**NNIPCamp Thursday Session 1**

**Shared Indicators**

Attendance

* Amy T.
* Spencer
* Sheila M.
* Brianna
* Kathy (host)
* Jake C.
* April H.
* Phyllis
* Manny

**Kathy:** Some folks from Chicago and Charlotte Khan from Boston. When NNIP started the focus was on being focused and responsive to local needs. If you brought up a set of indicators, there were riots. So, Garth and Charlotte began to introduce the idea. There were several sessions to hammer out what the indicators would be. The motivation was we wanted to tell a bigger story about neighborhoods, and we had ideas about everyone shared tract-level crime data for the last 5 years. We could do central analysis and look at overall patterns and patterns across cities. Each partner could do a blog or story about why their city was different. We had a failed McKnight initiative (NCIS closed) thinking about metadata, and the mechanics of how to collect it. We talked about prenatal care definitions etc. One part was the mechanics, and people are interested in this. First of all, people assume UI has all your data. This would be builds instrumentally over time. We haven’t devoted the mental space to pitch this to funders. If we start small, say 5 people.

**Sheila:** It sounds silly for sites to send one set of a data to one place?

**Kathy:** This is all local data

**Sheila:** Oh ok

**Kathy:** The beautiful part is that you all have local data

**Jake:** One of the inherent problems with this is that local data is local, and it’s hard to aggregate up. What if we distributed the analysis as opposed to the data. This doesn’t solve the mechanics question, but it is shared.

**Spencer:** There is the possibility to compare data if we standardize the methodology. If we agree on a methodology we can tell a common story. In LA, NYC, and Durham some indicators really are the same. California Reinvestment coalition… we don’t always agree on the methodology, but we agree on the importance of the story.

**Sheila:** We do this already because we have to pull from 2 states, and because many data sources are state level they’re different. We often have to put them on separate charts.

**Manny:** 5 years ago, we got a sustainability grant, one goal was to develop and indicators website, the first thing I did was go to Tom’s paper, but 30 indicators morphed into 600, but we wanted 10. The problem is that our proposal said we would look at 6 very different city areas, and help them develop the tools to progress. When we finally whittled it down to 30 indicators, the 6 quadrants said no, they wanted their own. They should be able to choose the indicators they want. When we start talking nationally this get infinitely more complicated.

**Kathy:** I thought about this in terms of areas versus indicators per se.

**Phyllis:** I think we’re overthinking this. There are national standards—

**Kathy:** I don’t think their all

**Phyllis:** For example, prenatal stats.

**Manny:** In some cases it’s true, but in most cases there are no standards.

**Sheila:** For example, definition of race?

**Kathy:** Local data usually doesn’t have multiple options.

**Sheila:** Are local partners insist that we use alone or in combination, but makes it harder because the census doesn’t publish tables. We’re committed to doing it, but other sites might not see the value.

**Sheila:** For example, the Russian Orthodox has a segment of people of color that feel isolated.

**Kathy:** I feel that until we try it, we will run into these problems.

**Phyllis:** Well just look at UCR. All of these other groups have shared indicators, and we can do this in a much more meaningful way. Even if it’s not the Mercedes model.

**April:** I would shy away from rankings. There has been much talk about our issues, but in national settings our issues are not given the same attention.

**Phyllis:** What I mentioned earlier about peer cities.

**Sheila:** For example our issues revolve around growth and not decline like some cities.

**Kathy:** These grouping may be way more interested.

**Jake:** As long as we have the basic framework, we can mold it into the different things we want.

**Spencer:** Collaborative is key for funders

**Kathy:** There needs to be local payoff

**Sheila:** People are obsessed with being able to compare themselves.

**Spencer:** Many funders say the foreclosure crises is early.

**Kathy:** If we could say look at the trends teen pregnancy is dropping everywhere.

**Manny:** One thing you may run into, we look at KS and MO and I just spent time with Dept Local Health and causes of death, and rates between KS MO are vastly different. They assume our data is wrong, but there’s something happening here.

