

Community Engagement Commission Agenda
Thursday, August 13, 2015
6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers

- 6:30 p.m. **1. Roll Call**
- 2. Approve Agenda**
- 3. Approval of July 9 Meeting Minutes**
- 4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda**
- 5. Old Business**
- 6:35 p.m. A. Receive Neighborhood Association Task Force report
- 6:55 p.m. B. Advocates partnership proposal on Promoting Civic Engagement in Diverse Populations
- 7:10 p.m. C. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification
- 7:25 p.m. D. Update on new civic engagement module for city website
- 7:35 p.m. E. Implementation of other strategic recommendations
- 7:50 p.m. F. Definitions of Civic and Community Engagement
- G. CEC Social Gathering
- 6. Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports**
- 7:55 p.m. **A. Chair's Report**
- B. Staff Report**
- i. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas
- ii. Other Items
- 7. New Business**
- 8:00 p.m. A. Planning for Aug 24 joint meeting with the City Council
- 8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**
- 9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**
- 10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**
- 8:40 p.m. **11. Adjournment**

Public Comment is encouraged during Commission meetings. You may comment on items not on the agenda at the beginning of each meeting; you may also comment on agenda items during the meeting by indicating to the Chair your wish to speak.

Be a part of the picture....get involved with your City....Volunteer. For more information, contact Kelly at kelly.obrien@cityofroseville.com or (651) 792-7028.

46 Commissioner Gary Grefenberg thought they should approve the minutes pursuant to City
47 Statute because they are responsible for the minutes and since eighty percent of what was written
48 ~~in Bowman's summary is now~~ in the ~~amended~~ minutes as prepared for staff, he thought it would
49 be confusing ~~and,~~ duplicative to ~~also~~ include the summary in the minutes, ~~which can be~~
50 ~~discussed. He thought three quarters of the summary were taken verbatim from the minutes and~~
51 ~~the principle of the Commission adopting its own minutes.~~

52
53 Chair Becker was fine with it either way. He asked for other Commissioners opinions.

54
55 The other Commission members gave no opinion either way. Mr. Bowman stated initially ~~there~~
56 ~~was a request that~~ the summary was to be substituted in place of the minutes but because ~~they-his~~
57 ~~summary were was~~ not the official minutes, he could not do that ~~but so~~ he ~~could instead~~ put them
58 on as an addendum. Chair Becker ~~indicated clarified that~~ he ~~was letting Mr. Bowman know that~~
59 ~~the revised version of the minute prepared for staff by TimeSaver now included much of Mr.~~
60 ~~Bowman's summary asked that the summary replace that section of the minutes~~ because
61 TimeSaver, ~~the firm that prepares the minutes,~~ sometimes looks for feedback and in ~~that this~~ case
62 the Commission was deferring to Mr. ~~Becker's' Bowman's~~ summary because they liked them
63 better and they were also ~~previously~~ submitted officially to the Council. Mr. Bowman indicated
64 it did not matter to him if they had the addendum or not and it was up to the Commission.

65
66 Chair Becker moved and Commissioner Grefenberg, seconded a motion to remove Attachment
67 A from Agenda Item 4. **Motion passed unanimously.**

68
69 Chair Becker asked if there were any other changes to the minutes. Commissioner Grefenberg
70 stated there were a few changes he had. He stated on line 263 and ~~23~~64, they should insert
71 ~~ConveleseCongolese~~ before family and then he had a spelling correction, the word Nepali should
72 be Nepal. He stated at the very beginning they should not delete "part of meeting" in the
73 attendance list because Lisa McCormick was only here for part of the meeting and they should
74 keep it in the minutes.

75
76 Commissioner Grefenberg moved and Commissioner Manke seconded a motion to approve the
77 June 11, 2015 meeting minutes as amended. **Motion passed unanimously.**

78 **Public Comment**

79
80
81 ~~Ms.~~-Lisa McCormick, Wheeler Street, stated at the last meeting she was at, she requested a
82 correction and she did not see it in the packet. She passed out copies of the changes to the Task
83 Force minutes she requested changes to.

84
85 Commissioner Grefenberg indicated it was normally the process of the Task Force to approve its
86 own minutes. Ms. McCormick indicated the Commission was being asked to accept the changes
87 and with all due respect to the Task Force, it was submitted and put into the public record via the
88 Commission packet prior to any Task Force approval of its minutes and because it was submitted
89 to the public record, she would like to add her comments and correction to the public record.

90

91 Commissioner Grefenberg hoped at the Task Force's next meeting they will discuss this. He
92 stated he has had communications with Ms. McCormick on this issue and he thought it was best
93 they should take a look at it and have the Task Force approve it.

94
95 Chair Becker suggested that as a procedural motion procedure it would be best to not include un-
96 adopted task force minutes as a task force report in order to avoid this sort of confusion in the
97 future.

98 99 100 **Old Business**

101 102 **A. Progress Reports on Priority Projects for 2015 (continued)**

103 **i. Priority Projects for 2015**

104 **1. Assist and encourage the formation of Roseville neighborhood associations**

105
106 Commissioner Grefenberg stated reported that at the last meeting of the seventh meeting
107 of the ~~Community Engagement Commission~~ Neighborhood Association Task Force he
108 had submitted his resignation as co-chair of that Task Force. Following that, he had
109 suggested that Mr. Jerry Stoner replace him as co-chair to serve along with the other co-
110 chair, Ms. Donna Spencer. He indicated he will remain on the Task Force but wanted
111 someone who would be able to conduct meetings more effectively better than he could.

112
113 He Grefenberg then asked at this time that Ms. Spencer give an update on the current
114 Task Force work information on neighborhood associations. He indicated he will remain
115 on the Task Force but wanted someone who would be able to conduct meetings better
116 than he could. (Jerry Spencer arrived at the meeting at this time.)

117
118 Ms. Donna Spencer and Mr. Jerry Stoner updated the Commission on the neighborhood
119 association's Task Force information. Task Force Co-Chair Donna Spencer distributed a
120 written report to the Commission, a copy of which is attached and made a part of this
121 record.

122
123 Task Force Co-Chair Mr. Task Force Co-Chair Stoner updated the Commission on the
124 Task Force timeline; he and stated he indicated the Task Force to date they are was on
125 track to complete by August 6, 2015, which will be the date for packet submission to this
126 Commission. The Task Force's -and he thought their last meeting is was August 5th,
127 2015. He noted they added the Task Force have has two meetings left and feel was of the
128 opinion like they it have had enough time to complete all that they it are was going to
129 realistically complete within that time.

130
131 Stoner He stated said they have had there were some difficulties with differences of
132 opinion within the group, but he and they felt they the group now have had a strategy for
133 tying that out in a way that is acceptable to everyone. What they are going to do is be
134 providing footnotes in the final report that will note areas of concern. There are a bunch
135 of different issues were one or two people have concerns but there is somewhat of a

136 majority opinion. They will note that when they come across it. He thought there is
137 likely to be at least one place where they will provide two complete versions of a
138 particular point because the differences are too major to be captured in just a footnote.

139
140 Mr. Stoner stated the goal is to sidestep the fact that they ~~dissent~~ dissent from each
141 other and to ~~really acknowledge capture everything they have talked about because~~
142 the problems center ~~on almost~~ more on questions of fact, ~~on~~ which they cannot realistically
143 ~~hunt down without consulting with~~ City staff or ~~consult with the~~ Council. They wanted
144 to present the information to the Commission so they can take the time to dissect all of
145 the issues and really know everything they were thinking.

146
147 Ms. Spencer ~~indicated they wanted to update updated~~ the Commission on where ~~they are~~
148 ~~the Task Force was~~ on their topics. ~~Originally they began with She stated two people~~
149 ~~presented at their meeting~~ a multi-page list that included ~~nine eight~~ nine topics; ~~this list had~~
150 ~~been reviewed with the Commission at its May 14th meeting -~~ Since then, She reported
151 ~~indicated she the Task Force~~ has taken out all of the ~~different~~ sub-points and condensed
152 them into a shorter list. The main thing she wanted to highlight for the Commission was
153 they have condensed all of those issues but one into six topics, which are ~~divided listed~~
154 ~~by under~~ the Task Force's Commission's two charges ~~of to~~ the Task Force; ~~these charges~~
155 ~~were: (1)- The Task Force charge are~~ to make recommendations for the City to
156 encourage and facilitate the formation of neighborhood associations; and ~~then (2)~~ to make
157 recommendations on how the City can foster and facilitate neighborhood participation
158 and civic decision making.

159
160 Task Force Co-Chair Spencer continued that ~~T~~there is only one topic in that original list
161 that their final report in August will not address ~~that was included in that original list.~~
162 That item ~~is concerned~~ Ttopics ~~that go outside Beyond~~ Neighborhood Associations; ~~and~~
163 other ways neighborhoods could participate in civic decision making. They have
164 narrowed their report to just focus on neighborhood associations and the interaction
165 between the City and the neighborhood associations.

166
167 Ms. Spencer stated ~~what~~ she wanted to highlight to the Commission ~~is~~ where they are at
168 in the current drafting of the report. She thought as a group they are in a decent place
169 with the first topic, "What are the Purposes of a Neighborhood Association" and the
170 second topic, "What are the Benefits of Neighborhood Associations." Also with Item 4,
171 "How Can the City Encourage and Facilitate Neighborhood Associations," they have had
172 a lot of discussion and made a lot of progress on clarifying that issue.

173
174 Ms. Spencer stated what they are still working on is Issue 3 "Whether the City Should
175 Adopt Some Kind of Policy around Neighborhood Association." She indicated this is a
176 very complicated issue for their group. One major subtopic under this is whether the City
177 should somehow recognize neighborhood associations and what the criteria should be.
178 That is one they are still ~~making their way through discussing~~ but will definitely have in
179 their report the different opinions that have come out of that discussion. Also, the Task
180 Force is still working through Items 5 and 6 in their original list they are still working

181 | ~~through. They~~ The Task Force's focus are has been really around the communication
182 | between the neighborhood association and the City.

