DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community engagement is the participation of members of a community in assessing, planning, implementing, and evaluating solutions to problems that affect them. As such, community engagement involves interpersonal trust, communication and collaboration. Such engagement, or participation, should focus on, and result from, the needs, expectations and desires of a community's members. Community is not solely defined by geographic boundaries and may include residents, users, community organizations and institutions, neighborhood associations, businesses and workers, cultural communities, advocacy groups, students and youths.

PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

1) RIGHT TO BE INVOLVED – Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a **right to be involved** in the decision-making process.

QUALITIES . . .

VALUED - Community engagement should be a fundamental value and should be part of the regular culture of how things are done.

2) CONTRIBUTION WILL BE THOUGHTFULLY CONSIDERED - Public participation includes the promise that the public's **contribution will be thoughtfully considered.**

QUALITIES . . .

EARLY - Engagement should happen as early in the process as possible—before momentum is difficult to redirect.

INCLUSIVE - All organizations involved in the community engagement process should encourage and provide the opportunity for all viewpoints to be heard.

RESPECTFUL AND OPEN - Individuals involved in the community engagement process should strive to be respectful and open to the ideas of others.

DELIBERATIVE - Community engagement should include a deliberative process of weighing pros and cons.

3) RECOGNIZE THE NEEDS OF ALL - Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by **recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants,** including decision-makers.

QUALITIES . . .

RESPONSIVE - Engagement should be about what the community needs not only about what the City needs input on at any given time.

FAIR - the process must be fair—not everyone gets their way, but everyone has a place at the table.

TWO-WAY - Communication must be two-way.

BROAD - Notifications should be broad.

FORMAL AND INFORMAL - Formal and informal relationships should be identified, recognized and valued.

COORDINATED - The City should coordinate with other jurisdictions, such as parks, schools and libraries, on community engagement.

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07

4) SEEK OUT INVOLVEMENT - Public participation **seeks out and facilitates the involvement** of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

> QUALITIES . . .

> **CREATIVE** - Potential community engagers should be creative in their techniques to gain participation.

> **EASY** - Efforts should be made to identify barriers and make the path to participation easier for those who are least likely or able to participate.

> **SUPPORTED** – Resources should be allocated or available to groups with community engagement mandates.

> **MONITORED** - Groups that receive resources to provide participation should have accountability and measurable outcomes including how the group is representative.

5) PARTICIPANTS DESIGN PARTICIPATION - Public participation seeks **input from participants in designing how they participate**.

> QUALITIES . . .

> **ESTABLISHED** - There should be established expectations and roles.

> **CLEAR** - There should be clear expectations and mutual accountability for core principles.

6) ADEQUATE INFORMATION - Public participation **provides participants with the information they need** to participate in a meaningful way.

> QUALITIES . . .

> **CONSISTENT** - There should be a consistent and predictable system for sharing information needed for informed community engagement.

> **TRANSPARENT** - Communication should be well-defined, timely, fair, clear, and transparent.

> **INFORMATIVE** - Communities should be made aware of how decisions will affect them.

> **LEGAL** - Legal requirements for notice should be clearly stated and understood by all.

7) KNOWN AFFECT OF PARTICIPATION - Public participation **communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.**

> QUALITIES . . .

> **CIRCULAR** - There should be two-way **follow-up to "close the loop**" about what happened and why.

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07

RECOMMENDATIONS

R1 - APPROVE PRINCIPLES - Document the value of and commitment to community engagement by approving "Minneapolis Core Principles of Community Engagement."

CONTRIBUTION WILL BE THOUGHTFULLY CONSIDERED . . .

R2 - REQUIRE ORGANIZATION TO INCORPORATE PRINCIPLES - Require organizations—that receive resources to engage the community—to encourage openness to alternative viewpoints by incorporating "Minneapolis Core Principles of Community Engagement" in their work.

