PROGRAMS, FUNDING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Work Group 1

Abstract

A Framework creating enhanced neighborhood programs and funding

neighborhoods
2020

Program, Funding and Implementation Work Group
Draft Report 11/17/2018

Community Members:
Claire Bergren
Brandon Burbach
Beryl Ann Burton
Sunny Chanthanouvo
Kathleen Cole
Becky McIntosh
Sarah Linnes-Robinson
Nate Streeter
Becky Timm

Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission (NCEC) representatives:
Kari Louwagie, Commissioner
Marcus Mills, Commissioner

Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) Policy Board representatives:
Marcea Mariani

Mayoral Representative
Tony Sterle

Minneapolis City Council representatives:
Council Member Jeremiah Ellison – (Cacje Henderson)
Council Member Jeremy Schroeder – (Sara Gangelhoff)

Neighborhood and Community Relations Department (staff support):
David Rubedor, Director
Karen Moe, Deputy Director
Steven Gallagher, Community Relations Policy Specialist and Neighborhoods 2020 Project Lead
Stacy Sorenson, Neighborhood Support Specialist
Anthony Taylor, African American Community Specialist

Facilitation:
Kelly C. Weiley, CoAct Consulting
Chris Nietupski, Notetaker

The Neighborhoods 2020 process was created by the City Council to look at how the City serves and supports neighborhood organizations both internally and externally via staffing, organizational/advisory board oversight and grant-funded programs. Each piece is important for equitable and high-quality services to be provided to residents. The Neighborhoods 2020 process comprises four important parts:

- consistent funding and programming for neighborhoods and other community-based programs such as the One Minneapolis Fund and the Community Innovation Fund
- proper sizing and oversight of these programs by an advisory body
- a consistent citywide community engagement policy for the City of Minneapolis that incorporates the Core Principles of Community Engagement
- evaluating the Neighborhood and Community Relations Department's service delivery model and making changes if necessary.

As part of the Neighborhoods 2020 process, the City Council created three work groups. "Work Group 1" was charged with developing a framework for Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation. The work group included five neighborhood organization representatives, three cultural community representatives, two representatives from the Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission (NCEC), one Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) Policy Board representative, two undoing racism/equity representatives, two representatives of the City Council and one representative from the Mayor's office.

The work group met eight times between July 25 and November 8. On November ____ it approved the following recommendations to the City Council for a framework for Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation. This framework outlines the Work Group's recommended positions and outlines the roles and commitments necessary to ensure that a funding program is equitable, fair and encompassing the needs of the City.

Basis for Program and Guidelines

The Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation Work Group based its work on five general goals. These goals, created to have a basic understanding of the next generation of neighborhood programmatic funding, are:

Goal 1: Increase *inclusive and vibrant* leadership within neighborhoods. Create a space for new ideas, people and planning.

Goal 2: Create *effective* financial and programmatic accountability of neighborhood organizations to the communities they serve and to Minneapolis taxpayers.

Goal 3: Increase the *effective* capacity of neighborhoods in the areas of administration and program development.

Goal 4: Create *inclusive, diverse and equitable* neighborhood organizations.

Goal 5: Clarify an *effective* role for neighborhood organizations and their relationship with the City of Minneapolis, including its Neighborhood and Community Relations Department (NCR).

Through these goals, the Work Group developed a framework for program guidelines, accountability measures and recommended organizational changes within NCR and best practices for neighborhood organizations.

Underlying these detailed recommendations, though, is a set of necessary culture changes for neighborhood organizations, the City of Minneapolis and other civic/cultural groups. This would result in a resetting of these relationships and greatly increase the chances of long-term success of creating a truly equitable and inclusive engagement system.

Programmatic Guidelines Ensuring Identified Goals

The Work Group developed recommendations to ensure that neighborhood organizations are accountable, equitable and available to all stakeholders.

Financial accountability

It is recommended that funded organizations should agree to follow the NCR Audit Policy. These audits would be paid for by the department; however, failure to agree to an audit or financial review could result in termination or suspension of contracts.

Funded organizations should use an approved accounting/financial software program. NCR should research the cost, availability and implementation issues of potential programs.

Finally, if a funded organization has identified or been informed of embezzlement, fraud or misappropriation of funds, the organization must cooperate with any investigation.

Duty to perform by funded organizations

Funded organizations should have a minimum duty to perform—a minimum set of standards that must be completed during the contractual period. Organizations would be required to report these deliverables to NCR annually. This annual report should be available to the public through multiple access points.

Bylaws review

Funded organizations should make their bylaws available for review by NCR to ensure that the new program guidelines can be met. NCR staff would review and advise the organization on any potential issues; organizations, then, should be given an adequate amount of time to fix those problems.

Meetings

Annual meetings/elections and quarterly membership meetings should be viewed by neighborhood organizations as a way to reach out to the community and increase involvement. An election process, even with its imperfections, can still provide a way to increase stakeholder interest and to draw new people into the organization.

The following recommendations on annual meetings/elections and quarterly membership meetings are intended to make the election process more normal and predictable, and to develop broader public participation and a sharing of power.

Annual Meeting: Neighborhood organizations should provide alternate means of voting. This could include such initiatives as allowing for early or late voting in addition to voting at the meeting. All neighborhoods are required to hold an annual meeting. Taking nominations from the floor should be mandatory.

Annual meetings should have a required set of reports such as: State of the Organization, Financial Reports and Outreach Activities as a minimum standard.

Quarterly Meetings: Quarterly general membership meetings should be required for all funded organizations.

Citywide Annual Elections: Neighborhood organizations should be encouraged to "opt-in" to a Citywide Neighborhood Election Day (a single, identified day for all neighborhood board elections), which would include an annual meeting, elections and a general introduction of the neighborhood organization.

Board membership requirements

The Work Group recommends that the neighborhood system become more stakeholder-centered. In this model of participation, the purpose of the board would be to act as a steward for the stakeholders in the community. Stewardship would ensure that the widest interests of the neighborhood are represented in the deliberations of the organization, and that these voices are communicated to the City. The real power of a neighborhood organization derives from the broadness and inclusivity of its stakeholder base, not from the individual voices of the board.

Funded organizations should be required to mandate board officer and board member term limits to increase leadership and diversity and to expand board membership.

Diversity

Neighborhood organizations and cultural community organizations must realize that both have an impact on geographic areas, as well as perceptions across the spectrum. New board structures that enhance the role of all members, or careful attention to how meetings are run, may allow groups that once felt excluded to feel welcome. All funded and non-funded organizations should seek to develop a cooperative relationship with neighborhood organizations.

