

# NCEC Strategic Planning Session, cont.

---

## Review of first session

Expectations of strategic planning session – culled from first planning meeting

Ground Rules

Non-negotiables in this process

- The Neighborhood and Community Relations department and the NCEC will work together in a collaborative approach to engage neighborhood and cultural communities.
- The Commission operates as an advisory board to the City that provides advice and recommendations to the City Council.
- Although only the City Council may direct the work of staff, the NCEC advises the Neighborhood and Community Relations departments rather than directs its work.

## Results of SWOT Analysis

### Strengths

- Well positioned issue; policy city wide
- Lots of support (eg. paid staff)
- → equity
- Board practice
- Reflect certain demographics in Minneapolis
- Visible
- Commissioner heard improved relationship with NCO
- Good at reacting
- A lot of passion and interest at being proactive
- Respect and appreciate various points of view/consensus building
- Riding crest in city council; looking at topics City Council says they want to talk about
- Good relationship with city council
- Diverse skill set and age range
- Experienced some wins, e.g. One Minneapolis
- Body of work created collaboratively
- Embrace principles of community engagement
- Stable programs → CPP

## Weaknesses

- Lack of shared knowledge of history of neighborhoods
- Lack of organization → follow through and coordination
- Role of staff vs. commissioners, leadership chair
- Not been proactive recommending policy
- Unclear regarding mission
- Tension between department and commission
- Policy approval inadequate
- Letting the committees do the work they are charged with
- Executive committee and chair functioning
- Board orientation → varied understanding of what is entailed in involvement
- Meeting attendance and involvement
- Can estimate the amount of resources to do the work
- Representation to public
- 9 charge from the city council → have not chosen what we choose to stand for
- Structural issue → tenure of commissioners; lack of stability and relationships
- Things that come up every year, e.g. budget
- Reactive → asking for things from other commissioners
- Spread too thin → time commitment
- Lack of timely communication → e.g. meeting materials
- Who is stakeholder? Appointed vs. elected by neighborhood. What are expectations?
- Renters unengaged in community involvement

## Opportunities

- Impact state's infrastructure
- Influence city wide practice of engagement
- Best practice sharing → ideas for cross pollination
- Bringing together neighborhoods → pairing them and learning about each other
- The rising interest → Black Lives matter; policies on equity in city that work with other bodies that serve the public, like transportation
- Engage undocumented residents
- Help define what equity means through policy
- Helping neighborhoods help themselves
- Push city departments to greater equity work and engagement, move dial on equity around community engagement
- Influence how TIF dollars are used moving forward
- Affect the neighborhood organizations help them help themselves
- Reinvigorate neighborhood programming; make sure resources follow
- Opportunity to bring community and cultural organizations more to the table
- Redefine that we're not fighting over same pot
- Integrating three stakeholder groups
- Leverage other players; Leverage 3-4 million in NPP
- Consistently create effective NPPS

- Bringing NCEC into cultural work with Department

### **Threats**

- Elected officials have little understanding of messiness of community engagement
- Meeting expectation (general public) and city council members (One Minneapolis)
- Failure to show outcomes (e.g. raising people out of poverty)
- Lack of mission and focus
- TIF and CPP funds end in 2020 → must prove effectiveness
- Define what to do with excess TIF funds
- Define who we are serving → Neighborhood Associations
- Not clear what success looks like → We try to fix the structure but there may be other ways to fix it; other ways to incorporate diversity that leads to greater engagement
- City culture → culture of inertia: (oppositional vs. the residents)
- Need to have city workforce reflect community
- Not sustainable representation from all communities
- What do we want to do with neighborhoods – scrap it or reinvent it?
- How do we create process that is inclusive
  - (Community apathy is an issue)
  - How do we move the needle without losing pathways to communication
- A few rotten apples (neighborhood groups) give a bad rap

### **External Perception**

- Don't know what data is used to inform work
- Lack of communication with district/passivity
- See commissioners and wedded to department
- See members on commission as focused on a single issue
- City council sees NCEC as tied to neighborhood organizations
- Some city council members wonder why NCEC exists; they gravitate to neighborhood work rather than equity, etc. Asking for what's the return on investment?
- Some community organizations see as an influential board
- Some community perception that NCEC is a rubber stamp for mayor
- City council doesn't see how work is connected to people
- Loss of elected officials at table – loss of clout

### **Parking Lot**

- Looking at the marketing – who are we marketing to?

## Goals/Issues to Address

- Start neighborhood 2.0 discussion (6 stars) [Eric, Dennis, Jeff]
- Develop policy recommendations (6 stars) [Tessa, Matt, Jeff, Ishmael]
  - Equity
  - TIF
  - Specific Departments
- Strengthen NCEC logistics (2 stars) [Executive Committee]
  - Staff community roles: who's job is what
  - (More transparency)
- Write and use work plan (7 stars)
  - Leads to meetings that are priority based Ishmael
- Structural opportunities -> resolved; for example, longer terms (2 stars)
- Design and follow PR plan (2 stars)
- Equity in city department engagement/city wide community engagement (6 stars) [Eric, Doron, Debra]
- Challenging neighborhoods to do more/engage more, especially unrepresented (4 stars) [Kenya]
- Being clearinghouse to unite neighborhoods (2 stars)
- Be a convener for interest groups (e.g. bringing together people who care about certain issues, such as seniors) (2 stars)



**Strategies/Action Plan**

Break into small groups around goals: refine goals to be more measurable; develop strategies and action plans for implementation through 2016.

NCEC SWOT action plan		LIKELIHOOD OF EFFECTIVENESS	
		HIGH	LOW
RESOURCES REQUIRED	HIGH	Longer term planning	Back to the drawing board
	LOW	Low-hanging fruit Implement plan now	Delegate to one person

Goal # 1:

Strategy # 1:

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

Strategy # 2:

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

Goal # 2:

Strategy # 1:

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

Goal # 2:

Strategy # 2:

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

Goal # 3:

Strategy # 1:

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

Strategy # 2:

<i>Objectives for Strategy</i>	<i>Date of Completion</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Status and Date</i>

**Next Steps**