

Work Group 2: Governance
Notes for Meeting 2.3: September 11, 2018

Introduction/Check In:

All members, facilitators, staff and public had an opportunity to answer the question of, “What does equity mean to you?”

One of the members created a handout with a basic definition of equity and questions they try to ask themselves when thinking about achieving 100% “True Equity”. That handout can be found here.

Grounding:

Reminder of the goal of this meeting - Decide on potential duties of this commission

- ***More goals if time remained -***
 - Who should be on the commission?
 - What should the structure look like?

State of the Union:

Summary – Facilitator recapped where the group is right now.

- Minneapolis has a commission, (NCEC) that deals primarily on neighborhoods and neighborhood actions
 - Hypothesized that ~70-80% of time is spent here.
 - Two Group Members did underscore that NCEC does do lots of resident/volunteer work as well, and has done work in the community engagement realm, citing Art of Hosting, World Cafes and other work. One of those two members did concede that neighborhood business did comprise a majority of what the commission does work on.
- NRP has to somehow be included in statutory requirements
- There is no commission overseeing the equity/community engagement of residents
 - This leaves the majority of city departments community and neighborhood engagement initiatives NOT overseen by the community
- Possibilities *for recommendation plan*
 - One opportunity we have is to broaden this scope of advisory to include not just neighborhoods. Instead board would hold city departments and neighborhoods accountable for engagement for communities and neighborhoods.
 - Another possibility is to create one commission for neighborhoods and one for community engagement (2 separate)?
 - Other possibilities? was listed as well

Examples of possible structure

- Steve Gallagher presented a document showing two theoretical models of proposed commissions from this work group. (That document can be found, here)
 - Model 1: The proposed community engagement commission has all departments present their Citywide Community Engagement work to the commission. The NRP

Policy Board is a subcommittee of the commission. Neighborhood organizations would be part, but not all, the work plan for the proposed commission. The commission would increase the intended purpose of and vision the Mayor, City Council and City Departments on community participation policies and processes to systemize community input into all City processes.

- Model 2: The current NRP Policy Board and Community Engagement Commission would be combined into one commission. The membership would have a legal obligated number of elected officials plus neighborhood representation to fulfill the statutory requirements. Neighborhoods 2020, Minneapolis Fund (if existing), Community Connections Conference would be some committees. The commission would increase the intended purpose of advising the Mayor, City Council and City Departments on community participation policies and processes to systematize input into all City processes.

Discussion

The facilitator asked each person present to weigh in on which type of plan they might want – one in which the governance is more broad oversees community engagement that would include neighborhoods, one that created separate governance structures or another option.

- The following represent the opinions or ideas that were shared. While a few members of the group wanted more information about what structures are already in place that could guide them, the group as a whole decided it made more sense to brainstorm as if they were starting from scratch and would reference existing structures after the ideal was created/crafted to compare. 9 Members of the group were in favor of broadening the scope to include both, one member did not agree with that.
 - Gravitating towards aligning on single structure due to:
 - Attendance challenges
 - Streamlining
 - Possible “Citizen Advisory Board”
 - Remove city appointments and replace with liaison
 - Reminder to look at ways to represent beyond geographic location (for instance, homeless or renters that move more often)
 - Incentivize membership in the proposed structure by empowering them (decide “what kind of power do you want to give?”)

Potential Duties Outlined for “Planet 11” (the theoretical name given as a placeholder for this structure). The proposed potential duties (outlined below) moved forward from a theoretical perspective as if starting from scratch. The proposed solutions were compiled but were not voted upon as a group.

All members were given a chance to name duties.

- Helping neighborhoods have the tools to expand engagement and capacity
- Audit of Neighborhood Orgs – participation and evaluation
- Provide a forum to hold city accountable – challenge city hall/council
- Present policy to city and get it passed
- Grievances from residents
- Promote broad engagements, increase inclusion and identify/barriers of participation from all City departments.

- Provide assistance to neighborhoods target outreach goals that are not met
- Ensure neighborhood-based planning informs municipal budget and priorities (eg participatory budgets)
- Encourage leadership development skills to stakeholders
- City-wide promotions for neighborhoods should conceive of an holistic engagement plan to implement
- Identify technology to engage stakeholders
- For equity to exist, recommendations must be passed by city council or explain with detail why not. And have a process to get back down to stakeholders.
- Process for Planet 11 to be accountable to neighborhoods
- Link with nonprofit status - Funding for leadership and nonprofit to match for neighborhoods
- Advise the City Council on policy matters to build the capacity of the underrepresented groups to increase the participation in the civic governance of the City
- Ensure neighborhoods expand their capacity and expand their efforts to engage in underrepresented groups.

One member voiced their reservations about working in a group with very little observable racial difference and expressed feeling uncomfortable making decisions without hearing from the community. They also expressed frustration at the fact that the City Council members who were assigned to this group have yet to attend a meeting. A few members strongly agreed with the need for hearing more directly from community members and one member shared their plan to go into her community to share the updates of the work that we have been doing and encouraged others to do something similar. One member suggested the group create an online survey to send out to residents to also try to capture ideas and voices in the process. Homework includes thinking about which questions you'd like to send out and hear the answers to as well as dates for a public listening session in November.

Check Out:

- Next meeting is Wednesday, September 26 from 6 to 8 p.m.
 - Location Crown Roller Building, 105-5th Avenue – 2nd floor
- Reminder to use the [Workgroup Resource Library](#).
- Homework:
 - Review Steve's handout on other cities
 - Continue to think of potential duties
 - Listening Session Dates - Check your calendars for dates that work for a possible listening session with the public in November. (Reminder: Thanksgiving is November 22.)
 - Also look for opportunities to share in your own neighborhoods
 - Online Survey Questions - If we solicit feedback via online survey, what questions do you want considered?
- Do you have questions for the community? Steve has the ability to ask those that volunteered to be on a listserv. Contact him with suggestions!
Steven.gallagher@minneapolismn.gov
- 612.673.2905