Some neighborhood organizations rightly complain that the issue of diversity is sometimes used to attack the system rather than as a fair criticism. The neighborhood system, made up of volunteers supported by City staff, cannot by itself achieve what the political system as a whole has been unable to accomplish. Thus, active participants in the neighborhood system often bristle when diversity is used to denigrate the value of their own involvement.

But the neighborhood system does have an extra burden in addressing this issue. The rationale for the neighborhood system is that it brings more voices to the table than the systems of representative government and, therefore, brings added value to the City's decision-making process. Therefore, neighborhood organizations cannot escape the expectation that they should more effectively draw in renter, working class, youth, people of color and others who have less-than-hoped for representation.

Annual Diversity Reporting: Funded organizations must ensure that they are representative of the residents they serve; therefore, annual reporting on board diversity should be included as a part of the organization's annual reports. If the diversity of a funded organization is less than 15% of actual demographics, a "Diversity Action Plan" should be required.

Diversity Action Plan: A Diversity Action Plan would be a plan to improve the funded organization's internal diversity. Funded organizations and NCR would work together to develop a plan. The plan should develop processes and practices that will actively encourage new membership that reflects the diversity within the geographic area of the neighborhood, including the diversity of community interests, ethnicity, race, gender, age, class, religion, homeowner and renter status and sexual orientation. Board members of neighborhood organizations would need to embrace new ways of reaching out to people, beginning with a clear statement that all are welcome and encouraged to participate. The plan should include surveys and discussions with a broad range of community members to help a neighborhood organization design procedures, meetings and events that will reach out to a wider demographic base.

The plan should also consider how the organization can create a more welcoming environment. The Work Group identified many practices that should be adopted, adapted and implemented to enhance broad-based representation, equity and equal access.

- cultural sensitivities should be considered when forming meetings, events or gatherings (including meeting times and locations)
- various stakeholder work schedules also should be considered
- childcare at meetings (certainly at annual meetings)
- food at meetings (this should be made an eligible expenditure)
- transportation assistance

Organizations that do not complete a required Diversity Action Plan may have their funding terminated.

Outreach Plan

All neighborhood organizations should develop an outreach plan that includes a door-knocking component. The best way to connect with stakeholders is through face-to-face contact. A robust engagement plan should be implemented by every funded organization. The plan should include many of the same components of a Diversity Action Plan. Communication(s) should not be considered community engagement.

Neighborhoods shall submit a measurable outreach plan to engage residents with multiple opportunities to engage in meaningful face to face interactions including a plan to engage underrepresented residents (door knocking, pop events, tabling at popular locations).

Contractual relationship

The City of Minneapolis and neighborhood organizations should have a two-way contractual relationship. Neighborhood organizations do not have to receive funding from the City of Minneapolis (see Optional Adherence below). Neighborhood organizations may refuse funding because the program requirements are not agreeable or the organization has other funding streams and City funding is not needed.

Optional adherence

Neighborhood organizations, as private non-profit corporations, can choose not to comply with the some of the funding requirements of the City of Minneapolis (although not those considered essential to engagement), but still agree to fully participate in the citywide community engagement process. Such organizations could remain the acknowledged geographic neighborhood organization for such purposes, but organizational funding from the City of Minneapolis would be terminated.

Best Practices

Funded organizations have a duty to continually look at new ways to increase involvement, membership and influence in the community they serve. Organizations should collaborate with one another through:

- observation of other funded organization's meetings
- periodic gatherings of board chairs, treasurers and other officers to encourage dialogue and share projects
- find and incorporate alternatives to Robert's Rule of Order (which can often be intimidating to new members)
- staff gatherings
- City Council Member neighborhood meetings

Funding

Funding for programming should utilize an array of delivery service models. Different geographic areas of the City need different types of funding available to support their activities.

Total allocation

The Work Group recommends that the City provide a base level of programmatic funding of $10 million per year through City's budget process. A substantial investment in these funded programs will increase equity, diversity and engagement within the City. Historically, the City has provided between $20 million and $4 million annually to neighborhood organizations.

Competitive funding

Twenty-five percent of this total allocation should be available on a competitive basis to any community engagement-driven organization within the City of Minneapolis.

The purpose of the competitive funds would be based on City-identified priorities defined on an annual basis. Funds would be allocated based on needs met, return on investment, deliverables and the ability to sustain projects when necessary.

Neighborhood and cultural community organizations applying for this funding would receive "bonus" points on their application for partnerships.

Neighborhood organization funding

Seventy-five percent of the total programmatic funding should be available to neighborhood organizations. The funding allocation for neighborhood organizations would be based on racial diversity, poverty level, household type, population and rent burden in the following percentages:

- racial diversity – 30%
- poverty level – 25%
- household type (renter/owner) – 20%
- population – 15%
- rent-burdened population – 10%

Neighborhood organization funding would comprise base funding, impact funding and discretionary funding.

Base Funding Allocation: Neighborhood organizations would have a maximum potential allocation based on the funding percentages listed above. Fifty percent of the total maximum allocation would be considered base funding for the most basic community engagement activities, including such items as staff, rent, phones, mailers and newsletters.

Impact Funding Allocation: Neighborhood organizations would be able to increase their funding based on increased engagement activities. An amount equal to 25% of the maximum potential allocation would be available for these increased activities.

Neighborhood organizations would be free to explore new "outside-the box" activities to increase engagement activities within their geographic area, or to combine activities with other neighborhood, community cultural and other non-profit organizations.

Discretionary Funding: Neighborhood organizations in different areas of the city have different needs and, therefore, need to adjust their activities accordingly. To allow for these differing needs, a discretionary funding stream should be created equal to 25% of each organization's total maximum allocation.

Neighborhood organizations must be able to identify neighborhood priorities, needs and improvements and have the ability to carry out measurable outcome(s). Discretionary funding would be available to a single entity, a partnership or sponsorship to address these priorities. Examples of the areas in which discretionary funds could be used are:

- outreach staff
- planning for future projects
- capital projects
- farmers markets
- community gardens
- increased community engagement activities

- housing/business development
- environmental projects
- park/school/library projects
- traffic/infrastructure projects
- other specialized projects

The discretionary funding pool is intended to be one-time projects or projects that could be potentially self-sustaining in the future.

Intent

The intent of the multipronged funding approach is to ensure consistency within the neighborhood system; increase funds for increased engagement practices; and, allow lower functioning neighborhoods the ability to increase funding through action planning.

Capital long-range improvement funding

Neighborhood organizations should have the ability to identify capital projects on a five-year basis within their geographic area and have direct access to 10% of available Capital Long-Range Improvement funding available through the City's annual budget process.