183 |
184 | Ms. Spencer stated she also wanted to highlight examples of how they have reported the
185 | Commission feedback. There are four Commission comments they have been
186 | processing. One is the definition of civic engagement, which has been included in the
187 | draft now. There has also been discussion around inclusion of renters and business
188 | owners and they have incorporated text related to that. On this specific issue ~~There~~ will
189 | be a footnote ~~on that~~ because there has been a lot of discussion and differences in opinion
190 | on ~~it, especially~~ whether business owners should be included. They also have already
191 | incorporated the notion of integrating neighborhood associations into the City's
192 | notification process. One thing she added in her handout is she thought the Commission
193 | suggested they be clear that they are not talking about homeowners associations.

194 |
195 | Ms. Spencer stated two areas of Commission feedback ~~that the Commission provided that~~
196 | ~~they which the Task Force has~~ have not addressed was ~~there was commentary about~~
197 | providing a tool kit or resources for how an interested person could form a neighborhood
198 | association. ~~They have not tackled that extensively to date and she was not sure where~~
199 | ~~they would end up on that.~~ Secondly ~~There~~ was ~~also a the Commission's~~ suggestion to
200 | be mindful of outreach to underrepresented groups, ~~but~~ she ~~also~~ understood that the
201 | Commission had acknowledged ~~that this~~ was something ~~they it~~ could play a role in.
202 | Right now, their draft report does not explicitly address ~~that this issue~~ but ~~as a the~~ Task
203 | Force, ~~they had~~ discussed the notion that the Commission would be a good body to
204 | proceed with that issue.

205 |
206 | Commissioner Ebony Adedayo asked if ~~they the Task Force have had~~ modeled some of
207 | ~~their its~~ policy making after what ~~they have had been~~ done in ~~the City of~~ Minneapolis
208 | and St. Paul, which have two vibrant neighborhood networks. ~~She thought they might~~
209 | ~~have something that could be modeled after.~~ Ms. Spencer ~~indicated~~ responded that they
210 | had started their ~~actual meetings deliberations~~ by looking at materials from other cities.
211 | She was not sure if they looked at Minneapolis or St. Paul but they did look at other
212 | cities, such as Edina, and ~~they~~ also reviewed a city in West Virginia where her family
213 | lived because ~~they have it had~~ done a lot with neighborhood associations. They did look
214 | at other cities but in no way have they exhausted their ir research. Mr. Stoner indicated
215 | they did look at St. Paul.

216 |
217 | Commissioner Grefenberg, a Task Force member, ~~stated responded that they he had~~
218 | looked at St. Louis Park and ~~in the very beginning, they did look at~~ the City of
219 | Minneapolis. He stated he attended a conference they Minneapolis hosted on
220 | neighborhood associations, at which the issue of and they did look at some core values
221 | for public participation they had developed as well. ~~He concluded that~~ ~~There~~ has been
222 | at least some research done, but commented that ~~He noted the cities of~~ St. Paul and
223 | Minneapolis are so large that ~~they have the Task Force had tried to~~ focused on suburban
224 | examples such as St. Louis Park and Edina.

225 |

226 Ms. Spencer stated it is also really relevant because even in the small number of
227 examples they looked at there was a lot of variation in terms of how formal a city got.
228 Edina has definitions and criteria for what is a neighborhood association but her
229 hometown has no formal policy on it but both of them have vibrant neighborhood
230 associations. There are many different variations and they can see the pros and cons for
231 each of those.

232
233 Commissioner Gardella thought they have already done a tremendous amount of work
234 but the point about pros and cons was interesting. Commissioner Gardella thought there
235 was some way they could be thinking about the pros of a more formal approach and
236 asked what does it limit and who gets excluded if it is a more formal approach. Also,
237 what are the benefits of having it less formal and what do they lose if it is less formal,
238 which may help ~~them~~ the Task Force in ~~their~~ its planning.

239
240 Commissioner Grefenberg indicated they have discussed the pros and cons at great length
241 within the Task Force. Ms. Spencer stated as they spend more time on that section they
242 will work on the pros and cons for the report.

243
244 Ms. Diane Hilden, Bayview Drive in Roseville, stated she wanted to take this opportunity
245 to apologize publicly to the members of the Task Force for losing her temper at a recent
246 meeting. It was not a great performance and not something she was proud of. She stated
247 it came out of a great frustration of feeling like the Task Force was not representing its
248 individual members ~~of the Task Force~~. ~~She stated there was a struggle and several~~
249 ~~members left the Task Force and there continues to be a struggle.~~

250
251 As background for her remarks sShe stated she started the Lake McCarron's
252 Neighborhood Association, ~~which Ms. Sanders has taken over and done such a gracious~~
253 ~~job over the last several years. She stated she and was also working worked on in~~ St.
254 Paul ~~on the District Council System~~ as a Community Organizer ~~working with the a~~
255 neighborhood associations so she has some familiarity with this the concept ~~concept and~~
256 ~~she really felt this was a confused concept and she has a hard time because of making too~~
257 ~~many rules and regulations.~~

258
259 There is something interesting about the organic nature of neighborhood associations,
260 Hilden continued, - That is, when they tend to operate the longest and best when they
261 originate from the neighborhoods, ~~and there are really only two in Roseville at present~~
262 ~~after all of these years and people have talked to her on and off for many years about~~
263 ~~starting one up and then never doing it. She added This is a subject that is near and dear~~
264 ~~to her heart and she~~ felt a lot of the Task Force disagreement was because from the
265 beginning they did not air whether this was a good idea to impose neighborhood
266 associations or ~~some kind of~~ rules and regulations about them. She understood Tthe new
267 culture of community engagement in Roseville ~~that they are all talking about, a~~
268 ~~community engagement and she supported that kind of culture but she felt this~~ is a very
269 complicated topic and represents lots of different avenues, and
270

271 | Although the work that a number of people on the Task Force ~~has~~ have done has been
272 | outstanding. ~~She stated~~ she did not agree with and would not support, at this time, any
273 | regulation ~~of or~~ any formal way ~~at this point~~ to be ~~made recommended~~ to the City
274 | Council because she felt they needed to investigate more what is already being done in
275 | Roseville. She stated they need to look more into the neighborhood watch program,
276 | which is kind of a neighborhood association, before they proceed. She, however,
277 | thought a lot of ground work has been done that could be useful for future things.

278 |
279 | Chair Becker stated this report will be coming back to the Commission at the August 6,
280 | 2015 meeting, which they will then discuss in depth and form an opinion before bringing
281 | it forward to the City Council.

282 |
283 | Commissioner Sanders asked how the Task Force came to be made. Chair Becker stated
284 | the Commission created the Task Force. Commissioner Gardella stated it was part of the
285 | recommendations that an earlier task force of the Human Rights Commission had
286 | organized; then the Commission proceeded forward with that earlier recommendation and
287 | included it on their work plan presented to the Council last December. came from them
288 | because at one time, the Commission was a Task Force and one of the items on their
289 | agenda was to review neighborhood associations. The Council approved it as a list of
290 | priorities- priority for the Commission to figure out determine what the City ~~should~~ could
291 | do to encourage and facilitate about neighborhood associations. Subsequently and the
292 | Task Force was formed by the Commission -to help explore that. There seems to be
293 | interest at the Council level for neighborhood associations but how to do it and what to
294 | do was left up to them.

295 |
296 | Commissioner Gardella ~~stated commented that~~ if what comes to them in AugsutAugust
297 | includes are still big, meaty questions, ~~they~~ the Commission will not be forced into
298 | something by the August 24th City Council presentation. She was and they are ok OK
299 | with going to the City Council and explaining ~~they the Commission need needed~~ more
300 | time to review and discuss the issues.

301 |
302 | Commissioner Grefenberg indicated for a correction commented for the record that there
303 | are three neighborhood associations in Roseville, not two.

304 |
305 | Commissioner Gardella stated the Commission should be open to extending their
306 | discussions regarding this topic if need be.

307 |
308 | Commissioner Adedayo stated she was really excited about this; ~~and~~ as a resident in
309 | Roseville, she was not aware that did not know neighborhood associations existed in
310 | Roseville. She thought this was a great opportunity to get community members involved
311 | eivically in the civic life and happenings of the City.

312 |

313 **2. Create Learning Events on community engagement in Roseville**
314

315 Chair Becker stated the primary thing they have been talking about is a partnership
316 proposal with advocates.

317
318 Commissioner Gardella stated she was working on this in partnership with Commissioner
319 Sanders and they have a meeting with the Advocates for Human Rights next week to
320 flush out the proposal a little more in light of the City Council's revised strategic
321 priorities document. So she hoped there would be more to report at their next meeting.
322

323 **3. Joint Task Force with Planning Commission to study notification issues and**
324 **formats**

325
326 Commissioner Manke ~~stated~~ ~~reported~~ ~~they~~ ~~this~~ ~~joint~~ ~~task~~ ~~force~~ ~~have~~ had their second
327 meeting; and everything is going well and ~~she~~ ~~thought~~ it was ~~very~~ clear that the ~~people~~
328 ~~involved~~ ~~the~~ ~~members~~ ~~of~~ ~~this~~ ~~Task~~ ~~Force~~ are committed to this. ~~She~~ ~~heard~~ ~~from~~ ~~outside~~
329 ~~that~~ ~~a~~ ~~report~~ ~~had~~ ~~come~~ ~~up~~, ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~all~~ ~~very~~ ~~excited~~ ~~about~~ ~~it~~, ~~and~~ ~~things~~ ~~were~~ ~~going~~ ~~well~~.
330 She indicated they have not gotten into anything in depth but she thought that they were
331 such short staffed the first time that this time they had more people involved so it was just
332 a catch up meeting. They have another meeting coming up on Thursday, July 16th so she
333 hoped they would get a little further on that.

