**Friday, October 28th (10:15 AM ET)**

Session 3 – Participatory Community Engagement

Led by Erikka/Amy

Notes by Elizabeth Burton

Attendees: Jay Dev (Esri), Sara Jaye Sanford (Commuities Count), Lori Hanson (Children’s Trust), Annie Calef (Boston Indicators), Jordan Graves (D3), David Asiamah (Black Wealth Data Center), Amy Hawn Nelson (AISP), Katie Zager (UNCC-UI), Ethan Hug (MORPC), Liz Monk (Pittsburgh), Mickey McGlasson (Create Lab), Anthony Galvan (CPAL), Jiaqi Dong (NYU Furman Center), Danya Littlefield (Data You Can Use), Camille Seaberry (Data Haven), Christina Brown (Drexel), Kate Eikel (CT Data), Hyden Terrel (Drexel), Erikka Gilliam (Drexel), Rita Nelson (Drexel), Amy Carroll-Scott (Drexel). Rahul Jayaraman (Just Communities Arizona)

Amy Hawn Nelson: learning community of sites with data infrastructure, data systems that exist, gov agencies but partner with COBs and nonprofits. established systems and supporting them in shifting powers to communities. if you had $50,000 what would you do?

Amy CS: want them to spend it on planning but community members in the process. Santa Monica did health equity review, how much does it inform? comprehensive data review. what if we did community review of data analysis? hard in big cities but comm voice reflected in what they’ve received and how it’s used. planning process to center community expertise. can share Santa Monica data review but pre covid.

Rahul: community advisory group, if not siloed to people with internet access/speak English. people more engaged participate in this.

Amy cs: study of being in community advisory board, people who drop off have interesting things to say.

Rahul: train members to know what’s going on with the data.

Liz: who owns the data at the end of this? are there other researchers at Drexel who want this?

Amy: going to have integrated data system, required to have that. collect survey data, participant tracking system and able to refer within it. researchers came out of the woodwork. specific request process for asking for the data. more time promoting to community partners. more control over survey data. creating raw data downloadable for indicators. can reidentified because folks know each other. indicator data is democratizing. user informed as presented. MOU/DEA snafus with city/school to create indicators but that shut down the conversation. one time data integrated over the six years but not refreshed. spend $50,000 on how to get decision makers on the data in the room and democratized access to this data couldn’t just improve services but advocates use it. request same data anytime to publish a paper but service coordination door goes down, not equitable use of data.

Liz: Adam’s Children Hospital, if data being reused from survey, how do people perceive data used but question from comm lead, if continuously used going forward and researchers making money from it how does that come back to the community?

Amy: center data for the community above academic use. no academics have asked for the data. ability to keep data secure. request/analyze raw data but keep it secure. academics have systems in place does it need to funnel to others.

Mickey: how did you get people to answer questions? how did you go through process of saying this is valuable enough to improve and use these responses and why so rich a survey? level of depth that must be included?

Amy: required by grant and collect contextual evidence

Erikka: I say 355, up to that. for each household, randomly select child in the household and whoever their caregiver is takes the survey, whichever kid that caregiver has up to 3. depends on age category, determines how much questions you have.

Hyden: infant/mid school child/high school kid, you’ll get all the questions.

Mickey: project at the beginning to use survey-based work to better understand displacement. at initial phase, tradeoffs raised for asking more questions and people responding. asking too much. framework for navigating that?

Amy: this team wasn’t on board when starting survey, identify domain with comm leaders and within there folks depending on interest, review different question. offer different valuated questions. once these folks started before IRB approval, so streamlined the heck out of the survey. wanted to know about public safety, household needs, housing; multi sector grant. easier to see same model in the past and want to expand into public safety model for DOJ Byrne grant. community generated but no one wanted to say goodbye to many questions besides triggering ones.

Erikka: gave people $55 for taking the survey, upped it every year.

Hyden: the community was interested in a lot of the questions, many answered the personal ones, especially public safety, and schools.

Rita: depending on how many children you have, it will take at least at hour.

Christina: especially if want to be their therapist at the same time.

Rita: say they only have 15 minutes. at the hour, say oh sorry and then they want you to keep going. some people just want to vent, need someone to talk to. build that trust when seeing them at other communities. some homes had 6-10 children. start with upcoming birthday. want to give them about all their kids.

Hyden: with wearing the orange shirts, people said they wanted to do survey on the street. but randomly selected households and had to explain that. created resource guide for the neighborhood. food, housing assistance, utility assistance, mental health. resource guide for what not addressed.

Rita: had weekly meetings which was the best to share what went wrong and right.