Neighborhood organizations have a better understanding of what is needed within their own area, have a vested interest and have an ability to plan long term. Providing neighborhood organizations access these funds will:

- create a financially-balanced distribution
- ensure an equitable distribution of funding
- create ownership within the capital funding decisions
- lead to better communication between city departments and neighborhood organizations
- create partnerships between public and private investment(s)

Additional funding for cultural community organizations

NCR should create separate funding streams for neighborhood and cultural community engagement activities. Neighborhood and cultural community organizations should have to follow the same policies, procedures and expectations.

The City is encouraged to increase the amount of overall funding in order to include cultural community organizations. While the Work Group's recommendations are primarily dedicated to neighborhood funding and programming, the Work Group recommends that programs be created to allow for a combination of services, partnerships, sponsorships and noncompetitive funding.

Pooled services

Collaborations should be encouraged. Funded organizations with a lower level of administrative abilities should be encouraged to pool services with higher functioning organizations. Pooled services would result in lower overall costs and allow each funded organization to increase its level of service to their communities. Pooled services may include:

- staffing and specialized staffing
- administration
- accounting services
- community outreach services
- shared office space
- newsletters
- door knocking
- healthcare grouping
- bulk buying services

NCR may provide temporary additional funding to organizations wishing to transition to a pooled-services model.

Duties to be performed by the City of Minneapolis

The City of Minneapolis should be viewed as a partner in community engagement efforts. NCR has a complex relationship with funded organizations. The department is a funding provider, monitors contract/performance/funding compliance and assists in the development of neighborhood organization capacity. Some additional assistance areas for NCR should be:

- provide training for new board members at least once a year and when needed by individual neighborhood organizations
- develop human resource advice, training and best practices for funded organizations
- create and distribute a Handbook for Boards to be available to funded organizations for their own boards including "best practices" in creating their own board information
- secure, train and implement technical programs for accounting, volunteer and donor tracking, planning and communications
- provide a user-friendly technological means to track contract balances, plan modifications and program status
- research, identify and coordinate possible lower costs options for Directors and Officers, General Liability and Health insurance (including the possible coordination of a Health Insurance Pool)
- provide a listing of qualified providers for translation and interpretation (in addition to City-owned translation equipment available for organizations' use)
- create a graphic design program or contractual agreement available to neighborhood organizations
- continue contracting with an attorney specializing in non-profit organizations to be available to funded organizations up to two hours per year
- create job descriptions for NCR staff to be given to funded organizations (list of expectations)
- Create a "best of" or other awards for top programs in the City.

Appendix A: Notes for the Work Group

Work Group 1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation
Meeting 1: August 1, 2018

Introductions/Prep
- All members introduced themselves, pronouns they use, neighborhood and one thing they like about where they live.

Check In

- There was a question from resident member regarding how residents were notified about Neighborhoods 2020.
  - Answer: city website, through neighborhood groups, and anyone that signed up for the N2020
  - *Follow Up:* The concern centered around whether these were effective enough ways for entire population to be notified. Inefficiencies identified including those with limited internet access.

Working Agreements

- *Summary of activity:* Group members took individual time to reflect on what they needed from the space, their fellow participants and the facilitator to engage to their fullest and get the most out of the process. No examples were given before the activity, where members wrote on notecards before sharing. After sharing the following agreements, consensus was taken based on head nods and nonverbal "ok"s and no objections were voiced.

- *The following agreements were made:*
  - Challenge ourselves to be open and over-the-top creative while ensuring all voices are heard and honoring others' experiences
  - Assume positive intent from all member actions
  - Seek to understand and find the best parts of alternative views
  - Focus what you verbalize on group relevance
  - Be mindful of others' knowledge and expertise levels
    - Examples: Define all acronyms and assume people do not know about something until it is discussed in this space.
  - Be ok with gray areas and understand we won't get all questions answered
  - Step up, step back
    - Speak up to share your perspective and have your voice heard (stepping up) and be mindful how much air time you are taking up. Step back to allow and encourage others the space to share and be heard. (stepping back)
  - More engagement should come from each other than from speakers
  - Take care of yourself –

- Examples of how one would stay comfortable in space included: getting up to stretch, use restroom, eat snacks, use fidget toys, etc, all without question.
- Practical action steps for homework between meetings
  - Example: even if homework is "think about X"

Equity Training

- *Summary:* Anne Phibbs from Strategic Diversity Initiatives led a ~one-hour equity training course that focused on defining implicit bias, microaggressions (sometimes referred to as micro inequities) and ways in which the group can act as an ally for potentially marginalized individuals and groups. Anne made her presentation available for download on the upcoming N2020 workgroup resource library. What follows are quotes and discussion above and beyond what can be found in that presentation:
- *Quotable/Notable from Anne:*
  - To do equity work we have to be willing to take risks.
    - Intellectual risks and emotional risks because we can't talk about race without it being emotional. We are going to make mistakes – this is life long work.
  - How can we keep race front and center and not count on that person in the room to be the spokesperson for everyone?
  - What looks little and insignificant to some people is just a reminder to someone else that they are different.
  - Often times microaggressions unfairly sets boundaries or definitions of "who belongs where"
  - Example: A doctor asks two women expecting a child, "tell me again who is the mom?" While the intent of the question was to be reminded about which female in the room was physically giving birth, the mom who was not giving birth feels those three letters (m-o-m) ripped off the band aid in an exclusionary way.
  - *Advice -* Do everything with attention to these details.
- *Group Activity/Share:* Two small groups formed to discuss and develop an understanding of and commitment to diversity and inclusion.
  - *The following next steps were proposed -*
    - Who am I accountable to in my role?

    - What perspective has not been expressed?

    - Are we centering decisions around those most affected?

    - Are we being clear of the limitations not being met by actions?

    - Where am I transgressing/offending by my actions?

    - How can we be open to more voices?

    - What barriers that come into play with this discussion?

    - Who are we listening to and why?

    - Do I need to lead on this or should someone else?

    - Do I need to give something or compromise?

Check Out
- Next meeting is Thursday, August 16 from 6 – 8 p.m. in same location
  - Crown Roller Mill, 2ⁿᵈ Floor Conference Room
  - 105 S. 5ᵗʰ Avenue
- Potential New Meeting Locations? Contact Steve Gallagher with suggestions!
  - Steven.gallagher@minneapolismn.gov
  - 612.673.2905
- Workgroup Resource Library
- 1935 Map of Minneapolis referenced in Thursday's orientation provided to illustrate the segregation of the city at the time. If you'd like a paper copy, just let us know! Email Steve (email above)
- Homework: Visit Mapping Prejudice to review some history of the racial segregation of Minneapolis. Articles, stories and videos are provided on the site.