334
335 Commissioner Grefenberg indicated the July 16th meeting is open to the public and is
336 held at 6:00 p.m. in the Aspen Conference Room at City Hall.

337
338 **4. Online civic engagement module for city website**
339

340 Chair Becker indicated this is the module they are adding with the vendor Granicus. The
341 committee has not met since their last Commission meeting but he asked Mr. Bowman
342 for an update.

343
344 Mr. Bowman suggested they have a meeting in the next week to talk about some policy
345 issues, if they want to formalize a policy for submission of topics. He thought they were
346 getting closer, tried to call their Granicus ~~R~~rep. today, and had to leave a message. One
347 of their setbacks is the ~~R~~rep. they were working with left the company so they were
348 shuffled to somebody else, which set them back a little bit. He thought they were back on
349 track now and should be able to formalize everything in the next couple of weeks. He
350 stated they are moving forward but thought they needed to make a policy
351 recommendation to the City Manager.

352
353 Chair Becker asked if they had a go live date for the module. Mr. Bowman stated he
354 thought it would be before the end of the month and felt they were still on target for the
355 month of July.
356

357 Commissioner Sanders asked who would determine the policies. Mr. Bowman thought
358 they would make a recommendation as a committee to the City Manager. Included in
359 there would be staff seeking feedback on certain projects or looking for information and
360 then the other question is how they receive suggestions from outside of staff or Council
361 and is there a review process for that. The module does include an open ideation aspect
362 to it where anyone can suggest anything but he thought they wanted on the more formal
363 side of it to determine what the process is there.

364 **5. Assist in the Resumption of Roseville U Programs**

365 Mr. Bowman stated ~~this Roseville U programs will~~ resumes next week ~~where-when~~ the
366 Police Department and traffic issues are up. ~~next and going to do something on traffic~~
367 ~~stops.~~

368 Commissioner Grefenberg asked if there has-had been any new information on attendance
369 numbers. Mr. Bowman ~~stated-answered that~~ there are not any new numbers available.
370 The programming had a break during Rose-fest but would be starting up again. He also
371 noted the programming will be available online and they will also contact previous
372 attendees to remind them of the program coming up.

373 Commissioner Gardella asked whether evaluations were done at the end of each sessions.
374 Mr. Bowman indicated they do send out evaluation forms now, although they were not
375 done in the beginning. Commissioner Sanders ~~stated-added because she has attended~~
376 ~~some of the programs~~ she knows that the attendees are sent an email evaluation- because
377 she has attended some of the programs

378 Commissioner Grefenberg asked if the evaluation was sent shortly after the program is
379 concluded. Commissioner Sanders stated it was.

380 Commissioner Sanders asked if the last program cancelled by the Police was going to be
381 brought up again. Mr. Bowman stated they are not going to bring that back this term and
382 will need to be a part of another Roseville U program.

383 **ii. Implementation of Other Strategic Recommendations**

384 ~~Chair Becker asked if there were any other strategic recommendations from the~~
385 ~~Commission.~~

386 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~stated-reported that some one~~ of their ~~other series of the~~
387 Commission's non-priority recommendations dealt with the whole range of Commission
388 and some discussions about a uniform Commission Code. He advised the Commission
389 that he and Scot Becker and some of them met with two Councilmembers who were
390 primarily involved in developing a code that organizes things like absences and a variety
391 of issues and that is coming up for the Council at their next meeting. There may be some
392 feedback. He has done a quick review and it seems to be quite compatible in his opinion

402 | with some of their recommendations contained in their seventy--item report to the City
403 | Council.
404 |

405 | Chair Becker agreed and stated the intent is to consolidate and standardize much of the
406 | Commission structure and ordinance in one spot and then have specific variances from
407 | that on a Commission by Commission basis. He stated he took a look at the Code and did
408 | not see anything obvious red flags in it. The attendance policy, which was one of their
409 | recommendations, is in there in a couple of spots. He would encourage everyone to read
410 | the Council packet to see what is being proposed. When he reviewed the Code, he did
411 | not see any big change to the CEC that he could tell.
412 |

413 | Commissioner Gardella asked if Chair Becker recalled when the election of the Chair and
414 | Vice-Chair take place because they made a recommendation that it does not necessarily
415 | have to happen when a Commission is formed. Chair Becker did not believe it was
416 | specified. He believed that they specified the election of a Chair and Vice-Chair for
417 | annual terms but he did not believe there was a planned date for the election. He asked
418 | the Commission double check that item.
419 |

420 | **b. Other Old Business**

421 | **i. Strategic Initiatives from 2/17 and 2/18 Council/Staff Workshops**
422 |

423 | Chair Becker stated the Council had discussed this ~~at large~~ and what they ultimately
424 | decided to do was remove all but two of the Strategic Initiatives, including ~~to include~~ the
425 | Community Engagement section. There were several commissioners who offered
426 | testimony both at the Council and Commission levels with some concerns about either
427 | the priority projects that they had under Community Engagement or the metrics they used
428 | to measure the success of it. Because of that, the Council recognized some of the
429 | problems with that, recognized the overlap with the existence of this Commission, and
430 | the easiest way to do that was to strike that from the list of Strategic Priorities.
431 |

432 | Chair Becker ~~stated-reported~~ several Councilmembers had reached out to him after that
433 | and they wanted to clarify with him personally that it did not mean they were devaluing
434 | the Community Engagement Commission; rather it was a vote of confidence ~~that this in~~
435 | the Commission ~~is here~~ to do that work charged by ~~so~~ the Council. Becker added that
436 | the Council will be looking to the Commission to ~~form~~ achieve those priorities.
437 |

438 | ~~and he thought in addition to forming the priorities the bar has been raised for the work~~
439 | ~~that they do and that they ought to be able to measure the success of those priorities and~~
440 | ~~they should start to think about that as they adopt those priorities. As far as he was~~
441 | ~~concerned, Becker indicated, the Council's decision not to add the staff-recommended~~
442 | strategic initiatives was, in his mind, a signal to the Commission that it ~~is was~~ business as
443 | usual with perhaps a higher level of expectation from the Council about how professional
444 | they are going to be in their recommendations and making sure that they are successful.
445 |

446 | Commissioner Grefenberg hoped the same professionalism would carry over to the [Civic](#)
447 | [Engagement Neighborhood Association](#) Task Force as well in the fact that they are
448 | developing an overview of some very specific recommendations to make sure it
449 | represents the neighborhoods. He thought this professionalism was a good thing. It is
450 | difficult because they do not have staff at the [Neighborhood Association](#) meetings.

451 |
452 | Commissioner Gardella wanted to make a note of appreciation that the Council was
453 | flexible and more than willing to let that go and that they did recognize the value of this
454 | Commission. Commissioner Grefenberg stated they have a Council that is very
455 | interested in Civic Engagement and Community Engagement and she would agree with
456 | what Commissioner Gardella stated. From his perspective, they have an opportunity in
457 | the next year or so to do something on the five priority issues they have discussed.

458 |
459 | **ii. Community Engagement Commission Webpage Content**

460 |
461 | Chair Becker thought they talked the last time about a number of things they wanted to
462 | add to it such as photos. He would like to add a photo of the new Commission but since
463 | one Commissioner was absent, recommended they take the photo when all
464 | Commissioners were present. They could also include photos of the [Rosefest](#) parade and
465 | [Rose the Party in the Parkfest](#).

466 |
467 | Mr. Bowman asked if everyone was ok with the changes he made to the website after the
468 | previous meeting. Commissioner Grefenberg thanked Mr. Bowman for sending the
469 | changes out and he liked them but he indicated they did not discuss the changes as a
470 | Commission.

471 |
472 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated in early December of 2014 the Council approved their
473 | priority projects for 2015 and the change Mr. Bowman sent to them was to contact people
474 | listing specific contact people for each of those priorities. Chair Becker indicated he did
475 | not have any specific objections to the changes and thought it was a good starting point.

476 |
477 | Chair Becker explained to Commissioner Adedayo what the website consisted of and
478 | asked her to review the topic and at some point think about what she, [as a new](#)
479 | [commissioner](#), found useful, what she did not [find useful](#), and bring that back to the
480 | Commission for discussion. Commissioner Adedayo stated she appreciated that and
481 | would make that a priority. Commissioner Gardella stated Commissioner Adedayo has a
482 | great communication experience and does great communication work for her
483 | organization.

484 |
485 | Commissioner Grefenberg thought it would be good for Commissioner Adedayo to go
486 | back and look through some of their previous minutes ~~also~~ because ~~he thought~~ they were
487 | a ~~very~~-valuable resource.

488 |
489 | **iii. Community Engagement Commission Social Gathering**

490 |

491 | Chair Becker indicated Commissioner Manke has sent out an ~~an~~ doodle electronic
492 | invitation, looking for perspective meeting dates for that social gathering and she may
493 | want to include Commissioner Adedayo to get her input. He encouraged all
494 | Commissioners to fill in their availability

496 | **Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports**

498 | **A. Chair's Report**

499 |
500 | Chair Becker expressed his personal appreciation for the hard work that everyone had in the
501 | Rose-fest Parade and at the Party in the Park. He thought everyone came together without a lot
502 | of formal discussion at the meeting and he thought it looked pretty good. He thought the booth
503 | looked pretty good, he manned it for most of the day, and thought it was ~~good~~ a delight to talk to
504 | ~~the~~ number of people that stopped by ~~came in~~. Chair Becker noted that Council Member
505 | LaLiberte-LaLiberte and Planning Commissioners Boguszewski and Bull also staffed the booth
506 | during the day.

507 |
508 | Chair Becker updated the Commission on the Rose-fest booth activities. He stated there
509 | appeared to be quite a few people that were not residents of the City stopping at the booth, either
510 | they were visiting or worked in the City and he thought for next year when designing the booth
511 | they should think about how they can incorporate drawing more people, residents or otherwise,
512 | in-to the booth to talk to them.