> *VOTE 1: PROPOSED MODIFICATION*: Require organizations that receive resources to engage the community in order to encourage openness to alternative viewpoints **by annually adopting the "Minneapolis Core Principles of Community Engagement." Create a report that formally reports back to the City's Community Engagement on their implementation of the Principles annually.**

Fail - the vote was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   0
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   4
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   6

> *VOTE 2:* R2.1 - *PROPOSED ADDITION*: Design and implement tools that City staff and departments utilize to communicate upcoming projects early in the process to support early involvement of residents. These tools should also assist City staff in identifying ways in which resident input can be solicited and incorporated into the planning processes of upcoming projects.

Pass - the vote was in favor of adding this recommendation to the report.
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   6
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   4
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   0

RECOGNIZE THE NEEDS OF ALL . . .

R3 - INCLUDE INDEPENDENT BOARDS - Develop more formal ways to include independent government boards in the community engagement system (School Board, Park Board, County, etc.)

R4 - COMMUNICATE WITH NON-GEOGRAPHIC GROUPS - Notify geographic and non-geographic community organizations about community engagement processes.

R5 - DEVELOP CITYWIDE SYSTEM - Develop a system for citywide engagement regarding citywide issues.

> *DISCUSSION 1:* **Discussion Point**…*MORE CLARIFICATION NEEDED:* It was noted that this recommendation does not seem very descriptive or duplication another rec.

Fail - the vote was against adding more clarification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   1
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   0
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   9

R6 - SHARE NRP INPUT - Develop a system to coordinate input from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) to City departments.

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07

VOTE 3: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: **COORDINATE INPUT & ACTIVITIES** - Develop a system to coordinate input from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) to City departments and between City Departments.

Pass - the vote was in favor of including this modification.
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   6
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   0
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   4

R7 - INCREASE PLANNING INPUT - Develop a system to get increased resident input into the planning process.

VOTE 4: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: Develop a system to permit community organization plans to inform the City's planning process and contribute to the City's work prioritization.

Pass - the first vote (below) was to discuss further. The second vote (called as ayes and nays) was in favor of adopting the modification with the word "plans" changed to "priorities."
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   2
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   7
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   1

SEEK OUT INVOLVEMENT . . .

R8 - ALLOCATE RESOURCES - Develop a system to allocate resources to organizations that are asked to engage the community.

VOTE 5: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: Add to the end of the recommendation the following text: (Resources may include but are not limited to administrative funding, training or staff assistance, or professional technical assistance to eligible groups that desire to work to engage the community.

Pass - the vote was in favor of including this modification.
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   7
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   2
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   1

R9 - APPROVE ORGANIZATION CHARACTERISTICS - Approve "Characteristics of Organizations That Can Receive Resources to Engage the Community" (page 11).

R10 - DEVELOP ACCOUNTABILTY SYSTEM - Develop a system of accountability for organizations that receive funding to engage the community.

R11 - SUPPORT CURRENT INITIATIVES - Utilize and support current community engagement projects and initiatives, including the NRP.

VOTE 6: PROPOSED ADDITION: Utilize and support current community engagement projects and initiatives, including the NRP **and the City's community engagement system as defined BELOW/ABOVE.** *[as a task force we have not defined this so it would require additional time/work]*

Fail - the first vote(below) was to discuss further. The second vote (called as ayes and nays) was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   2
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   3
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   4

R12 - ALLOCATE RESOURCES FOR NRP - Allocate resources and staff for administration of adopted NRP Neighborhood Action Plans and existing contracts beyond 2009.

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07

R13 - IMPLEMENT FIELD HEARINGS - Implement a system of field hearings—hold more meetings at times and locations that are convenient to the affected community.

R14 - IDENTIFY ALERNATIVE LOCATIONS - Identify or create locations around the city for meetings, etc.