Work Group 1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation
Notes for Meeting 2: August 16, 2018

Check In - "What could each of these images represent?"
Members were asked to think, draw or comment after looking at three similar pictures depicting
"Equality," "Equity," and "Liberation"

- What does each of these images represent in regard to program funding and implementation?
- Who does each of these images represent?
- What should out-of-the-box, over the top creative thinking include?

Here is a graphic description of the work group's thought process:

-

Welcome:
- Introductions: All individuals in attendance - including guest speakers and members of the public – stated their name, location and one thing about themselves you wouldn't know by looking at them.
- Working Agreements recap – statements agreed upon during meeting #1 were displayed prominently near the entrance of the room throughout the meeting. After quickly reading through each statement, members gave a nonverbal nod of re-approval. No objections were stated.

Discussion on Minneapolis' five (5) year financial plan
- *Summary:* Mark Ruff, Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for the City of Minneapolis, shared Mayor Frey's "Five Year Financial Direction" worksheet and the "City of Minneapolis 2019 Budget Financial Plan" - which included current year snapshot of the NCR Special Revenue Fund – with the work group. These documents can be found at http://www.minneapolismn.gov/ncr/2020. While Mr. Ruff provided information about options to fund neighborhoods in the future, he underscored the mayor's intention to continue funding neighborhoods and encouraged the group to focus more on what the program will look like – ensuring "when there is consensus among what the program should be [workgroup, city council, mayor], we can find the money. What follows are quotes and discussion above and beyond what can be found in those documents.
- *Quotable/Notable from Mr. Ruff:*
  - "I get to do the fun parts" (speaking of working on new projects and finding money to fund them)
  - "I really enjoy my job. The part I miss the most is I don't get to spend as much time with people like you. I spend all of my time in city hall now." (Prior to this job, Mr. Ruff was a consultant working with the city.)
  - "There is no tougher job than being an elected official. Those are very brave people. You see your name in the paper, you may get bashed a lot. I have a great deal of empathy for the people that run for office."
  - On politics – Mr. Ruff and his staff have a duty to serve the city, not to interject their own political views. Being unbiased in their approach is of utmost importance.
  - On project funding – Mr. Ruff and his staff's objective is to avoid showing favoritism for one particular project or group over another. This includes – among other things – not offering any proposal advice on the "best" methods to win city council and/or mayoral approval.
  - On how does the city functions at a high level: "We are not like the state. The state has several dedicated revenue sources. We don't have that. We have broad swaths of sources (enterprise funds). A fair amount of our revenue is used to fund public works, convention center (etc.). The rest is used for the basic operations of the city."
  - On why the Five Year Financial Direction -
    - "It's good best practice to look five years into the future."
    - "We don't want (the city) to live paycheck to paycheck."
    - "A five-dollar crystal ball is better than no crystal ball at all."
  - On expenditures:
    - One of the exceptions is the way NCR and neighborhoods have been funded. They have been funded through a non-revenue source from TIF (tax increment financing) pursuant to legislation sought by former City of Minneapolis Mayor RT Rybak and (then City Council member) Betsy Hodges who saw a need to extend neighborhood funding.
    - The city currently dedicates $4.1 million to neighborhoods via the CPP (Citizen Participation Program) and $3 million to and through NCR.
  - On TIF:
    - It has been around since the 1970s to help redevelopment. It is off budget and does not compete with other money. But those sources for neighborhoods of are going away. If the

city of Minneapolis wants to reignite the neighborhoods programs it has to start in the regular city budget from now on.
- Question: Did the city let the TIF expire?
  - Answer: It was a state law that ended. To reinstate would require state legislatures, then county and city to re-approve. This has been known publicly for eight years.
- NCR wants increase funding for neighborhoods -
  - This is still a priority for the Mayor
  - The dilemma for policymakers is that if funds for NCR are added then the levy increase will approach 10 percent.
- Question: Is it the job of the N2020 work group to find the money?
  - Answer: No, your job is to say how it would be used. We find the money.
    - There is no secret box where we can find it.
      - WG job is to present how much and how effective your proposal would be for neighborhoods
    - WG can also lobby state legislators (for funding like TIF)
    - However, historically the mayor gets 80/90 percent of what they put in the budget – so that is usually where (the work) should occur.
    - There is no expectation that the work groups will answer every question. But the framework that the WG's set will set the discussion for work/funding to come.
    - Advice: Be a good listener to policy makers. Recognize these are newly elected officials who are still setting their priorities.

Discussion of History of Neighborhood programs in Minneapolis
- **Summary:** Bob Cooper, Manager of Minneapolis' Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) and Citizen Participation (CP), held an open discussion surrounding the history of neighborhood programs. After an oral presentation, the group asked for the history – and acronyms – to be written out in one document for ease of use and recall. The result of that discussion can be found as an addendum to these notes.
- *Quotable/Notable from Mr. Cooper:*
- Agencies/groups have been governing neighborhood programs in Minneapolis since 1980
- The first, state created the Minneapolis Community Development Agency (MCDA) focused mainly on housing and economic development.
- The Citizen Participation Program (CP) followed leading to contracts with target and non-target areas of the city. This focus clearly defined the roles of the neighborhoods versus the city – what the city can expect from neighborhoods and what neighborhoods can expect from the city
- The Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) - created by state law and city ordinance – helped develop long range program, providing direct access to dollars to do projects in neighborhoods
  - Neighborhoods have almost full control: the money is from the city but neighborhoods have the say.
- The Community Participation Program (CPP) (Not same as CP) replaced the Citizen Participation program and emphasizes engagement and a base level of support. But it is no longer a two-way program. The City does not have expectations in contracts; only neighborhoods. This agency contracts with neighborhoods to do engagement. There is funding to do projects – purely at the Neighborhood discretion.
- Question: Are most neighborhoods using their CPP resources?
  - Answer: Yes. Most groups use their funding during their three-year allotment.
- Thought provoking questions raised for further thought during conversation with Mr. Cooper:
  - How would you run a meeting differently so that people feel welcome and engaged?
  - Maybe something to think about is, should part of the program include a small grant program outside of this major program for groups that want to increase participation?

- How do you keep diversifying? (Not just outreach. How do you keep them to want to be a part of it?) If you get to those conversations, what does that look like?
- Can culture-based conversations be a part of the neighborhood conversation? It would be nice to come up with a framework for those guidelines?

