



**WG1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation  
Meeting #6  
October 18, 2018  
6-8 p.m.  
Crown Roller Building**

**Check In:**

Building off last meeting's discussion of transformational processes, all work group members, staff and members of the public were asked to state something that helps them with change.

**Presentation:** David Rubedor (Director of NCR) and Karen Moe (Deputy Director of NCR) joined the workgroup meeting to discuss NCR budget and staff descriptions. What follows is a discussion about two handouts: NCR 2018 approved budget (8 pages) and NCR Budget summary (2 pages).

- NCR was set up to change the way communities can engage with communities in different, multiple ways.
- Engagement techniques and services support this work (beyond just neighborhoods)
- The budget is a good reflection of that work and approach
  - Reminder, blue area on graph goes away Jan 1, 2020 – this is why N2020 is here to discuss
  - Staff are broken into two buckets – community organizers/cultural outreach + neighborhood support staff. Small % cover enterprise support
  - TIF money can be banked by council and carry it over (but that would mean not spending money previously - unlikely)
- Staff is thrown in many directions and has a lot to cover. If WG members have ideas on ways NCR can do what NCR does better, they are welcome.

*Discussion/Comments from Members:*

- Members understand that the growing and resource pains are real. However, community either doesn't know or wouldn't care. There is a lot of preconceived notion and misunderstanding.
- Guidance needed for NCR:
  - NCR has 70 nonprofit organizations adding value to the community. The challenge is also the opportunity. They all have different processes and tools. When things start going awry, it's difficult to know when to step in.
  - Need guidance around tools and expectations. What would that look like? Note: In many cases currently NCR doesn't have authority or can only step in once it is too late. Need better tools and ways to step in sooner.

- Balance is NCR needs guidelines but they can't be too strict. Where is that fine line supporting autonomy?
- Current CPP is good but lacks practicality and perhaps is misguided.
  - NCR is therefore reactionary and not proactive.
- Lots of pressure on neighborhoods to be bootstrapping with little money. So where is the same pressure on NCR? Could we decrease their budget overall and give that money to neighborhoods? Can we give them more incentive and accountability?
  - Worries expressed about what would actually be cut and if it would serve that purpose
- Barrier thoughts from NCR:
  - Ease of entrance into organizations is currently confusing with so many boards and requirements – this can be disengaging. There's also a lack of understanding about what neighborhood orgs can do. Folks have also found environments unfriendly for new people that do not understand the jargon (“inside baseball”).
  - Losing local level work lost if a staff member leaves (based on the relationships they had)
  - Most boards are administrative-heavy. Eliminating that frees up time and capacity to do other things
- Many of the things this workgroup voted on are going to be time and are cost intensive – and that could be tough if we cut the budgets. Need to be cognizant of realistic expectations.
- The current paperwork for NRP and CPP is a burden and creates a lot of work for both neighborhoods and residents. The current paperwork that is required is not required by state statute and therefore can be changed. It would take a large process to streamline and overhaul and the benefits would be for both neighborhoods and NCR.
  - Recommendation from workgroup is to streamline the process of paperwork (ie administrative)

**Presentation:** Bob Cooper, Manager NRP and Citizen Participation, spoke on previous funding allocations for neighborhood programs using a handout which are at [www.minneapolis.gov/ncr/2020](http://www.minneapolis.gov/ncr/2020).

- All things being equal between neighborhoods, budget distinctions are made based on population
- The way we would allocate based on variables is based on subjective components (cultural needs, housing, income, etc).
- Question: What do you see as the best way to institute accountability checks? (Example: Renters vs homeowners.)
  - Simplest is representation on the board.
    - (But not all representation should be at the board level. Volunteers as well. Though this is hard to measure, and/or hasn't been measured well.)

- Also need to be some way to support groups that are making efforts

#### Discussion:

- “Should there be uniform board eligibility requirements?” was voted down originally. But we have now heard that it is very important. Should this be revisited at next meeting. =yes
- Eligibility requirements for membership into the organization (and be eligible for board membership). Members = those that can vote on annual meeting.
  - Requirements are more helpful for cultural communities to increase access. It could also be more helpful for renters who move from section to section. We want it to be part of status quo in terms of letting neighborhoods choose who is on the board. (though there is are barriers with 70 different). Then there is a concern about how to let people know of these changes.
  - Should we be focused on membership to the association (instead of focusing on board). The concern about focusing on board seats is that if you can't find someone that fits the requirements then you “lose” that seat for the year.
  - No final decision was made as the discussion began at the end of time for the meeting and some members had to disperse.
- **Concern:** In a situation where the process of developing framework through N2020 has been staff driven, what happens if staff is part of the problem? And how can that change through this N2020 process?
  - NCR: We recognize that things haven't worked. That's why the tools are needed. In the past things haven't been possible (or even legal). If we have these guidelines put together then we can go in and make changes.
    - Also realizing that we exist in a political environment. For example, if an organization is favored by a council member then it is tough to make changes there.
- **Concern:** Concerns of the ability of NCR staff to make changes (like changing the paperwork process for NRP and CPP), be proactive, or advocate for residents, despite it maybe meaning losing their jobs or funding for neighborhoods was brought up. A suggestion from previous meetings was put forth again to reorganize NCR and redirect money to neighborhoods.
  - NCR acknowledges they could and would like to find a way to assist neighborhoods more effectively, including simplifying paperwork and the administrative burden on neighborhoods. The scope of workgroup 4 will be to look into how to change NCR based on how neighborhoods end up being funded to better serve residents and neighborhoods.

#### Check Out:

- Next meeting – Thursday, November 8th 6 – 8 p.m. at Crown Roller Building (this will be meeting #7)
- Homework: Think about funding formula for neighborhoods
  - Review what this follow up handout regarding what the 15 formulas are based off of. This was referenced by Bob and the document provided should offer more clarity.

- Recognizing success to this point:
  - This group has completed the first step by establishing guidelines
  - Next step is to create a formula for funding the next cycle.
    - What should a base funding amount be per neighborhood
    - Allocate percentages for impact funding, discretionary funding and competitive funding
    - Create a list of priorities based on future funding
- After this NCR can put together one document where WG lets NCR know what is right/wrong (react to it)