513 |
514 | Commissioner Manke thought they should open this up to the City Councilmembers as their
515 | resting place to come back to during the event. She stated she had sent ~~out a list~~ to all of the
516 | Commissioners inviting them to stop by; -she added she thought they ~~needed~~ might need to be a
517 | little stronger in ~~their recommendation of asking other Commissioners to helping them~~ staff the
518 | booth. Commissioner Gardella thought it was a great invitation, stated this was the first year,
519 | and now that people have seen the value of the booth she thought it will get increasingly more
520 | crowded in the years to come. She thought the Commission being the organizers of the booth
521 | was the perfect thing for them. She thought all of the Commissions would benefit being there
522 | and listening to what people have to say.

523 |
524 | Chair Becker thought as they include other Commissioners and Representatives they should have
525 | some signage to recognize the Commissioners that are in the booth at the time they are there to
526 | draw people in who are interested in certain Commissions.

527 |
528 | Commissioner Grefenberg suggested the poster be displayed in the lobby because it speaks
529 | advertises ~~of~~ the Civic Engagement module. Chair Becker asked where they thought they get
530 | more traffic from interested parties this time of year, City Hall or the Oval. Mr. Bowman stated
531 | the Oval is not busy right now because there is not any ice there at this time. The skate center
532 | still gets some traffic but it is not as much as in the winter but said he thought there would still be
533 | more traffic at the Oval than at City Hall because they mostly get contractors at City Hall. If
534 | they want to put something at the Oval that might be better. He stated he would talk to the
535 | facility managers there to see if there is a place where the Commission could display the poster.

536
537 Commissioner Grefenberg stated the cost of the poster was very reasonable and could have
538 another one made. He stated his second point was they came in under budget at approximately
539 \$270. He stated he really admire how it all came together and especially admire the persistence
540 of Commissioner Manke in securing a rather significant slot in the parade. He was impressed
541 that there were two Planning Commissioners at the Party in the Park and agreed with what has
542 been said and it would be great to involve others. He also thought it would be good to have more
543 of the Commissions participating in the parade.

544
545 Commissioner Sanders asked if there were any brochures handed out at the Party in the Park.
546 Commissioner Manke indicated there were. Mr. Bowman stated they had a hand out card that
547 they created for the module. Chair Becker added that Council Member Laliberte also provided
548 copies of the budget feedback form for distribution. Commissioner Manke thought having stuff
549 to hand out to people that stop by the booth is critical.

550
551 Chair Becker stated on August 24, 2015 they will be meeting in a joint meeting with the City
552 Council and therefore on- August 13, 2015 the Commissiony will be discussing what they want
553 to present to the Council so he would like everybody to think about that so they can have a
554 fruitful discussion at the Council meeting. He thought they should at a minimum talk about their
555 progress on the main priority reports and get some feedback and get their suggestions for what
556 they should incorporate in next year's planning.

557
558 **B. Staff Report**
559 **i. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas**

560
561 Mr. Staff Liaison Garry Bowman stated-reported the City Manager will present the-his
562 recommended budget at the next City Council meeting on July 13th, 2015. There may be some
563 interest in that.—The Council will also be having some discussion of the Community Engagement
564 Commission and Human Rights Commission and discussing the structures of those
565 Commissions. He thought the Commission would be interested in those. He also stated Mayor
566 Roe and Councilmember Loliberdie-LaLiberte will be providing an update to the Council on
567 Community Engagement items they had discussed in front of with their Commission last
568 February. He stated the only other items before their meeting on August 10, 2015 is a joint
569 meeting with the Human Rights Commission and that is also the night the Council will be
570 holding the budget hearing, which is the-only-an opportunity for residents to give their thoughts
571 on the initial staff recommended budget.

572
573 Chair Becker stated the two CEC-City Council agenda items for its next meeting items of
574 relevance to the Commission the-Council will be diseussing are available in the Council packet
575 available on line -and he encouraged the Commission to look at it-them. These items are a
576 discussion on the Community Engagement and Human Rights Commissions structures,
577 including the possibility of merging them, and a presentation by Mayor Roe and Council
578 Member Lisa LaLiberte on the topic of Community Engagement.

579

580 On the first item, Chair Becker He stated explained that City staff has supplied three options to
 581 the Council, including e merging the Human Rights Commission with the Community
 582 Engagement Commission ~~to include its Charter and its Membership~~. The second option would
 583 be to combine the two Commissions and expand the new Commission's scope. and T the third
 584 option is keeping ~~it the current~~ status quo of both Commissions. This is somewhat being
 585 prompted by there being three vacancies on the Human Rights Commission. He stated the
 586 Council meeting is more of a workshop meeting and he would be surprised if the Council took
 587 action on ~~the this~~ item. He indicated he had a brief meeting with the City Manager, and Carrie
 588 Kari Collins who drafted the Request for Council action (RCA), and the Chair of the HRC who
 589 drafted the request for Council action along with the Chair of the HRC. At that meeting staff
 590 and they indicated they had five different opinions from the City Council about what they would
 591 like to see happen. He expected there to be a churning of ideas and perhaps a revision of
 592 proposals and with this issue will come coming up again over subsequent meetings. He thought
 593 there would be opportunity for the Commission to respond at later dates if they it cannot make
 594 the meeting on Monday.

595
 596 Commissioner Gardella stated it was hard to make a recommendation not knowing more about
 597 the work and exactly what the charge of the Human Rights Commission ~~is, noting some of it~~
 598 ~~makes sense and some of it doesn't~~. Commissioner Grefenberg stated some of the specific items
 599 for retention suggestions that were in the staff Recommendation for Council Action (RCA RCA)
 600 recommended Council action prepared by Kari Carrie Collins were the student essay contest
 601 being transferred and he also thought there was some discussion of the Naturalization Ceremony,
 602 which does not take a lot of work. He ~~would~~ encouraged encourage all Commissioners to be
 603 present at Monday night's meeting because the Council ~~respects that~~ perceives that as a sign of
 604 Commission interest. He also ~~knew reported~~ that the Chair and Vice Chair of both the Human
 605 Rights and Community Engagement Commissions were asked to be at that meeting, so he asked
 606 if Commissioner Gardella could be there because Chair Becker would be out of town. ~~He also~~
 607 ~~thought it might be an opportunity for them to comment~~.

608
 609 Commissioner Gardella indicated she could be at the meeting but she would not feel comfortable
 610 making a recommendation to the Council because the Commission has not discussed this and she
 611 did not feel personally knowledgeable enough about what is within the HRC's body of work.
 612 She would feel comfortable saying the Commission would appreciate love to discuss this more
 613 ~~and have~~ the opportunity to discuss it further and the implications for it, ~~she thought~~ until the
 614 Commission could talk about it a little more she did not think they had an opinion.
 615 Commissioner Grefenberg thought that once ~~the it was clear what direction the~~ City Council
 616 went towards a direction was proceeding there would be an opportunity for the Commission to
 617 provide have feedback.

618
 619 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~said tated~~ it was his understanding based upon discussions ~~in talking~~
 620 ~~about this~~ with a couple of Councilmembers that the origin of these discussions was was the
 621 original initiative focused on the HRC, ~~and then there was some of the items that they wanted to~~
 622 ~~not see disappear such as the essay contest and Naturalization Ceremony~~. He did not think it was
 623 meant in anyway of being in as a criticism of this Commission.

624

625 Chair Becker agreed and thought if it was adopted as drafted the Commission would take on
626 additional responsibilities. He stated he had some personal opinions on this as well ~~and~~ which
627 mirrored ~~what was being the Commission's discussed current discussion-~~. He encouraged anyone
628 to attend and voice their opinion. He would appreciate it if Commissioner Gardella could be at
629 the meeting and report back to the Commission.

630

631 **ii. Other Items**

632

633 There were no other items to report.

634

635 **New Business**

636

637 **A. Definitions of Civic and Community Engagement**

638

639 Chair Becker noted the CEC's discussion in June in which we agreed to discuss the definitions
640 and distinctions of community engagement and civic engagement. He pointed to the packet item
641 8a, which was included by indicated Commissioner Gardella, who was charged at the last
642 meeting with providing some definitions for the Commission to consider. -attached in the packet
643 Item 8a to go along with this item. He indicated she has consolidated some items that they
644 talked about the last time and felt they needed to have some working definitions for what they
645 feel is Civic and Community Engagement.

646

647 Commissioner Gardella stated it not uncommon that these two terms are used interchangeable
648 and yet they are very distinct bodies or work that include.~~They are~~ very distinct strategies. She
649 did not recommend that the Commission -and she thought for them not to say they are going to
650 pick one or the other; it was clear that the work of the Commission -she thought it makes
651 perfect sense for their work to involve both community engagement and civic engagement. It is
652 important, however, but for them to be clear on what they mean or what they want to say is how
653 they think about this kind of work, ~~she thought would be very important.~~ The definitions
654 provided are offered as She stated these are offered as they could be potential definitions they
655 may want to adopt, they could be fodder for conversation, or they could craft something
656 different. She indicated the list should not be considered exhaustive. She stated based on the
657 definitions she would like to propose a discussion on the distinction between "community
658 engagement" and "civic engagement," and suggest that the Roseville Community Engagement
659 Commission adopt a working definition of each at the August meeting.

660

661 Commissioner Gardella did not think they wanted to make a decision at the meeting on a
662 definition. If there is something they all agree with and want to move forward with, that would
663 be fine. But she thought this was something they could have more conversation about and
664 should give everyone time to think about it. Chair Becker concurred and stated if there is
665 something that is universally agreed upon they could note that and then come back with a formal
666 proposal to take action on at a future meeting.