Amy: constantly trouble shooting in the fields and in the office.

Rita: chance to practice when waiting for IRB, domestic abuse situation, alcohol/drug abuse.

David: as worked to overcome institutional histories, strategies to sustain that? values around being participatory. institution to redress some of those?

Amy: working with Drexel leadership, actual PI of Promise is retiring, she’s trying to make a lot of this her legacy before leaving. pushing for these asking for. leading task force for paying community advisory board, trauma informed for surveyors, quick pay system so don’t have to use gift cards, trying to get IRB to require anyone to propose research that happens in disinvested/low income triggered to take trainings on trauma informed/participatory training, global engagement. systemic things looking at. university responsive on gun violence, get university to fund TA for COB on front lines of gun violence epidemic. Drexel does rapid grants, one on gun violence. rather than bringing new people, funnel that into COB who don’t have time to evaluate. This is the time to make change.

Rahul: similar distrust in Tucson, but not tied to an institution. paying community advisory boards, offer incentives. shot up response rates.

Christina: people interested in doing the survey without compensation

Rahul: anyone 18 or older, not doing it randomly just equal distribution from wards. ward 6 is higher income ward and outlet there was ward leader. but in low-income communities were more on the ground, which is more important there. more important in second half to have boots on the ground after covid.

Amy: surveyors practice their pitch. perspectives on why community members.

Hyden: when say it is for their neighborhood and from the area in the same boat, help child and school, grandparents jumped on that. neighborhood for safety and clean up.

Christina: how many times did you go to foodbank? did you get different people to do the survey?

Rahul: not that much of an issue, went every 2 weeks for 2 months and don’t think people were wanting to answer over and over again.

Christina: also did outreach at food banks and making families aware of free internet. making families aware every week but seeing the same families who kept taking the information.

Rahul: community leads could recognize people

Camille: survey participant a couple weeks ago from Morgan State about policing. Part of Baltimore police department decree. $20 half an hour. figured some amount of work/waiting. at the end of it, they asked if i wanted cash app. and said it would be in account. got notification. recommend that. curious for data leads, if there have been moments where saw number about community and helped do the work to have people understand that? moment where proud of work when a friend through organizing was in jail and asked to find paperwork. digging through stuff and printed out data haven community index report because he was certain after yale being in New Haven was going to get reparations from yale after all these years. use data haven work to get reparations.

Rita: all the data snapshots proud of. Wednesday in the office they post it. Urban Health Collaborative having research day with ongoing projects and going to see data story finishing up.

Amy: changing culture around office

Christina: doing surveys and see results, don’t have childcare because not free and accessible. now with PN and able to ask people and say childcare an issue. and now in the PN students have after school programs. excited about that.

Jay: successful because of partnerships, don’t have organizing capacity/skills to do this work. but organizing is a space to bring people out. how you all did that with long term organizations and sustained them or community research board turmoil. when have partners how do you help them stay stable and keep doing their work?

Amy: community research board, got promise zone in 2014 and increased researchers coming in getting prelim data, city agency with backbone agency and reaching out to researchers and comm members back in 2015. came out of angry/frustration. some personalities and side issues. important to go through more structured self-governance. law school at Drexel that has community law group that does projects. law students who researched self-governance models and lead it in participatory ways. at the end had voting structure, positions. second year with another law school project and co-created bylaws. created structure/manual for CRRB. wish did that for PN management team. collective impact model that could have been better run. really clear organizational overlap and not as many comm voices. lead by outreach manager.

Amy: sharing with other PNs: resources for sharing that model in substantive way. maintain intellectual property while sharing it out. feel like scratching the surface and go deeper.

Danya: crime and safety project in Milwaukee. when presented this data back to the community, some leaders in the room who didn’t take survey and said this didn’t represent their neighborhood, but residents took it. enough neighborhood presence that people knew the project. how do residents rely on this data even if not taking the survey?

* Rahul: too many organizations tried before and didn’t do justice, having a face people recognize
* Hyden: not going door to door but at community events and had opportunity to question them. would say they remember people. PTA meetings, school events. being visible in the community to come back out and talk.
* Amy: promotion before and left door hangers, did data fair. try to make data fun.
* Hyden: switch over to phone during covid if they didn’t pick up.
* Danya: did present back the results but could have let orgs know were doing survey.
* Amy: meeting ahead with organizations to share results and how to interpret.
* Rahul: orgs that did bare minimum of survey distribution
* Amy: randomization was important. school enrollment data, lead screening data and 0-5 vaccination data. data management office combo of those was as close to census in Philly.