What are our ethical responsibilities when analyzing information that is running in near real time? Are there different considerations for how we tell stories?
What is the burden of proof for neighborhood level analyses of two disparate kinds of information (for instance, covid infection rates and eviction rates)? What do we need to show to establish validity of our argument or mixing of data? How might we validate our analysis with "on the ground" examples?
How do we communicate effectively with non-technical audiences about near real time relationships in our data? What are some effective narrative vehicles or ways of storytelling that connect people to abstract concepts or information?

I think researchers, story tellers, and planners have a lot of responsibility when it comes to sharing real time information. I think we saw this on full display when we started reporting Covid-19 case and death numbers. The statistics were changing every day but people were making weighty decisions based on the statistics of a week ago. We were also throwing around mortality rate statistics and did not share with the public that those stats were not heavily influenced yet by robust numbers. We also started sharing mortality rates without explaining that some mortality rates look at deaths per those infected and some look at deaths per general population.

I think it is the researchers, story tellers, and planners who have the responsibility of explaining different data, especially when they are shared in real time. There is a great burden of proof with two disparate kinds of information. I think planners need to run analyses on the two information sources to prove that they are related like using a model to show that there is correlation and most likely causation involved.

This topic is something that is difficult to talk about and ever important right now, as much of the country (and world, but I will talk about the U.S. for the sake of discussion) refuses to believe in science but also is wholly misguided in how to interpret scientific reports. I'm convinced that if the general public were given the science portion of the ACT the majority would fail. I have so many friends and family who read scientific reports claiming that medical masks were not as good as N95 masks cause they only caught 70-80% of particles and claimed that medical masks were fake and didn't work. When in reality, the reports were attempting to share a tiered list of which masks worked best. None of them said wearing a mask was pointless, in fact many of them concluded that wearing any mask is better than wearing no mask which catches 0% of particles.

My point in sharing this story is to explain the immense need for researchers, story tellers, and planners to commit themselves to sharing their findings in a manner that can be accessed by anyone. I am a strong proponent for making academic research more accessible rather than less accessible which I think happens when academics spend years

in school trying to write more complicated reports and use bigger words. This may impress other professors and academics but the people who could benefit the most from the information are unable to comprehend what is happening.