667

668 Commissioner Gardella stated she had a couple of broad ways to think about the distinctions
669 between community engagement and civic participation and for most people community

670 engagement is the broader term and civic participation is a part of that or somewhere along the
671 continuum of engagement. ~~Often times~~ ~~so a lot of times~~ people will do community engagement
672 with a purpose of getting people involved in politics, **civic participation**, getting people involved
673 in impacting policy, ~~but for others~~. ~~For some people~~ that is not the goal of community
674 engagement.

675
676 Commissioner Gardella stated for some people the goal of community engagement is helping
677 people connect to one another, helping people feel safe and welcome in their community whether
678 they get involved in City government or politics does not matter.

679
680 Commissioner Gardella reviewed with the Commission a sampling of definitions and principles
681 for consideration by the Commission.

682 **Community Engagement**

- 684 • Community engagement is connecting with the people who live, work, or do business in
685 St. Paul to identify issues and create equitable, sustainable solutions that improve their
686 quality of life. – *City of St. Paul Emerging Leaders Academy*
687
- 688 • Authentic community engagement is the intentional process of co-creating solutions to
689 inequities in partnership with people who know through their own experiences the barriers
690 to opportunity best. Authentic community engagement is grounded in building relationships
691 based on mutual respect and that acknowledge each person’s added value to the developing
692 solutions. – *Voices for Racial Justice*
693
- 694 • Community engagement is a process that includes multiple techniques to promote the
695 participation of residents in community life, especially those who are excluded and
696 isolated, by engaging them in collective action to create a healthy community. - *Building*
697 *the Field of Community Engagement*
698
- 699 • Community engagement is the process of working collaboratively with groups of people
700 who are affiliated by geographic proximity, special interests or similar situations with
701 respect to issues affecting their well-being. - *The Centers for Disease Control and*
702 *Prevention (CDC)*
703
704

705 **Community Organizing**

- 706 • The process by which people are brought together to act in common self-interest,
707 empowering all community members with the end goal of resolving specific issues and
708 distributing power equally throughout the community. - *adapted from Changemakers*
709

710 **Civic Engagement or Civic Participation**

- 711 • Individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern.
712 Civic engagement can take many forms – individual volunteerism, volunteering on city
713 commissions and committees, involvement with neighborhood groups or other non-profit
714 civic organizations, and/or organizational involvement for electoral participation. It can
715 include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a

716 problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy. – *American*
717 *Psychological Association*
718

719 **Principles of Authentic Community Engagement**

- 720 • Honoring the expertise in the community. Communities have the knowledge, experience
721 and capacity to identify challenges and to be a part of solutions.
- 722 • Commit to communities. Ensure that engagement efforts leave the community better. Stay
723 in it for the long term.
- 724 • The goal of authentic community engagement is to work WITH communities NOT FOR,
725 on behalf of, or to do things TO communities
- 726 • Understand the historical context in which previous attempts of engagement have
727 been occurring. What are the stories of success, lessons learned, barriers, and
728 tensions?
- 729 • Immerse yourself in the community, “establish relationships, build trust, work with
730 the formal and informal leadership, and seek commitment from community
731 organizations and leaders” to co-create (create together) solutions.
- 732 • They should be intentional in addressing power imbalances especially those affecting the
733 ability of the community to act as an equal partner.
- 734 • Recognize, respect and appreciate the diversity/differences within and across communities.
735 Awareness of the factors impacting communities’ ability to exercise their power (like
736 historical trauma, oppression, disenfranchisement, etc.) must be intentionally addressed
737 while co-creating, planning, designing, and implementing approaches to engage a
738 community.
- 739 • Expect tension. Authentic engagement is not necessarily easy or peaceful.

740
741 Commissioner Gardella asked how the Commission would like to proceed and what would be
742 helpful for them to know and do in terms of these definitions.

743
744 Commissioner Adedayo stated she appreciated the distinction between civic engagement and
745 community engagement because they are very similar and she did not realize how distinct they
746 actually are. She really liked how Voices for Racial Justice approaches the definition as well as
747 | Building the Field of Community Engagement, which is an initiative of ~~and not to~~ Nexus
748 | Community Partners. Commissioner Gardella stated in full disclosure, Nexus Community
749 | Partners is the organization she works for and Building the Field of Community Engagement is
750 | part of her work.~~part of her Organization and part of her work.~~ Commissioner Adedayo thought
751 they were both really great.

752
753 Commissioner Grefenberg asked for clarification on which items Commissioner Adedayo liked.
754 Commissioner Gardella indicated the items were 2 and 3.

755
756 Commissioner Adedayo supported moving forward a hybrid of both of those, including language
757 around what communities are traditionally excluded or marginalized. They should get
758 mentioned because then there is an understanding of who it is they really want included.
759 Commissioner Gardella thought that was an excellent point as traditionally, community
760 engagement has been oriented towards under-represented communities and marginalized

761 communities. It has a lot to do with equity and sharing power. She stated naming that and being
762 explicit about that feels right to her.

763

764 | Commissioner Grefenberg ~~stated said on a concurrent way concurrently~~ the Neighborhood
765 Association Task Force has been discussing civic engagement and what it means. Last night it
766 adopted, for working purposes, the definition noted at the bottom of page one, continuing on
767 page two. That ~~also~~ was the very definition Civic Engagement Task Force, the precursor to the
768 Commission, they had developed a few years ago at an earlier Task Force. This definition was
769 also used when they were considering creating a community engagement commission. He
770 thought ~~it~~ defining community and civic engagement was primarily the decision of the
771 Commission but the Task Force was using the one at the bottom of the page one.

772

773 Commissioner Adedayo stated her only thought on that is based on the distinction he provided,
774 Community Engagement is more long term relationship building with neighborhood
775 | organizations. They and are there for forty-fifty or more years and their particular issues they
776 organize around in that time span, such as getting a sidewalk or transit system, after the people
777 are done organizing around that issue the relationship continues because of the aim of the
778 organization.

779

780 Commissioner Grefenberg thought it was also when the Council, over a year ago, discussed the
781 creation of this group, largely the work of Councilmembers Wilmer Willmus and Deliberty
782 Laliberte and they chose the term Community Engagement. He personally thought it was to
783 recognize the broader nature of community engagement though many of their projects would
784 probably fall under civic engagement. He stated during the discussion last year among the Task
785 Force he had done a research on those terms leading up to their decision. He asked to distribute
786 the research to the Commission. He thought Commissioner Sanders would agree that during the
787 discussion at a Council retreat last February, Councilmember use them interchangeably, which
788 he thought caused confusion.

789

790 Commissioner Grefenberg stated his only suggestion is they add something on the background
791 for this discussion; on this and his only point was he found it easier ninety percent of the time to
792 describe; community engagement is as a broad term which encompasses civic engagement but
793 he was also open to making the distinction that was in the manner articulated tonight. He
794 indicated he was not sure but for him it would be an easier way of stating what they are doing by
795 saying civic engagement is a form of community engagement.

796

797 | Commissioner Grefenberg thought it might be useful, if and when they develop to recognize that
798 the word terms are distinct, but he thought it helps with the understanding to see it as a civic
799 engagement as a specific type and the additional things on page two of his handout under civic
800 engagement, the two bullets are not critical. He thought those are more descriptive on and
801 anecdotal types of things and he did not think they needed to include those. Chair Becker
802 thought they were more rationale for why they would want to do it. Commissioner Grefenberg
803 agreed.

804

805 Commissioner Grefenberg stated his suggested changes are to recognize the confusion, the
806 Council citywide, and in some way recognize that most people use them interchangeably but
807 they are different and civic engagement in some ways is a specific form of community
808 engagement.

809
810 Chair Becker thought if one of those sections was rationale and the beginning part is somewhat
811 of a preamble. He stated the one he found most interesting to talk about is civic engagement
812 being a subset to community engagement.

813
814 Commissioner Gardella stated she was ~~going off working under~~ the assumption that it was
815 important for them as a Commission to have a definition or ~~to~~ have some language that
816 distinguishes the two considering they are called the Community Engagement Commission and a
817 lot of their work is around civic engagement. ~~She saw their role as helping and that they could~~
818 ~~help sort of~~ clarify some of ~~current discussion~~that, not just for the Council, ~~but for they do it~~
819 ~~themselves at the Commission table~~ and others ~~do it~~ as well. It is just common and happens all
820 of the time. She stated if ~~others agreed with that, and if so, that is agreed that is what it~~ is
821 important for them to have ~~then the~~ conversations about what sounds and feels right, given their
822 work, what language does not feel right, what questions they have about that and then making
823 sure it matches up and aligns with what they are charged with doing. She thought that was
824 another important part of the piece.

825
826 Commissioner Manke thought both Commissioners ~~Adedayo Grefenberg~~ and Gardella had a
827 really good handle, being their backgrounds and she would be fine with letting them come up
828 with something more definite or formal for the Commission to look at. Commissioner Sanders
829 indicated she was taking it all in at this time.

830
831 Chair Becker agreed with Commissioner Adedayo and liked bullet points two and three because
832 they get at the root of the relationships. Bullet points one and four do have value because they
833 define a certain amount of scope in that the first bullet point not only talks about people living
834 ~~here~~ but also people working here and he thought they should incorporate that somehow in the
835 definition. He also thought there is a certain amount of geographic proximity so communities
836 are bound not only by social strata or ethnic or racial backgrounds or nationalities but also by
837 geography. Whatever definition they do, he would like to see that incorporated into it.

838
839 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~stated~~ said he saw a distinction from the draft from Commissioner
840 Gardella and his background draft and thought both were important. ~~and H~~he would like
841 Commission consideration to include the background to show why they are discussing this
842 because this will be something eventually the Council will see. The other thing is the definition
843 of community because he thought the term community included more than a geographical are,
844 but groups such as there was the ~~communities~~ of faith and of color ~~and~~ he thought it may be
845 useful to recognize that fact. He thought that might be useful to explain that community means
846 different things to different people. Commissioner Gardella thought her bullet point four
847 covered that item.