Work Group Processing Activity:
- **Summary:** Three groups of 3-4 committee members formed around the questions -
  - What are the you want to start answering?
  - What would equity look like?
  - What would incentives look like?
- Results/Recommendations:
  - The groups combined their answers to come up with the following:
    - How can we fund cultural communities in the process of building our framework?
    - What is the role of the neighborhood associations after a disaster?
    - Should we be looking at pooling resources and even ideas between neighborhoods?
    - Should there be the underlying support of staff in Neighborhoods themselves or shared regionally?
    - How are we going to encourage equity and what is effective oversight and accountability?
    - Where is the structure & support to train Neighborhoods to do outreach?
    - What behaviors do we want to encourage?
    - Is the Neighborhood model a successful and viable model to achieve the community's and the city's goals?
    - What are changes between old guidelines and new?
    - How and to what extent can we ensure equity is reflected/incentivized?
    - How and to what extent can we hold neighborhoods accountable to these guidelines?
    - How can we measure/monitor outcomes?
    - How can we use current programs to evaluate future state?
      - Best practices: What is working? What isn't? When to stop/start/continue?
    - How can neighborhoods share resources to create efficiencies?
    - Should every neighborhood have some guidelines?
    - What other groups are related to neighborhoods exist? What are their opinions?
    - How can they be better engaged? Funded? Integrated (if integration makes sense)? How to facilitate partnership?
    - What are distinctive needs only met by neighborhoods?
    - How do we conceptualize needs in different neighborhoods? How do we prioritize those needs?
    - How do we get people who broadly represent the neighborhood on the board?
    - How do we define services provided by neighborhoods (vs city services)?
    - How do we define partnerships with culture orgs?

Check Out
- Next meeting is Thursday, September 6 from 6 to 8 p.m. in same location
  - Crown Roller Mill, 2nd Floor Conference Room
  - 105 S. 5th Avenue
- Reminder to use the Workgroup Resource Library, link here.
- Homework:
  - Read specific documents discussed:
    - Report on 2016 Neighborhood Diversity Survey
    - 2017-2019 CPP guidelines

Work Group 1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation
Meeting 3: September 6, 2018

Check In:
- Name/Pronoun introductions
- Each person in attendance named a favorite thing about fall

Review:

- Working Agreements
- City Council Definitions of Equity
- City Council Equitable Engagement
    - *Reminder* - Pink groups are those identified by the city as those that are in most need of engagement cultural groups
- *Notes* -
    - Clarifying question on programmatic ideas included in Meeting #2 notes: These were written out verbatim based on the flip charts submitted by small groups at the end of Meeting #2.
    - *Reminder* - For future reference, if you have any concerns about notes, please email Steve Gallagher 24 hours in advance of next meeting

Discussion on goals of workgroup:
- Note - Reviewed goals on page one of document Steve sent to group to prep for this meeting
- *Summary* - NCR developed goals from the questions, ideas and discussions from the last two meetings work group one has had; plus, added more to anticipate future questions and to help identify problem areas. The WG went through each goal and made the following suggestions.
    - Goal #1 - change "many" to "several"
    - Goal #2 - Reminder, not every group has financial accountability attached to their strategic plan

- o Goal #4 -
  - Take "program" out
  - Reminder, 2018 survey was updated to meet a more expanded definition of diversity
- o Goal #5 - clarify "City of Minneapolis" (example: does this include NCR?)

Ranking of programmatic ideas into categories
- *Summary* - NCR staff also created a list of guidelines possibilities based on previous discussions. In this meeting all members present voted on each guideline to indicate whether or not to incorporate each specific guideline possibility into first proposal mock drafts (green = incorporate; red = do not incorporate; yellow = more discussion needed). The group also recommended an additional set of guidelines for consideration.
- This exercise consisted of each member having a Red, Green and Yellow piece of cardstock. The facilitator announced the guideline and individual members raised the corresponding color of their agreement. Any idea which that full agreement, or those with over 2/3rds agreement (7 out of 10 votes), will be listed as incorporate (green) or not incorporate (red) into the guidelines. Any idea which has a majority of yellow, or a mix of Red and Green votes, will be considered further for debate and final consideration both in small and large groups.
- Upon completion, time remained and the group began discussing # 10. The group had a majority wishing to spend 10 mins or less on each topic and allow each member a chance to speak (prior to responses from members who had already participated)

Conversation on (#10, original language): *"Collaborations between Neighborhoods and Cultural Groups: Require both Neighborhood Organizations and Cultural Community Groups, whom are funded, to have minimum expectations of cooperation."*

- *Summary* - A robust discussion to clarify and amend this guideline rounded out the meeting. Key majority opinions, concerns and opportunities centered primarily around the following thoughts (though no final conclusion was decided on):
  - o Discussion of including the word "require" vs "encourage"
    - Want to be sensitive to cultural group's time - that can't be all things to all people
    - Want to attract the right resources
    - Does using "require" force groups to keep this top of mind?
  - o Vetting
    - Are there concerns the city would require neighborhoods to work with a group they're not comfortable with (due to past experience, reputation, etc)
    - Reminder - these groups are vetted and they will be vetting neighborhood as well
      - Neighborhoods need to go to these orgs, unlikely to be vice versa
  - o Should you work with cultural groups that are within your neighborhood (over others)?
  - o Keep in mind disproportionate numbers of groups based on neighborhoods - not all have the same #s or access
  - o Should "collaborate" change to "partner"
  - o How does the city find these cultural groups?
  - o How do neighborhoods find these groups? How do we bridge that gap?

- Could there be a liaison that works with the neighborhoods?
  - Public comment reinforcing the help a liaison can bring, also providing empathy and knowledge back and forth
- Could there be a required day for neighborhoods to go meet with these groups?
- *Initial suggestions from Steve to wrap up conversation*
  - Make this guideline a best practice
  - Explained that discretionary income can be expanded, designed to facilitate collaboration
  - Volunteered to have NCR staff come up with a position statement to clarify the guideline for the group to react to.

For the next meeting –

NCR staff will cluster guidelines into general categories and/or provide more narrative where necessary

- WG asked to break into small groups to discuss
- *Future timeline -* During the meeting between September 20 and October 2 (Meetings 4 & 5) staff will develop one or two funding proposals, taken from the programmatic features, and present to the work group. Using the guideline framework developed previously, staff will try to determine the viability financially. Previous funding proposals will be presented at the Work Group. The work group will then review, ask questions, comprehend, debate and adjust into potential funding proposals.