> *VOTE 7: PROPOSED MODIFICATION*: Identify or create locations around the city for meetings, etc. **This should include City Council meetings, boards and commissions.**
>
> Fail (however replacement modification approved) - the first vote (below) was to discuss further. The second vote (called as ayes and nays) was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report) and to instead, modify the recommendation about field hearings. (Original field hearing recommendation: Implement a system of field hearings—hold more meetings at times and locations that are convenient to the affected community.) Add: In addition, explore holding meetings of the city council, commissions and boards in the community.
>
> ● Green "yes" votes –   3
> ○ Yellow "maybe" votes -   7
> ● Red "no" votes -   0

R15 - CREATE POINTS OF INTERACTION - Create well-defined points of interaction between the City and community organizations from the beginning of each process to its end, **including evaluation**.

> *VOTE 8: PROPOSED MODIFICATION*: Create well-defined points of interaction (clear processes, contacts within departments, and timing, etc) between the City and community organizations from the beginning of each process to its ends, including evaluation. These points of interaction should be established in all City departments.
>
> Pass - the vote was in favor of including this modification.
>
> ● Green "yes" votes –   8
> ○ Yellow "maybe" votes -   1
> ● Red "no" votes -   1

R16 - MAINTAIN CONTACT INFORMATION - Maintain an updated, centralized and inclusive list of contact information on community organizations (both geographic and non-geographic) for notification and outreach.

R17 - COORDINATE TIMELINES - Make timelines for City projects better coordinated between City planners and community organizations.

R18 - IMPLEMENT BOARDS AND COMMISSION CE REQUIREMENTS - Require City boards and commissions to implement community engagement strategies in their work, providing them with sufficient resources and training. Strategies should include annual evaluation and accountability reports.

> *VOTE 9: PROPOSED MODIFICATION*: *Add to the end of the recommendation the following text:* **City boards, commissions and departments should work together – through community engagement work plans – to ensure community engagement activities are properly coordinated with efforts that are cross-jurisdictional.**
>
> Pass - the first vote (below) was to discuss further. The second vote (called as ayes and nays) was in favor of adopting the modification with the following changes: Change "City boards" to "Independent boards" and tighten up the wording to say… Independent boards, commissions, and departments should work together on community engagement work plans that are cross-jurisdictional.
>
> ● Green "yes" votes –   5
> ○ Yellow "maybe" votes -   0
> ● Red "no" votes -   5

R19 - REQUIRE ALL TO INCORPORATE PRINCIPLES - Require all partners involved in the community engagement process to incorporate the "Minneapolis Core Principles of Community Engagement" in their work.

R20 - SEEK INPUT INTO CE SYSTEM - Seek out and include community engagement partners in decisions regarding changes to the community engagement system.

R21 - SEEK INPUT INTO CE RESOURCES - Include community organizations in decisions about resource allocation whenever possible and appropriate.

ADEQUATE INFORMATION . . .

R22 - CREATE A RESIDENT-BASED COMMISSION - Create a resident-based commission of community engagement.

> **VOTE 10: *CHOOSE ONE OF THESE OPTIONS***

>> **R22A - *PROPOSED DELETION*:** Delete this recommendation because the NRP Policy Board already fulfills this role.

>> Fail - the vote was against deleting this recommendation.
>> - 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   1
>> - 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   0
>> - 🔴 Red "no" votes -   8

>> *OR*

>> **R22B - *PROPOSED ADDITION*:** Add to the recommendation some suggested responsibilities and parameters for the commission.

>> Pass (however additions not defined yet) - the vote in favor of this addition.
>> - 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   7
>> - 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   1
>> - 🔴 Red "no" votes -   2

R23 - TAILOR ACCESS TO INFORMATION - Provide information quickly and in ways that are tailored to users' needs.

R24 - USE TECHNOLOGY FOR DISIMENATION - Utilize technology, including the Web and WiFi, to provide information to encourage and increase informed community engagement.

R25 - CREATE CENTRAL LOCATION - Create a central location that informs people of the various avenues and resources available for participation.