848

849 Commissioner Gardella thought they could make sure there is some kind of sentence about that
850 when they come to the point of adoption of the definition. Commissioner Grefenberg agreed.

851

852 Commissioner Grefenberg stated he was very interested in the item on the second page of
853 Gardella's draft, the Pprinciples of Aauthentic Community Engagement; ~~and~~ he thought it has
854 some relevance of the work of the Task Force as well.

855

856 Commissioner Gardella ~~stated what~~ she understood ~~was that~~ it would be helpful to have a
857 definition of community engagement and a definition of civic participation, ~~and maybe~~ there
858 ~~may be are~~ some bullets of rationale of why those particular pieces of work are important. She
859 stated she was going to disagree with Commissioner Grefenberg on adopting his background
860 piece and did not think for the purposes of their Commission ~~that was relevant, and why they are~~
861 ~~doing it to clarify is not really what their motivation is.~~ She thought ~~what~~ their motivation was
862 this is their work and they need to be clear about what it is that they are saying their work is. She
863 would like to offer some language, a different background or preamble or something.

864 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~stated said~~ he heard her point. He stated he liked the principles and
865 thought it might be useful to include them in the final document.

866

867 Chair Becker asked how much the principles hinge on the definitions they pick or what her
868 motivation was. Commissioner Gardella stated ~~in some ways the motivation was in part some~~
869 ~~ways~~ the principles ~~help articulate think help sort of further articulate~~ the distinctions. That
870 might help give some examples or ways to see the differences. What she would not be very
871 expert at is coming up with a set of principles for civic participation and she would look for help
872 with that.

873

874 Chair Becker thought as they discuss this further they will determine what exactly the
875 relationship between the two definitions is. He stated he did not have an opinion yet but thought
876 at some point this will become more of a living document. Commissioner Gardella imagined
877 this being posted on their webpage.

878

879 Commissioner Manke stated this is originally what the Council came up with and then the
880 Commission has kind of already done this. She wondered how any of those things come into
881 this. Commissioner Gardella stated it is a little tricky and a lot of their priorities are more civic
882 engagement than they are community engagement. She thought there is great possibility with
883 the Advocates for Human Rights proposal, depending on how that is constructed and how that
884 process develops, ~~to. That could~~ be a really good community engagement strategy. The work
885 ~~and~~ could be designed with listening sessions with the community and underrepresented groups
886 to get feedback on specific questions or just to be open to hearing what people have to say. The
887 caveat to that is they have to have some confidence or some assurance that where that
888 information goes in the City, there is some response to it. She did not know how to do that.

889

890 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~stated said in Commissioner Gardella's earlier remarks~~ what he
891 thought was missing ~~in Commissioner Gardella's earlier remarks, which at times, the~~
892 ~~Neighborhood Association Task Force has addressed, and was included in their original Task~~
893 ~~Force report from three years ago is was~~ an item she had referred to ~~that as~~ public participation

894 | communicates to participants how their input affected the final decision. In a separate document,
895 | he would like the Commission to come up with core values of public participation.

896 |
897 | Commissioner Gardella thought what he presented could be the basis for the list of the civic
898 | engagement principles. Commissioner Grefenberg indicated that document has been vetted by
899 | the City of Minneapolis and this organization and he has seen it in a couple of other cities but he
900 | thought it would be useful. He especially liked what she said about ~~outout in order to~~ civic
901 | participation ~~it~~ requiring ~~es~~ that the deciding body, whether it is County, City or a Commission,
902 | communicates back to the participants ~~who gave the original input~~, how or whether their input
903 | had any impact.

904 |
905 | Chair Becker thought they should frame the definitions and make a couple of core principles
906 | would make sense to start with but there will be additional work needed to frame out how it is
907 | they form their priorities so there will be ample time for the next level down.

908 |
909 | Commissioner Manke stated if something changes with the other Commission (Human Rights)
910 | and they were to combine, it is a constantly moving, evolving thing so she did not know if they
911 | could always lock themselves into one thing.

912 |
913 | Commissioner Adedayo stated the Met Council recently revised their public participation plan,
914 | which could be a really awesome tool in developing their principles and guidelines as well. She
915 | stated she saw the first priority of developing neighborhood associations as more community
916 | engagement because they are longer term. She think there are issues neighborhood associations
917 | work on but that relationship is established that they do not break apart when the issue goes away
918 | so she thought that could be one of the areas where they really infuse some of their community
919 | engagement principles definitions.

920 |
921 | Commissioner Gardella thought for the Commission the community and civic engagements are
922 | clearly connected so where one supports the other Roseville U could be a wonderful tool to use
923 | and there are different ways these two could serve each other.

924 |
925 | Chair Becker agreed most of the items for this year are civic engagement items but they will be
926 | coming up with a list for next year so they could change that.

927 |
928 | Commissioner Gardella recapped what the Commission discussed and indicated what the
929 | Commission still needed to work on.

930 |
931 | **Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

932 |
933 | Chair Becker indicated he did not have any items to discuss.

934 |
935 | **Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

936 |
937 | Chair Becker stated thought they would have a full agenda in August because they will need to
938 | prepare for the Council meeting and he thought it would take up a large block of their meeting

939 depending on discussion. If they are expecting the Neighborhood Association Task Force report,
940 they may want to ~~acknowledge-introduce~~ it and ~~review-digest~~ it at a future meeting.

941

942 Commissioner Adedayo asked for clarification on what the Council joint meeting will include.

943 Chair Becker explained the reason for the joint meeting.

944

945 Commissioner Gardella stated Commissioner Sanders and herself will be meeting with the

946 Advocates next week and will have a more revised agenda or proposal for the Commissioner to

947 ~~talk about-discuss; and~~ then the Neighborhood Association Task Force Report -will be another

948 ~~bulk of-work item; and~~ it seems like those are the biggest pieces to report to the Council and the

949 other three are just updates, she concluded.

950

951 **Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**

952

953 The Commission recapitulated the Commission actions taken at the meeting.

954

955 **Adjournment**

956

957 Commissioner Manke moved and Commissioner Adedayo seconded a motion to adjourn.

958 **Motion passed unanimously.** Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

959

**Roseville Neighborhood Association Task Force
Summary of Topics to Be Included in Final Report
For Community Engagement Commission Meeting on July 9, 2015**

Charge: Make recommendations for the City to encourage and facilitate the formation of Neighborhood Associations

- 1) What are the purposes of a Neighborhood Association?
- 2) What are the benefits of Neighborhood Associations?
- 3) Should the City adopt Neighborhood Association Policy guidelines for residents? (Includes whether the City should recognize Neighborhood Associations and expectations for Neighborhood Associations)
- 4) How can the City encourage and facilitate Neighborhood Associations?

Charge: Make recommendations for the City to foster and facilitate effective and authentic neighborhood participation in civic decision-making

- 5) What should be the expectations for communications from the Neighborhood Associations to the City?
- 6) What should be the expectations for communications from the City to the Neighborhood Associations? (Includes opportunities for City government and Neighborhood Association interaction)

Incorporation of Commission Feedback

- Distinction between homeowners association and neighborhood association
- Definition of civic engagement
- Inclusion of renters and business owners
- Integration of Neighborhood Associations into City's notification process

Correction to the May 20th Task Force Meeting Notes submitted to the Community Engagement Commission in their packet of June 11, 2015, agenda item 5.a.i.1, (page 19 of packet).

Submitted by Lisa McCormick

CORRECTION; Strike entire comment in red: Discussion: Lisa McCormick asked for a show of hands on whether those present agreed with the redrafted Core Values document she and Diane had produced over a month ago. Three of those present indicated they did not support the redraft, especially its reference to 'deference given to Citizens' requests'.

REPLACE WITH: “Relating to the comments on consensus, Lisa McCormick raised a prior issue relating to the use of the word “deference” in requesting that NAs be afforded additional consideration when making requests on behalf of their neighborhood. Gary Grefenberg indicated that in his opinion, it was the wrong word. The question was asked whether others felt similarly and of the five present, Jerry Stoner and Donna Spencer agreed they had a reaction to the word without further elaboration other than Donna saying she thought it was too strong a word.”

[By way of further explanation, Ms. McCormick’s stated intention and use of the word “deference” was to convey the concept that those most affected by a decision should have the greatest say in it.]



Roseville Neighborhood Association Task Force Final Report to the Community Engagement Commission August 5, 2015

Introduction

This report summarizes the deliberations and recommendations of the Roseville Neighborhood Association Task Force. The Task Force was formed under the Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC). The charge of the Task Force, revised and finalized at the May 15, 2015 Commission Meeting, was to explore ways and make recommendations for the City to 1) encourage and facilitate the formation of neighborhood associations and 2) foster and facilitate effective and authentic neighborhood participation in civic decision making. The Task Force was established to be an initial, short-term effort related to advancing neighborhood associations in the city of Roseville. Ultimately, the Task Force held nine meetings over the course of five months, between March 11, 2015 and August 5, 2015.

The Task Force began with ten members with Gary Grefenberg, a member of the CEC, serving as convener. At the second Task Force meeting, Gary Grefenberg asked the Task Force to confirm his role as a co-chair and add another Task Force member as co-chair. The Task Force selected Gary Grefenberg and Donna Spencer as its co-chairs. At the seventh meeting of the Task Force on July 10, 2015, Gary Grefenberg voluntarily resigned as co-chair and was replaced by Jerry Stoner.

One Task Force member, Kody Thurnau, attended only the first two meetings, and over time, three people resigned from the Task Force. The final members of the Task Force and contributors to this report include: Gary Grefenberg, Diane Hilden, Sherry Sanders (CEC member), Donna Spencer, Jerry Stoner, and Amy Zamow. Members who resigned include Marcia Hernick, Lisa McCormick, and Peggy Verkuilen. Following her resignation, Lisa McCormick continued to attend meetings and provided public comment on this report. This document was approved by all five members present at the final August 5, 2015 meeting.