Check Out:
- Next meeting is Thursday, September 20 from 6 to 8 p.m.
  - Location: Crown Roller Mill, 2nd Floor Conference Room
  - 105 S. 5th Avenue
- Resource reminders:
  - Use the Workgroup Resource Library, http://www.minneapolismn.gov/ncr/2020
  - Reference materials here
- Homework:
  - Review the updated guidelines document sent out by Steve G

- 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

neighborhoods 2020

Work Group 1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation
Meeting 4: September 20, 2018

Check In:

All members, guest speakers, city staff and members of community were asked to name a time when they enjoyed getting stuck in the rain.

Grounding Review Guideline Question Logistics: Review of guideline questions proposed by members in meeting #3 on September 6, 2018.

- **Question -** Is the structure of NCR to be discussed as part of the framework recommendations of this group?
  - Answer from Bob Cooper/NCR staff: Guidelines can include roles and responsibility (of NCR). I think not at a micromanaging level but I think at a high level in terms of support you'll receive, this should be included. Workgroup #3 is also representing this.

- **Logistics -**
  - Members were given two worksheets summarizing last meeting's guidelines
  - Shorter worksheet represented those that were voted on during meeting #3 that were either
    - Over 70% threshold in first vote so taken out as they will be included in framework
    - So far under threshold it won't make it
  - Members voted on remaining from longer worksheet
  - Each guideline was discussed with any member invited to a present a "pro" or "con" for keeping it prior to voting. After this discussion, a vote was taken with:
    - Red vote meaning "Eliminate"
    - Green vote meaning "Keep" and group will later decide if this becomes a "Best practice" vs "Requirement"
    - NOTE: Members were allowed to abstain

Guideline Question Pro/Con Discussions:
Note that not all guidelines had significant discussion before vote.

Summary of outcomes -
- After voting members expressed varying viewpoints that formed the basis of their vote.
  - In some cases members voted based on what they thought could get passed. Steve reminded that this is not preferred way to vote
  - NCR staff also reminded members that this is a long, grueling process. And process should cause you to think of the greater good instead of just your individual situation.

- A member expressed disappointment over votes that didn't seem to keep equity top of mind. After much discussion it was decided to extend guidelines discussion into the next meeting and allow for a look back to close votes and perhaps discuss again/re-vote. (see homework)

#1 KEEP (6 to 1): – Board member term limits
PROS:
- Pushes boards to empower new leaders
- Struggled for decades with same people. Feels like a social club
- Board members don't want to give up power and push those down.
- Someone can go off but still be involved
CONS:
- If there are not new leaders available it can allow
- Board term limits are best practices
- Can city make them? Yes. We can. They can choose not to and then risk not get funding
- Prefer city focus on the result they want. Perhaps the mandate should be leadership development rather than a specific
- Measuring something you don't actually want to measure
- You end up removing people that do have the interest

#3 – ELIMINATED (2 to 6): Uniform board eligibility (youth, businesses, special seats, union reps, etc). This would say each group has the same.
Pro:
- You could make it pretty general
Con:
- If you let anyone who shows up we have seen boards get filled by groups with specific interests
- Each neighborhood is so different
- Not much transparency
- It feels a better fit would be board training, bylaws, etc. where you consider membership

#4 Early Voting (2 to 6) - ELIMINATED
Pro
- Could you tell people ahead that more might be
- Voting outside of a meeting would be an important
- Fairly significant % works in the evening
Con
- You take away all opportunity to have debate on the board
- Annual elections
- One meeting had "Late voting"
- Viability would become even more administrative work
- Power gets congealed

NEW: Provide for alternative methods of voting options

#5 (10/0) – Uniform Annual Meeting Agendas

Pro:
- I think that is how you run a good nonprofit
- Not an exhaustive list
- Our neighborhood each year would
- This feels like a best practice
- I would argue it is a requirement. It is not the org money. These are minimal report
- Annual meeting is how people get involved

Con
- Bylaw changes
- A lot of this is already covered in state meetings. And to requirement this means more NCR time
- Saying it has to be at an annual meeting can seem bossy

#7 Baseline (7/3) - Funding to non-neighborhood groups

#9 Funding to non-neighborhood groups - rearranged this in two seperate votes
9a – Altogtether Different groups, same guidelines, same pot (1/8)
9b – Separate pot, separate guidelines (9/1)

- Not saying city should create a new one. But guidelines should be broadened so they are
- Marcus Comment – this is a very serious change from up until today.
  - Will they have a conversation with neighborhood groups? Are we disregarding? Does it inform?
    - Are we saying that cultural community groups would associating with neighborhoods?
  - It seems like a tough conversation in the context of groups
  - Do we believe in neighborhood orgs to do the question, then I want to see them?
  - I would like to see neighborhoods be a different
  - f we vote yes on #9 then we are including cultural groups that have to abide by
  - Marcea – why is this even on here?
    - Con – separate pots. don't know if we have the authority. Until we though
- If we just said that cultural groups are not geographic anyway,
- Can we require groups to work together? What happens when they overlap?
- Digging way into the weeds here. Which groups are going to be represented?
- You're talking about funding and deliverables.
- might we be talking about neighborhood funds that could be available if they worked with neighborhoods?

#10 – Collaboration between Neighborhoods and Cultural Groups (9/1)

Pro-
- One way you could do this is to begin to figure out needs for engagement. Once you have that number you can start leveling out. You strategically design the process.
- It should be incentivized
- I don't think it has to be oppositional

Con –

- Neighborhoods funded throughout the city. Where do you draw the line?
- I thought I was for this and yet there are other groups that cross boundaries (neighborhoods and business associations). And that can often sell short understanding what residents need
- This is an issue you hope to eliminate (there is an us them, but there shouldn't be)
  - This is "us/them" is making me really frustrated

#11 - Staff Funded Organizations will have paid professional staff (6 to 5)

#12 – Discretionary funds (10/1)
We know there isn't going to be a lot of money so to create a discretionary pot it would take away from outreach

#13 Competitive Funding
Pro: Would able to compete for city priorities
Con: It will water down the pot

(#16 should not be on worksheet - duplicate)

19: Budgeting to reflect for geographic (4/5)
Pro -
- Renters have different interests
- Is this a best practice
Con –
- We have had disagreements in the past and its led to debates

#20 – Infrastructure: Have dedicated post off address for organization – (6/5)
- IRS requires street address

#21 – Required Basic Meetings (0/10)
- Do people need monthly meetings open to public?