R26 - USE EXISITING GROUPS - Find consistent ways to use existing communities and groups to gather and disseminate information.

VOTE 11: **R26.1 - *PROPOSED ADDITION*:** Provide the resources to support a variety of communication strategies known to reach residents directly.

Pass - the vote was in favor of adding this recommendation to the report.
- 🟢 Green "yes" votes –   6
- 🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   2
- 🔴 Red "no" votes -   0

R27 - MAINTAIN WEB - Dedicate adequate staff time to maintain a **community engagement section on the City's Web site** that is user-friendly and can provide two-way communication through interactivity.

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07

R28 - REQUIRE TRAINING - Require City staff, community organization staff, and community organization board members who work in the community to have ongoing **cultural orientation and community engagement training**.

VOTE 12: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: - Require City staff who works in the community, **community organization staff, and community organization board members** to have ongoing cultural orientation and community engagement training.

Undecided - The first vote (below) was to discuss further. The second vote, a motion to keep the original text (called as ayes and nays), didn't' pass. Staff was directed to work on rewriting this item for a later vote.

● Green "yes" votes –   4
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   2
● Red "no" votes -   3

KNOWN AFFECT OF PARTICIPATION . . .

R29 - REPORT RESULTS - Establish policies that require **reporting the results** of a decision, particularly to those who provided input.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS, NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE CORE PRINCIPLES. . .

VOTE 13: R30 — PROPOSED ADDITION (MOVED INTO RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION): NEXT STEPS – The Task Force recommends additional work to bring these recommendations to the next level of detail be driven by the public as was the generation of this report.

Fail - The first vote (below) was to discuss further. The second vote (called as ayes and nays) was against including this addition.

● Green "yes" votes –   3
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   4
● Red "no" votes -   1

VOTE 14: PROPOSED ADDITION : (location to be determined) The City should provide the structure resources for best practices in community engagement to be available to all community organizations receiving city support and all departments interacting with the community. Peer support by those demonstrating best practices should be utilized.

Undecided - The first vote (below) was to discuss further. The task force asked staff to work on rewording.

● Green "yes" votes –   0
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   14
● Red "no" votes -   0

VOTE 15: PROPOSED ADDITION : (location to be determined) The city should incorporate incentives coupled with quantifiable and measurable goals in its community engagement system to encourage and promote community engagement from department level down to the individual contributor level.

Pass - the first vote (below) was to discuss further. The second vote (called as ayes and nays) was in favor of adopting the addition with a couple of substitutions. The final addition reads: The City should incorporate quantifiable and measurable goals in its community engagement system to encourage and promote community engagement from department level to the individual employee level.

● Green "yes" votes –   1
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   6
● Red "no" votes -   3

VOTE 16: PROPOSED ADDITION : (location to be determined) The city should provide adequate resources to city department programs that rely on residents as their primary human resource (such as CCP/SAFE).

Undecided - the vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.

● Green "yes" votes –   4
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   1

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07

● Red "no" votes -   5

VOTE 17: PROPOSED ADDITION : (location to be determined) The city should promote more collaboration and improved communication between community organizations and block clubs where their respective goals in community engagement align.

Pass - the vote was in favor of adding this recommendation to the report.

● Green "yes" votes –   8
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   2
● Red "no" votes -   0

CHARACTERISTICS OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT CAN RECEIVE RESOURCES TO ENGAGE THE COMMUNITY

(**Note:** these characteristics are based on the ones used in the City's Citizen Participation Guidelines for neighborhood associations with changes and additions made by the Task Force.)

VOTE 18: PROPOSED ADDITION: These characteristics identify community organizations who should receive city support to empower residents to lead and initiate in the prioritization, planning and action on issues specifically important to their community through that community organization.

Undecided - the vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.

