

MGISAC Compiled SWOC analysis Winter 2012

Strengths:

- Membership and those who attend meetings
 - Passionate membership
 - Respected, professional membership
 - Attendance of interested individuals
 - Many experience members from a broad community base – some have served for 10 or more years
 - Collegial
 - State agency reps are organized in one department, good communication within this group
 - Diversity of members, all levels of government, private companies that contribute to the council.
 - Members willing to train and reach out across the state.
 - Desire to work with anyone in the state.
 - Representative of GIS professionals in the State of Missouri
 - Representation and expertise across sectors and space.
 - Number of engaged local government folks.
 - Fair representation of Stakeholders
 - Good representation from diverse geospatial community
 - Good cross section in membership (city, county, state, vendor)
 - Good working relationship *within* the MGISAC.
- Volunteer-based organization
 - Volunteer run
 - Strong, long time desire for the advancement of the technology in the state by the volunteers.
 - Most are volunteers
- Operational Strengths
 - Meeting regularly
 - Monthly meetings are well organized and attended.
 - Some reserve \$\$.
 - Have money in the bank to invest into the community
 - MSDIS Clearinghouse has stable funding base and is making improvements
 - Communication
 - meetings well attended
 - website and list serves that are open to all
 - Active Committees have vision on what they want to accomplish
- Leadership
 - Generally strong and increasingly diverse leadership...
- Programmatic Strengths (not just the programs we hold but the category of
 - The Conference
 - Generally hosts a solid conference and seems willing lately to change-up the conference.

- Bi-annual conference helps keep members motivated with a specific goal, a successful conference.
 - Has made a conscious effort to not be conference centric all the time
 - Outreach activities – symposia, workshops
 - Outreach (regionalized workshops and statewide conference)
 - LGov activities are becoming stronger
 - Responsive to community requests
- Impacts
 - Provides a single focus point for furthering Missouri’s geospatial agenda
 - Tackled some very large projects that have had significant impact on Missouri’s geospatial efforts
 - Have had some notable successes brokered from within the group – aerial imagery, Lidar, address standard, image services.
 - Missouri is noticeably better for geospatial today because of Council activities.
 - Sounds as if informal data sharing across communities is common.
 - The collective GIS knowledge of the MGISAC is huge.

Weaknesses:

- Culture of the Organization
 - Working together.
 - Accepting difference and change.
 - Reliance on tradition
 - We tend to nibble on the edge of big challenges, and dive in and focus on smaller things.
 - Divisive at times...
 - Diversity has led to political gridlock, unable to develop message on big issues such as data sharing
- Financial
 - Money – what do we have? What do we want to do with it? What can we do with it?
 - Reluctant to spend bigger dollars to achieve bigger goals
 - No funding for changing mission, MSDIS needs to “job shop” in order to survive.
 - -Lack of funding and resources are an issue at every level of government. *(this may also be an external weakness –SW)*
- Operational Weakness
 - Volunteer organization
 - Volunteer run
 - This is a volunteer organization and people don't have the time to devote to many of the big issues that are brought up.
 - Who is driving the bus? Who is responsible for setting the mission of the organization?
 - Ad-hoc creation of meeting agendas.
 - In competition with OGI
 - Too many folks that sit and watch – workload pulled by a small minority.
 - State agency members are not part of the agency they represent, (OA)
 - Many meetings nothing gets accomplished causing some to lose interest
 - Leadership - Need to ask folks to ante up or ask that they find replacements that will.
 - Size of council makes it unwieldy, danger of blocs forming in opposition to other blocs
 - Too many committees are not functioning effectively, need a champion to set their vision.
- Identity Issues of the Organization
 - Uncertainly as to where the council really fits, should it be a state managed council or independent? Non state reps often feel as not as important.
 - Still searching for an identity with the state and state agencies – this has been somewhat complicated by GIS consolidation...
 - Operate somewhat as a reporting body rather than an action body (Here's what we (members) have done rather than here's what we are going to do.
 - State agency members are not part of the agency they represent, (OA)
- Organizational Planning
 - Difficulty completing and achieving things.
 - No dedicated responsibilities, only “volunteer” responsibilities, creates potential accountability issues and difficulty in getting work completed.

- Too decentralized, subcommittee focused as opposed to working on a big project, and assigning roles in that project to the subcommittees.
- No Measurable Goals and Objectives
- No documented Annual Work Plan
- Lack common terminology regarding planning and operating (Vision, Mission, Goals, Purpose, Objectives)
- Hot topic of the day is only item really worked on rather than well documented measurable goals.
- Lack of defined direction for Council and associated Committees
-
- Programmatic Issues of the Organization
 - Has danced around data sharing issues...
 - Needs to focus on more legislative champions – no concerted effort to visit legislators since defunct GIS Day efforts in the capitol.
 - Focus on some good things but don't get to the real issues (best things- i.e. data sharing)
 - More K-12 interaction needed.
 - Reluctant to be tasked by CIO/OGI
 - GIS Inventory of Missouri is lacking
 - Narrow focused
 - Many counties have not advanced to hire/designate specific GIS services which could aid internal and external county coordination and management.
 - No clear communication regarding what the state wants from local governments.
 - Not enough communication between the producers of geospatial solutions and legislators - at the city, county, regional, and state levels.
 - We have a variety of different entities we are working with and there is no "one size fits all". The local group could come up with something that works very well in an urban setting (or rural) that is completely unsuitable for a state-wide or federal approach.
 - With the essentially defunct Missouri Enterprise Architecture effort the only standards in progress are cadastral, yet the bylaws objectives and MGISAC home page tout standards as a huge part of what we should be doing.
 - Lack of data sharing.