#22 Mandatory door knocking (5/6)
 Pro –
- Quality of interaction is lower - In terms of identifying what community needs
 Con –
- I think city needs to focus on deliverables. It's a tool.
- I don't think the language is nuanced enough

#23c – Changed language to to clarify and satisfy fully (11/0)
"Accounting Ability: organizations must have an acceptable contractual agreement for funded organization to cooperate in cases of fraud or embezzlement
Question: Is there an ethical question about "you should speak up"?
- Answer: This is not what the guideline is focused on.
Con –
- We have talked to the white-collar crimes unit and they have refused to do anything

- It may deter you from participating

#24 Create a minimum duty to perform for funded organizations (11/0)

#25 Same day citywide election for board members (7/4)
- Pro –
  - Example – a "Connections conference" – all have same conference/day
- Con –
  - people can't be in two places at once (some council members like to go to each)
  - why spend money on this?

#29 – Childcare: NCR contracts with childcare providers (6/5)
- Pro –
  - absolutely necessary for access
  - City can provide contracted
  - Nothing means they have to use service, but just says city will offer
  - Shouldn't be denying access just due to costs
- Con
  - what happens if city can't monitor childcare and something goes wrong?
  - How is this different for transportation? (that we aren't funding)
  - We might be talking about costs per neighborhood and this could be a big chunk

#30 Outreach/Door knocking: NCR Dept contracts with groups to provide door knocking services (5/5)
- Pros
  - Example of previous use where member saw this used – received 4,000 supporter responses and it helped project
  - Same argument as for child care – don't have to use but it would be nice to have service
- Con –
  - Defeats purpose because door knocking is about relationship

#32 – Training for best practices (11/0)

33 – Board Training (10/1)

#35 – Technology (10/1)

#39 Citywide Recognition Awards/Creating a "Best of" (7/4)
Pro –
- good press
Con –
- political
- competitiveness
- award winner are you going to get paid for all of the consultations

#40 – Collaborations: Funded organizations would be encouraged to observe other funded organizations' board meetings (9/0)

#43 – HR Services (11/0) Not on the list on the board

ADDED three

Neighborhoods would have access through recommendations or actionable items from CLIC. - This would be Capital projects

Set aside $ from CLIC (7/0)

Food provided (11/0)

Check Out:

- Next meeting is Tuesday, October 2 from 6 to 8 p.m.
  - Location: Crown Roller Building
- Resource reminders:
  - Use the Workgroup Resource Library, http://www.minneapolismn.gov/ncr/2020 .
  - Reference materials here
- Homework:
  - If you have more thoughts on any of the guidelines – that passed or that did not – please email Steve by Friday, September 28
    - Steve will combine all and present at next meeting
      - Steven.gallagher@minneapolismn.gov
      - 612.673.2905
- **Next meeting – Extend guidelines discussion**

WG1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation
Meeting #5
October 2, 2018
6-8 p.m.
Crown Roller Building

Check In:

- The facilitator shared the [Government Alliance on Racial Equity's](#) (GARE) definitions of
  The facilitator shared the [Government Alliance on Racial Equity's](#) (GARE) definitions of
  Transformative & Transactional. (Trying to move from the former to the latter.)
  - Transaction:
    - Issue-based
    - Helps individual navigate existing structured
    - Solutions "transact" with institutions
    - Short term gains for communities, but leave existing structures in place
  - Transformative:
    - Cuts across multiple institutions
    - Focus on policy and organizations
    - Alter the way institutions operate
- Shift cultural values and political will to create equity
- Think about Equity - ***Reminder of the three photos group used in meeting #2***

Introductions
- All members, staff and members of the public were asked to name an activity/event that they found transformative.

Equity and Inclusion Discussion:

Discussion of handout examining who may be underrepresented and why + commonly cited reasons why people don't "show up." See handout, here.

Answered questions about what groups are missing from the sheet (renters, work schedules, transportation, etc.) and ways we can improve and/or keep these areas of focus in mind as framework is created.

Discussion picked up again from last meeting about lack of equity in the guideline questions.
- The key divide in opinions centers more around how we can we focus on an equity lens against the backdrop of lack of trust of City/NCR to follow through/implement mixed with budget considerations.
- Some members differed in opinion on whether or not the city should be responsible for equity pieces.
- As has been the case throughout, reminders were given that the group should tailor to their recommendations towards desired outcomes and not based solely on past experiences.

Ultimately, execution is key.

Continued discussion for programmatic details:

Summary – while a number of guidelines were voted on and passed during the previous two meetings, the group focused on three guidelines that did not pass the original vote. Ultimately the language was massaged in an attempt to allow it to be included in final guidelines.

Childcare: Re-voted on and passed (10 to 1)
Updated language -
- Childcare, if requested, is -
  - An approved expense (from city provided)
  - Required for all meetings
  - On demand for all public meetings
  - Approved list for NCR

- Other notes/discussion -
  - City should provide list of people that are approved
  - Talk of incentivizing groups based on how much you provide of X (childcare, transportation, etc.), then you can do more

Mandatory Door Knocking (or outreach methods): No vote taken
Updated language:
- Have to submit a measurable outreach plan to engage residents with multiple opportunities to engage in meaningful face to face interactions including a plan to engage underrepresented residents (door knocking, pop events, tabling at popular locations).

- Other notes/discussion -
  - Utilize training and technology (guideline already voted on and passed)
  - Some concerns about making this/metrics mandatory
    - Face to face interaction is so valuable – are you reaching out in a meaningful way?
    - There is idealism vs holding accountable
  - Some ideas on metrics
    - Door goals per year?
    - % goal of household outreach
    - Utilize more than door knocking (now represented in updated language)
    - Intentionally engage underrepresented groups
    - Must have an outreach plan (see new guideline language below)

Represented boards: No vote taken consensus viewpoint
- Updated language: If boards are not representative of the demographics (age, homeowner/renter, race, ethnicity, etc.) of their neighborhood, they must submit a recruitment and outreach plan and make progress on a yearly basis. Which will be reviewed by the city and will impact funding.

- Other notes/discussion -
  - Have to submit a plan to join board
  - Need to make these accountable – incented best practice?
    - What is measured in a board?
    - Having a scale, weighted about where neighborhood is vs what you have accomplished
    - Outreach plan should have clear metrics on face to face piece
    - Guide them to thinking about face to face – this is the intention
  - If you have not met board requirements then there is a reduction in funding
  - What about switching from 3-year funding to 1 year cycle?

Check Out:

Next meeting - Thursday, October 18
- 6 – 8 p.m.
- Location: Crown Roller Building - second floor - 105-5th Avenue

Homework - What are accountability guidelines from your perspective? What are some ways to set metrics?