● Green "yes" votes –   1
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   7
● Red "no" votes -   2

CHARACTERISTICS:

VOTE 19: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: The only groups that should be eligible for resources for engaging the community are neighborhood organizations. *(If this modification is approved all reference to cultural or affinity groups would be removed from these characteristics)*

Fail - the vote was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)

● Green "yes" votes –   0
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   1
● Red "no" votes -   9

The City may provide resources including but not limited to administrative funding, training or staff assistance to eligible groups that desire to work to engage the community.

1)   Represent:

(a) a **geographically defined neighborhood** (in its entirety) within Minneapolis as identified by the most current Minneapolis Communities and Neighborhoods Map, or

(b) a **cultural or affinity group**.

2)   The group must incorporate the "**Minneapolis Core Principles of Community Engagement**" in its work.

3)   Ensure that membership is open with **no barriers to participation** or membership (such as membership dues, requiring attendance at a certain number of meetings before voting rights are conferred, etc.).

VOTE 20: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: Ensure that membership is open with no barriers to participation or membership (such as <u>mandatory</u> membership dues, requiring attendance at a certain number of meetings before voting rights are conferred, etc.

Undecided - the vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.

● Green "yes" votes –   0
● Yellow "maybe" votes -   7

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07

🔴 Red "no" votes -   2

4) Representative groups must demonstrate that they use **broad, open and inclusive deliberations** on behalf of their constituents and **comply with all applicable laws**.

5) The group must be able to **demonstrate how it is representative**.

6) The group must periodically provide the City with **information on the priorities** of the constituency the community organization represents.

7) Community organizations that receive resources for community engagement should provide **information on how to participate** in City processes to the community they represent.

8) The group must be **incorporated** (or identify an appropriate fiscal agent) and have adopted by-laws. The group must also have a **grievance procedure** by which its members may have their concerns addressed by the organization, and a **conflict-of-interest** policy and procedures.

9) The group must have a **board of directors** elected annually by the membership of the organization. The board must represent a fair cross-section of the community; neighborhood residents must comprise no less than 60 percent of the organization's board. An elected board must be in place for a minimum of one year prior to the beginning of the contract year to be considered eligible for funding.

   VOTE 21: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: The group must have a board of directors elected **on a regular basis** by the membership of the organization. The board must represent a fair cross-section of the community. **In the case of neighborhood organizations,** neighborhood residents must comprise no less than 60 percent of the organization's board. An elected board must be in place for a minimum of one year prior to the beginning of the contract year to be considered eligible for funding.

   Undecided - the vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.
   🟢 Green "yes" votes –   4
   🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   6
   🔴 Red "no" votes -   0

10) The group must have the ability to manage and provide clear documentation to **account for resources used**, how they were used and what was achieved. This includes, but is not limited to, being current on reporting on previous grants.

11) *VOTE 22: PROPOSED ADDITION:* Organizations that receive resources for community engagement activities should provide an independent auditor's report, expressing the accuracy of the organization's financial statements and effectiveness in community engagement based on measurable goals, to the City on an annual basis.

   Fail - the vote was against including this addition.
   🟢 Green "yes" votes –   2
   🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   2
   🔴 Red "no" votes -   6

12) *VOTE 23: PROPOSED ADDITION:* All board leadership of community organizations must demonstrate they have received training in board governance for an incorporated organization such as fiduciary duties, effective director – board relationships and roles and responsibilities.

   Fail - the vote was against including this addition.
   🟢 Green "yes" votes –   3
   🟡 Yellow "maybe" votes -   1
   🔴 Red "no" votes -   6

DISCUSSION ITEM NOT RELATED TO A SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION

DISCUSSION 2: There were comments about lack of specificity of what resources should be allocated. We do recommend allocating resources but do not say what resources. **DISCUSSION POINT…*Should this report include*** and *how* would it include *WHAT* resources.

Undecided - there was not time to discuss.

Presented to, voted on & discussed by Task Force on 10/29/07