Opportunities:

- Relationships with the State of Missouri & OGI
 - Cooperate with OGI to document relationships, processes, and structure by which both or all entities can interact and function.
 - New CIO - Opportunity
 - With a new CIO coming soon we should focus on a better relationship and marketing our value to the CIO.
 - OGI integration
 - New OGI and more formal relationships with leadership
 - Coordination and consolidation of IT infrastructure and resources
- External Opportunities
 - Proliferation of and interest in maps and spatial presentations, LBS
 - New technologies and techniques
 - Need for government official(s) to advocate GIS and all of its benefits.
- Programmatic Opportunities and potential culture change in the organization
 - Large efforts are waiting for a champion to push them through.
 - Assume the MGISAC is responsible for setting the direction and mission of GIS in the State, and move forward.
 - Can have great impact on legislative action, and have positive outcomes for public spending. Need to find ways to advocate effectively.
 - Public purview data sharing is growing
 - Changing conference location and format
 - LiDAR currently (and to a lesser extent data) is a route to Missouri users – how can we do more to help?
 - Maximizing MSDIS' functionality and services
 - K thru 12 – all aspects are opportunities for growth of the discipline
 - K-12 statewide licensing
 - Being looked to for standards development and guidance – leadership?
 - Statewide need for free topical training and educational / informational programs within the current budget environment
 - Create/maintain a single GIS Yellow Pages of state resources.
 - Educate elected officials and management on GIS, how GIS is used, and the business value.
 - MSDIS is moving forward with image server, collaboration with Wash U. Innovative solutions to a tight budget
 - An interest in understanding the [changing] world
 - Local government continues to have strong interest in the council, good energy.
 - Get people talking about GIS as a business solution and not as a technology
 - We need to stay current with how people are starting to use this technology outside traditional GIS mindset (mobile apps?). Identify more people that need to be at the table.
 - Data sharing amongst different levels of government.
 -
- Operational
 - Metrics / report card for activities
 - MGISAC website and communications / marketing
 - HSAC linkage with MGISAC's Homeland Security Committee

- We seem to lack participation of federal agencies with GIS capabilities and data that are often hard to find and obtain (Forest Service, EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of the Census, Fish and Wildlife Service, etc)
- Financial
 - Funding – there will be opportunities education and ecdev.
 - Tighter budgets requires more cooperation with others to make things happen, Lidar a good example.

MGISAC Threats/Challenges:

Operational

- The fine line between volunteers and mandates or deliverables
- Continued strong leadership
- Meeting format – maximizing meeting time to accomplish goals
- Setting deliverables for each year and committee driven by wider council plan
- The ability to make hard decisions and provide pointed leadership to those in authority

Programmatic

- Lack of an identified political champion within the legislature and executive branch
- Relevancy is lacking to issues facing state and local governments
- We face becoming obsolete/unnecessary with the spread of consumer GIS and lack of appreciation for what we provide.
- State GIS Inventory
- We need to do a better job of educating people to where all the data used by Google and other publicly used resources is really coming from
- Public not aware of the capabilities of GIS.
- In some (many?) areas there is an unwillingness or inability to share information. This seems to be centered on a lack of comfort with the open records laws and/or trust between entities.

State of Missouri GIS

- Ebb and flow of state government.
- Turnover in CIO office and view of GIS and IT from within State Government is clouded at best
- No designated GIO with role and focus on the entire state.
- Constant changes at the state level, with no clear direction.
- No GIO.
- State layoff's will impact ability of departments to use geospatial data.
- OGI could replace this group and be the authority. We need to find a way to have a more positive interaction and define clear roles and responsibilities of each entity. New CIO - challenge
- Changing state government, lack of stability makes it hard to commit to projects not directly controlled by the agency.

Financial

- Funding MSDIS maintenance and particularly future enhancements
- Funding may require a lobbying effort at the state level. However this is not an acceptable activity for government employees.
- Federal budget will make partnerships more difficult
- Funding and budget cuts
- Tighter budgets make it difficult to get things accomplished, especially as people are lost.
- Funding for statewide projects and initiatives

Membership

- Participation / lack of with key stakeholders and potential members. Burned bridges.
- The 'state' vs. 'locals' inability to see beyond their own sandbox