

Burroughs School Community Engagement Discussion

(1/29/07)

Comment

- 1) Use more visual communication to provide consistent feel
- 2) Explain Board's accountability - not understood and how "firm" are decisions
- 3) Neighborhood decisions weight and influence is not understood
- 4) Has there been true CE in developing CE report or system?
- 5) Apply resources to a new effort to capture CE definitions from ALL stakeholders
- 6) Simplify structure for CE
- 7) Neighborhoods with ability to determine uses of funds are critical to CE
- 8) Is adopting model binding and will it be followed? How will compliance be measured?
- 9) CE applied by department heads has to be consistent and a priority.
- 10) Make certain community involvement is not mistaken for community engagement.
- 11) CE has to begin earlier in any process.
- 12) What will be the outcome of participation?
- 13) Who is empowering who? Are people empowering city govt. to do their will?
Or is it the reverse?
- 14) What is a stakeholder and who defines stakeholder?
- 15) Concern about starting from scratch. Why not improve rather than completely new?
- 16) Contact person refers to someone else & on & on .. Story changes & no longer same story

- 17) Contact person drops issue - Need to use a "Feedback Model". Person should tell what happened to topic i.e. "referred to" "denied" etc.
- 18) City Hall should embrace a "Listening Model", neighborhood groups & "engagement"
- 19) Flow chart is needed of people bringing issues to the City - neighborhoods initiate & City respond
- 20) Things the City should not decide on & leave up to "smaller" jurisdictions, communities, neighborhood groups, etc.
- 21) Investment of volunteers is on different hours than City Hall
Board meetings, festivals, community communication
- 22) Define roles of City vs. neighborhood
- 23) Engagement is conversation --- Neighborhoods really want empowerment
- 24) City leaders set the tone & expectations for city staff
- 25) Create a working, living model, not a handbook
- 26) Small neighborhood groups are working, regional model does not engage more volunteers. Keep it small.
- 27) Neighborhoods have made changes on a neighborhood level. POP was too big to fairly disseminate dollars.
- 28) Consistent contacts are needed in each department --- long term relationships should be established between City and neighborhoods.
- 29) Funding for neighborhoods is critical for them to be a voice in the community & help improve the city
- 30) Neighborhoods want to give input to the city before decisions are made
- 31) Residents want to participate in setting the agenda
- 32) Neighborhoods want to be proactive rather than react to a crisis
- 33) Communication is the key. The best way to accomplish this is to use the already existing NO which represents thousands of citizens

- 34) Fund and strengthen existing NO (e.g. Cedar Riverside) as a means of communication
- 35) Come to the neighborhood before final decisions are made
- 36) Expand the report flow chart to better define which decisions NO should be involved in and which need to be handled by our elected officials (e.g. budget & major personnel = NO development&re-zoning, libraries = yes (these directly affect neighborhood orgs. and residents)
- 37) Create a monthly information package to notify neighborhood orgs. about changes, issues & updates (e.g. safety, schools, libraries, etc.). NO's get barraged with e-mails and information.