This report is divided into seven sections. First, it provides definitions that informed the discussions of the Task Force. The report then includes sections on the purposes and benefits

of neighborhood associations, city recognition of neighborhood associations, ways in which the city can encourage and facilitate neighborhood associations, and two-way communication between the city and neighborhood associations. Task Force members did not necessarily agree on all topics and, for this reason, this report indicates areas where further consideration by the CEC is recommended. Also, it is important to note that this report does not go beyond neighborhood associations and address other ways that the City of Roseville could facilitate neighborhood participation in civic decision-making.

General Definitions Informing Task Force Deliberations

What is Civic Engagement: Three years ago, the Civic Engagement Task Force (precursor of the CEC) defined Civic Engagement as follows:

*"Individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civic engagement can take many forms— volunteering on city commissions and committees, involvement with neighborhood groups or other non-profit civic organizations, and/or organizational involvement for electoral participation. It can include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy."*¹

What is a Neighborhood Association? A voluntary neighborhood-based group of residents within a specific geographic area who come together to protect, preserve, and enhance the livability of their neighborhood.²

Who is a Neighbor? Residents who either own or rent within a neighborhood. Some neighborhood associations may choose to include local business owners who operate businesses within the designated neighborhood area.³

Purposes of Neighborhood Associations

The purposes of a particular neighborhood association are determined by an association. Generally speaking, the following are purposes commonly identified by many neighborhood associations. The listing herein is not meant to be prescriptive or exhaustive but to serve as guidelines for existing or future Roseville neighborhood associations.

Neighborhood associations:

1. Build a sense of community and a culture of neighborliness;
2. Involve residents in their democratic forms of government;
3. Promote social activities of varied interest to residents;
4. Maintain and enhance the quality of neighborhood life and safety;

¹ American Psychological Association: <http://www.apa.org/education/undergrad/civic-engagement.aspx>

² NOTE: A neighborhood association should not be confused with a homeowner's association (often referred to as a HOA). A neighborhood association is a voluntary association formed around a particular community issue or interest. In contrast, a homeowner's association requires mandatory membership and arises out of ownership in a common-interest community, e.g., condominium, townhome, or other planned development. Such homeowner's associations deal primarily with financial obligations relating to the common property interest, e.g. maintenance and repairs, provided services, etc.

³ There was a public comment in disagreement with whether business owners should be included in neighborhood associations.

5. Provide the means by which issues and concerns of a neighborhood can be more effectively expressed and communicated, thus serving as a vital link between local government (City Council, Departments, and City Commissions, as well as School District and County government) and the neighborhood;
6. Promote community and civic engagement by presenting opportunities for resident involvement;
7. Assist staff in disseminating timely and understandable information to provide for informed resident participation in government decision-making and planning, thus gaining better acceptance and understanding of government decisions; and
8. Function as a liaison enabling two-way communication between neighborhoods and government entities on matter of interest such as zoning changes, redevelopment projects and their neighborhood impact, park projects and Comprehensive Plan amendments as well as other planning efforts.

Benefits of Neighborhood Associations

Neighborhood associations are one of many ways in which the City connects with its residents in the development and implementation of policies, programs, and services. Associations also encompass the process of communicating and working collaboratively with citizens and other stakeholders in balancing various interests and issues affecting their lives and neighborhood.

We recommend that the City recognize that neighbors can sometimes better understand and communicate their neighborhood's issues and concerns to City Hall, especially in a suburb that does not have ward representation.

Neighbors are often in a better position for raising the right issues and asking the relevant questions concerning a neighborhood. Their involvement and collaboration in civic decision-making provide City staff and officials an opportunity to answer their concerns and address their issues. Community members can also provide a valuable source of expertise to influence government decisions that improve neighborhood quality of life and delivery of public services. Neighborhood associations are an important means to facilitate and encourage neighbors to become involved in their community and engaged in local government and to improve communications between residents and their government.

Potential benefits of neighborhood associations and their involvement in a collaborative decision-making process include:

1. Provides residents a means to express a unified and collective voice;
2. Increases residents' overall awareness of issues, decisions, and other issues that affect the neighborhood and the City;
3. Offers opportunities for local government officials, developers, and residents to prioritize important projects, development, and planning and for the City and developers to solicit input from residents before development plans are finalized and before City approval is secured;
4. Allows the development of better and more creative ideas and solutions and encourages thinking 'outside the box';
5. Instills a climate of respect and acknowledgement of the interests of various participants, staff, and decision-makers;

6. Facilitates the resolution of neighborhood issues within the neighborhood: provides City officials and staff a better understanding of what are the issues neighborhood residents are concerned about;
7. Improves buy-in and acceptance of outcomes and improves confidence in the process leading to an increase in sustainable decisions and greater resident satisfaction with the City's decision-making process;
8. Engenders trust between citizens and local government;
9. Improves the City's access to the expertise of its citizens and expands the capabilities of existing city staff;
10. Nurtures the potential pool of informed and engaged candidates for Commissions and other volunteer efforts in the city; and
11. Assists seniors and elderly desiring to age in place an additional sense of connectedness and support.

City Recognition of Neighborhood Associations

The Task Force recommends that Neighborhood associations *have the opportunity to register with and be recognized by* the City. Further, the Task Force recommends that standards for Neighborhood association recognition be limited to a set of minimal requirements to allow for variation in associations across the City. It is important to note that the Task Force believes that not all Neighborhood groups should be required to be recognized. Instead recognition is suggested for groups that want to participate in the communication expectations and/or receive support from the City as described below.

While each recognized Neighborhood association will determine its own purpose, priorities, structure, level of formality, and level of activity, this Task Force recommends the following minimal standards for associations recognized by the City:

- Association name and contact information: The association will provide the City with the name of the association and the contact information (name, phone number, email address) for the primary association contact(s) to facilitate efficient two-way communication between the City and the neighborhood association.
- Association geographic boundaries: Each association will work with the city to recommend and determine its own geographic boundaries. The association will provide the City with an adequate description of the neighborhood. This description will identify the specific streets that form the boundaries of the neighborhood. The Task Force recommends that further consideration be given to the appropriate size of neighborhood associations when determining boundaries.
- Communication to members: The association must identify at least one pre-determined approach for communicating to its members (e.g., email, postal mail, phone) and will commit to communicating with its members when the City sends notices to the neighborhood association.
- Inclusiveness: The association will commit to being inclusive of residents within the neighborhood, with voluntary membership open to both home owners and renters in the area. The association will determine whether it would like to include businesses as part of its association.⁴

⁴ Supported by all five members present at the July 22nd meeting.

- Anti-Discrimination: The neighborhood association does not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, place of residence, disability, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, gender, sexual orientation, veteran status, pregnancy, age or any other class protected by local, state or federal law.⁵

Other neighborhood association recognition criteria considered by the Task Force but not yet agreed upon are the following:

- Communications about the City: The association will commit to encouraging its membership to become involved in community engagement and civic activism.
- Association Organization: The association will submit with its application its bylaws or a statement of its purposes, a description of its process including any membership requirements and standards of appropriate conduct, its structure, and its method of governance.
- Annual meeting: The association will hold at least one meeting of the general membership per year.

One advantage of requiring recognition criteria is that they facilitate awareness and understanding of the association by the City, they facilitate city/neighborhood two-way communication, and they can promote important City values (e.g., inclusiveness). A disadvantage is that too many criteria or too strict of criteria could unnecessarily inhibit the formation and variation in neighborhood association purposes, priorities, formality, structure, and activity level. The Task Force recommends that further consideration be given to recognition standards for neighborhood associations by the CEC, including whether only one association per geographic area is recognized.

Recognized neighborhood associations and unrecognized neighborhood groups are not administrative or legislative bodies. Both types of entities will not be assumed to speak on behalf of all residents in its neighborhood. Both types of entities are voluntary, and no resident will be required to participate. Both types of entities will not limit the ability of any individual resident or group to participate in the local civic process on their own. Communication with a recognized neighborhood association will not replace the City's methods of communicating with City residents.

How the City of Roseville Can Encourage and Facilitate Neighborhood Associations

To **encourage** the formation of neighborhood associations and other neighborhood groups, the Task Force recommends that the City of Roseville provide the following:

1. Space on City website in "Resident Resources" under "Neighborhood Associations" offering a list of associations with contact names, email addresses, phone numbers, and an interactive map of geographical boundaries of each association along with the lead of each association;

⁵ Supported by all five members present at the July 22nd meeting. This text is modified from Roseville's official non-discrimination commitment.

2. Neighborhood association news featured in City News and on the City website of upcoming events and activities, as requested by individual associations; and
3. A how-to document or tool kit which supplies a neighborhood that is looking to form an association with an explanation of how to form a recognized neighborhood association.

To **facilitate** neighborhood associations that choose to be recognized (see above) by the City of Roseville, the Task Force recommends that the City provide the following:

1. Neighborhood associations can reserve and use space for meetings with scheduling of city and park buildings at no charge.⁶
2. Upon the request of a neighborhood association, the City will pay for and coordinate a neighborhood mailing notifying residents of information about the association at least once a year.
3. The City will develop and maintain a list of City resources such as Staff and Officials who can speak on community policing, safety issues, fire safety, common ordinances, city codes, building applications, land use applications, and other issues of neighborhood interest for the purpose of community education.
4. The City will designate a staff liaison to serve as a source of information available for residents interested in forming or joining a neighborhood association and for existing neighborhood associations.
5. The City will develop, maintain, and provide information about existing funding and grants for neighborhood associations.
6. The City will establish funds or grants available to neighborhood associations to assist in City-approved projects for neighborhood improvement, beautification, education, community-wide events, and other neighborhood activities.⁷
7. The City will provide a website or similar function to which the neighborhood association can provide content.

