - 1/3 is going out to the community
      * Giving them money to define “learning questions”, get community impact, and collect the data
      * Org provides the training and analysis