**Spencer:** How are we different, and how can that be difficult. Rustbelt cities have common problems that are different than growing cities.

**Phyllis:** WE can look at who’s doing better than they should be, and figure out why. i.e. a rustbelt city that’s bringing in young people.

**Manny:** I don’t want to do this on a purely case by case basis. I’d like to be able to repeat data duplication amongst NNIP. Asking for one number at a time.

**Amy:** There is value in a pilot.

**Sheila:** That’s what they say we’re supposed to do.

**Jake:** I’m working with Agile and it’s a pain to manage.

**Kathy:** You’re right (to Jake) if we start with the questions, we’ll have better results. We could pilot with partners with better data systems. The whole point of Lionel being here is so he can fall in love with NNIP. We had a few papers that we had no communications plan for, and I don’t want another white paper that takes 3 years and then falls flat.

**Jake:** If we decide before, we won’t have people reject the indicator system.

**Sheila:** Would could ask is the foreclosure crises over. Funders say it is.

**Katie:** I think this is why NNIP is special, we can tell people they’re wrong, and then show them.

**Manny:** It doesn’t matter how much you show them, if it’s not packaged well they won’t fund it.

**Katie:** We won’t change Ford’s attitude but we can point out that its foreclosure is still a problem.

**Kathy/Spencer:** SF rental rates ( cross-site project?)

**Phyllis:** The whole investor thing as a fallout is relevant.

**Kathy:** If we use this springboard to say that we know that developers are more risky. Foreclosure data is hard.

**Spencer:** We use vacancy data.

**April:** Most investors in the county are related to one big investor. What’s going on with us is going on in other cities.

**Sheila:** What happens with the houses they’re buying up?

**April:** WE have to be aggressive, fine them, and chase them out, but if we weren’t these places would deteriorate.

**Kathy:** SF investment homes are running to S8 Voucher holders. So this crisis has been great for assistant residents.

**April:** We want addresses of the tax incentivized properties.

Spencer: You can’t get addresses, but you can generate probabilities.

**Kathy:** That’s interesting, but not the low-hanging fruit.

**Sheila:** The problem, from a while back, all the homes that used to apts are being rehabbed into very expensive SF homes. Housing Affordability is a huge problem in Portland.

**Kathy:** Any housing stuff, would have to be grouped by cities. The crisis isn’t over in DC, even in a hot market.

**Manny:** It’s not over in Kansas City either.

**Sheila:** Other hot topics? Income inequality? Segregation?

**Kathy:** PEW was doing some of this.

**Manny:** We’ve been kicking around findings that race has its privileges (i.e. poor and black)

**Kathy:** Remember David Solet’s years of lost life ignite, those results we startling. These folks live 15 years left than folks in this neighborhood.

**Sheila:** We have an interesting phenomenon, where one of the affluent communities is surrounded by a highway.

**Kathy:** I don’t remember the model, but we could ask.

**Phyllis:** Our state health department data, the years of life deficit was there.

**Sheila:** When I tried to do that, we couldn’t find lower level than county.

**Kathy:** 2/3 of partners have this. It’s the third most common dataset at the address level. If we took something generic, we could then break it down locally. The Casey report that came out said Wisconsin was the worst.

**Jake:** We’re creating story telling kits

**Phyllis:** People were shocked by the mortality rate. Memphis needs this! Something positive.

**Kathy:** If we came up with questions, and floated them, by who could do this easily. I just want a small proof of concept to prove we can do it.

**Spencer:** What if we come up with 3 or 4 questions and people sign off. We can produce something with this, and raise the issue.

**Kathy:** Or have a local panel talk to local people.

**Sheila:** We could ask, “What is the most important issue facing your community right now” or top 2-3

In the closing session.

**Jake:** All we need is a minimum of 4 or these schedule a conference call, and we have a communications plan for the year.