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.minneapolismngov/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)

neighborhoods 2020

WG1: Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation
Meeting #7
November 8, 2018
6-8 p.m.
Crown Roller Building

Check In:
Work group opted to move immediately into review process to ensure this would be the last meeting together before meeting with the other work groups.

Grounding Review:
This was the last meeting for the workgroup and the entirety of the meeting was spent finalizing the framework for their proposal. That proposal draft can be found here in the resource folder (and was sent to WG members). What follows is anything notable and quotable from that discussion over and above specific wording changes.

- Group discussion on funding formula priorities
  - Ranking top 5 priorities on a list of 10
  - There was some concern that this group is not qualified to recommend percentages and instead should be focused on rationale for why more (or less) % are recommended for each priority.
- Councilmen Jeremy Schroeder - "I don't believe the city can do what neighborhoods can do and I don't believe neighborhoods can do all of what city hopes.

- Breakdown:

- Priorities:
  - 30% Population
  - 30% Poverty Level
  - 20% Renter/Owner
  - 20% Racial Diversity

- Definitions:

- 50% Basic
- 25% Discretionary
- 25% Competitive

Check Out:

This was the last meeting and the group agreed to let Steve make the final changes to the document.

November 19, 2018: Combined Work Group meeting!
- Powderhorn Park (3400 15th Ave S)
- Meeting begins @ 6 p.m.
- Meeting is open to public but intended to be a working meeting for all to share their proposals with the other groups.

Community Listening Sessions
- Check with NCR to see published list of community engagement listening sessions throughout the city.
- Reach out to Steve if you are interested in helping

Combined voting goals, policies, procedures and best practices

Yes	No	Maybe	Guideline
6		1	1. Board Member Term Limits
7		2	2. Board Officer Term Limits
2	5		3. Uniform Board eligibility procedures
2	6		Set Aside money from CLIC to be advised, utilized by neighborhood organizations
9	0		Provide for alternate means of voting
6		3	5. Uniform Annual Meeting Agendas
7	2		6. Board training
7	3		7. Baseline Funding Programming
7		2	8. Impact Funding
1	8		9. Funding to non-neighborhood groups (one pot - all programs)
9	1		Funding to non-neighborhood groups (two pots of funding; different guidelines)
9		1	10. Collaborations between Neighborhoods and Cultural Groups (best practices and encouragement)
6	5		11. Staff: Funded organizations will have paid professional staff.
			a. Executive Director
			b. Community Outreach Staff
			c. Accountant/Finance

10	1		12. Discretionary Funds
8	2		13. Competitive Funding
	5	5	14. City Funding: Shift 50% of current funding to cultural organizations.
7		3	15. City Funding: Increase City funding to allow more funding for cultural organizations.
8		2	16. Pooled Services: Encourage and allow neighborhoods with less capacity to pool their services to create a base level of staffing, professional services, and administration.
			a. Executive Director(s)
			b. Community Staff
			c. Accounting Services
			d. The City of Minneapolis provide additional funding to assist with transitioning to pooled services.
4	5	0	19. Budgeting: Create budgeting to reflect the demographics in the geographic area.
6	5		20. Infrastructure: Have a dedicated post office address for organization.
			21. Required Basic Meetings: Have a set of meetings open to the public (Respond to each)
4	6	0	a. Monthly Meetings
8		2	b. Quarterly Meetings
9		1	c. Annual Meeting
5	6	0	22. Mandatory Door Knocking
			23. Accounting Ability: organizations must have an acceptable
7		3	a. Should the organization be expected to use an accounting program (i.e. QuickBooks)

- Row 3: green=11, content="24. Create a minimum duty..."
- Row 4: green=8, yellow=4, content="25. Same day Citywide..."
- Row 7: green=7, pink=2, yellow=1, content="28. Communications..."
- Row 8: green=5, pink=6, content="29. Childcare..." (orange)
- Row 9: green=5, pink=5, content="30. Outreach/Door knocking..." (orange)
- Row 10: green=7, yellow=3, content="31. Outreach Services..."
- Row 12: green=10, pink=1, content="33. Board training..."
- Row 13: green=7, pink=1, yellow=2, content="34. Bylaw Review..."
- Row 14: green=10, pink=1, content="35. Technology..."
- Row 15: green=8, yellow=2, content="36. Technology..."

10			b. Funded organization shall agree to follow the NCR Audit Policy. Refusing an audit is grounds for funding termination.
11			c. Contractual agreement for funded organization to cooperate in cases of fraud or embezzlement.
11			24. Create a minimum duty to perform for funded organizations.
8		4	25. Same day Citywide Election for Board Members.
8		2	26. Funded Organizations: Expectation for receivables from this funding?
8		2	27. Technical Assistance from The City/NCR: Accounting, planning, communications
7	2	1	28. Communications/Graphic Design: NCR Department contracts with a graphic designer
5	6		29. Childcare: NCR Department contracts with child care providers - Passed later in discussions
5	5		30. Outreach/Door knocking: NCR Department contracts with groups to provide door knocking services- further comments
7		3	31. Outreach Services: Neighborhoods, Neighborhood Specialists and Cultural Community Specialists
11			32. Training: NCR should provide training for best practices
10	1		33. Board training: NCR would provide training for all new board members within the City
7	1	2	34. Bylaw Review: The NCR Department review neighborhood bylaws
10	1		35. Technology: The City will help secure, train and implement technological programs
8		2	36. Technology: The City provide to track organizations balances, plan modifications, program status

10			**37. Audits: The City will pay for audit services for funded organizations**
8		2	**38. Insurance: NCR Department will fund Directors and Officers Insurance**
7	4		**39. Citywide Recognition Awards: Every couple of years the Creating "Best of"**
			40. Collaborations: Funded organizations would be encouraged:
9	0	0	**a. Observe other funded organizations board meetings**
10			**b. Periodic gatherings of board chairs, treasurers, etc. to encourage dialogue and share projects**
8	1	1	**c. Find and incorporate alternatives to Robert's Rules of Order**
10			**d. Staff Gatherings**
8		2	**41. Health Insurance Pool**
10			**42. General Liability Insurance**
11			**43. HR Services**
10			**44. Translation/Interpreters**
9		1	**45. ADA Resources available to neighborhood organizations**
10			**46. Handbook for Boards (NCR creates)**
8		2	**47. Workplans for NCR staff - Neighborhood Specialists/Cultural Specialists**
		Moved to later	Neighborhoods would have access through recommendations or actionable items from CLIC (capital projects) - Passed

| 7 | | | Set Aside money from CLIC to be advised, utilized by neighborhood organizations |
| 11 | | | Food be available for neighborhood meetings - City funds can be utilized |