The above recommendations are an outgrowth of the City of Roseville's renewed commitment to community and civic engagement. Further study is recommended to explore how the City can continue to cultivate a change in culture that promotes community and civic engagement. Topics for further study include how to consult on upcoming projects, policies that increase transparency, and notifying associations of relevant documents relating to particular community issues.

City Expectations of Communications from Neighborhood Associations

A Neighborhood association, as any resident, has a variety of methods of communicating with the city. They can visit City Hall to meet with staff members. The City website also includes the phone numbers and email addresses for all City staff, and neighborhood associations can schedule meetings with staff. Neighborhood associations can also communicate with the City Council and Commissioners, directly by offering public comment at Council or Commission meetings or by sending emails. Members of the City Council and all Commissions have contact information, typically email addresses, available on the City website. There are also contact forms that can be filled out which will be communicated to the Council members or

⁶ Priority scheduling should be given to the association where appropriate.

⁷ One Task Force member had reservations about this item in its final form.

Commissioners. Last, a Civic Engagement Module, developed by the CEC, will soon be online and will provide another method of contact.

In communicating with the City on behalf of a neighborhood association, the association will:

1. Clearly identify that communication is coming from the neighborhood association;
2. Acknowledge that some communications to the city are considered Public Record;
3. Allow their opinions and comments to be incorporated into the Request for Council Action, to be included in the Council meeting packet prior to the Council meeting at which the relevant agenda item will be discussed; and
4. When providing public comment during a City meeting as a representative of a neighborhood association, be allowed additional time beyond the customary 5 minutes allotted per resident.

Neighborhood Association Expectations of Communications from the City

1. When a department or individual is communicating with a neighborhood association they shall:
 - a. Clearly identify itself/themselves and
 - b. Provide clear contact information.
2. The Task Force recommends that the City integrate the neighborhood associations into its normal notification process. Some suggestions for points of integration are (but not limited to):
 - a. Neighborhood associations shall be added to the City's database of parties requesting notifications.
 - b. When sending out communication based on geographic boundaries, the City should send that communication to any neighborhood association which covers at least a part of that geographic area.
 - c. The city should communicate regular broadcast emails with City Council agendas for upcoming meetings to the neighborhood associations.
 - d. Requests for Commission/Council Action shall be modified to include a checkbox to indicate notification of neighborhood association of a particular proposal (i.e. development proposal, land use application, etc.), as well as provision for inclusion of the association's position on an agenda item of relevance to the neighborhood association.
3. The Task Force recommends that the city look to organize group meetings between the City Manager and all neighborhood associations. These meetings should be at least quarterly or at the request of one or many neighborhood associations. The intent is to allow neighborhood associations to gather information to disseminate to their residents to improve the efficiency of public comment and more widely distribute information to the public. The CEC and the Council should assess the effectiveness of these meetings at regular intervals.
4. The Task Force believes that the City must more clearly communicate how public comments influenced the decision making process. The Task Force is concerned that too often public comment is solicited and accepted but not referenced. When a final decision has been made, the decision maker should indicate how public and neighborhood association comments affected the decision. If the eventual action differs

from the desire of the neighborhood association, some explanation should be made as to why.

5. If a neighborhood association gathers information from their members and presents it to the Council, the Task Force recommends that the information should warrant an opportunity for discussion.

Conclusion

The Task Force appreciates the opportunity to work on the important topics of neighborhood associations and neighborhood participation in civic decision-making and to provide these recommendations to the CEC. We are available to address questions and provide additional clarifications if requested. We recommend that the CEC continues to focus on neighborhood associations and ways in which the City of Roseville can better foster neighborhood engagement.

Promoting Civic Engagement in Diverse Populations

A Proposed Collaboration between The Advocates for Human Rights and the Roseville Community Engagement Commission

The Roseville Community Engagement Commission and The Advocates for Human Rights will collaborate to host a series of Learning/Listening Events on community engagement in Roseville. These events will use The Advocates' existing expertise and resources in hosting community forums and will focus on the strategic priorities identified by the Roseville Community Engagement Commission, primarily to foster a climate of public participation, encourage community engagement and civic participation across all demographic lines.

Planning Phase (July-Aug)

The Advocates and the Community Engagement Commission will jointly decide on a series of three learning/listening events to be attended by residents and city staff. Advocates and CEC staff will design an outreach plan to bring to the events residents that do not typically participate in city events, especially renters and a wide variety of demographic groups. CEC staff, in consultation with The Advocates, will tailor the events to focus on those aspects of community engagement that are current priorities for Roseville.

Learning Events (Sept-Oct)

The Advocates and CEC will hold three learning events at locations around Roseville, beginning with an event hosted by the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association in partnership with the Karen Organization of Minnesota. Other neighborhood associations will be invited to host or co-host the subsequent learning events and other community institutions will be invited as partners to help recruit participants and promote the events.

Priorities Workshop (Nov)

After the learning events, The Advocates will provide a workshop for CEC Commissioners that will help them analyze the results of the learning events with a focus on identifying immediate next steps and future actions that would improve community engagement in Roseville.

Report Release and Celebration (Jan)

The Advocates and CEC Commissioners will write a draft report of the results from the learning events and present it to city staff and the members of city boards and commissions in an informal session that would allow city staff to respond to the outcomes of the learning events and the CEC analysis. Feedback from city staff and members of boards and commissions would be incorporated into a final report that would be presented to the city council and released publicly in a community event that would also include participants from the three learning events.

The Advocates can provide the following support free of charge:

- All promotional materials, including flyers, email text, and press releases
- All materials to be used in the learning events and workshop, including agendas, handouts, flip charts, etc.
- Professional and experienced facilitation of all events
- Drafting and editing of the report generated by the learning events and priorities workshop
- On-call advice and support of the CEC's planning and outreach efforts

The Community Engagement Commission would need to undertake the following:

- Securing venues for all events
- Providing refreshments for participants
- Targeting outreach and publicity efforts to attract a diverse group of participants (with guidance from The Advocates)
- Working with city staff to ensure that the learning events and report are relevant and useful, and that the city takes action on issues identified by participants

The Advocates for Human Rights is a nonprofit based in Minneapolis MN. We have worked on human rights issues in local communities, including immigrant and refugee rights, for over 30 years. Last year, we published *Moving from Exclusion to Belonging: Immigrant Rights in Minnesota Today*, a report that centers on the human rights of refugees and immigrants in Minnesota. The report places its findings and recommendations within the context of state, federal, and international human rights law to identify what is working to promote integration and success, what is failing, and what gaps exist in public policy. Released April 2, 2014, the report draws on nearly 200 individual interviews and more than 25 community conversations involving hundreds of people throughout the state.

As a follow up to that work, we are collaborating with communities that are working to improve the experiences of potentially marginalized residents such as immigrants and refugees on many issues, including civic engagement, housing, and education. We offer a range of resources to assist communities to meet their self-identified goals.

JOINT TASK FORCE ON ZONING NOTIFICATION

A joint task force of the Roseville Community Engagement & Planning Commissions

June 18, 2015, Meeting Notes

Members Present: Gary Grefenberg, Michelle Manke, Jim Daire, Mike Boguszewski (late arrival)

Members Absent: Shannon Cunningham

Staff Present: Paul Bilotta, Thomas Paschke

Gary Grefenberg opened the second Task Force meeting at 6:00pm in the Aspen Room of the Roseville City Hall. For the benefit of Jim Daire, who was attending his first meeting of the joint Task Force, Grefenberg gave a brief oral summary of the Task Force's first meeting and the topics discussed at that June 18th meeting.

In addition to staff, four committee members were present: Gary Grefenberg, Michelle Manke, Jim Daire, and Mike Boguszewski.

The first topic previously discussed was how **renters could be included** in the notification process. Several challenges in accomplishing this purpose were mentioned: adequate database and database-merging; apartment numbering systems; identifying the number of units in a rental property. Renters will also need to include business entities such as commercial renters.

The second topic discussed was the **geographic area for notification**. State law requires notification of residents and businesses within a 350 foot radius of the proposed action; Roseville currently uses a 500 foot radius criterion. The third topic involve the **identification of issues or topics that trigger**, or could possibly trigger, **official notification**. Such issues or topics might also include road construction, anticipated dramatic changes in traffic, zoning changes, and notification of proposed development changes.

Also discussed at the previous meeting was the need to make sure the notification language was accessible to residents.

At today's meeting, committee members discussed the current and possibly new means of communication with the public on zoning issues: e- mail, "snail mail," notification signs on proposed project lots, applicant-sponsored open houses, and the City's recently redesigned web site. The question arose about using local newspapers, for example the Roseville Review, as a vehicle for notification.

Paul Bilotta told of a recent call he'd gotten from a neighborhood association chair who called to ask why they had not been notified of a commercial parking lot resurfacing project a block from his/her house. The following question was discussed by the Task Force: should notification be required of everything that the city grants permits for? And, who should receive the notice?

Paul indicated that the city issues 4500 to 5000 permits a year. The question arose as to whether a building permit for a bathroom remodeling project should require notification of nearby residents or the neighborhood association. The general feeling was that it was not possible that everyone or a neighborhood could be notified of every permit-required action: there were some permit-requiring projects of a small nature, or internal to a residential structure, that need not trigger notification.

Paul suggested the following matrix regarding the scale of the project and its appropriate notification strategy:

CLASSES OF ACTIONS	NOTIFICATION STRATEGY
A. large-scale actions which may have impacts over a wide geographic area, e.g., an asphalt plant.	The scale of impacts have to be defined, possibly through an EAW-(Environmental Assessment Worksheet) type process and notification tailored to the impact area.
B. Community-wide actions such as Comprehensive Plan or special interest projects	These may require a customized notification effort.
C. Normal hearing items	Needs to include renters, potentially affected people driving by, or email lists
D. Permits of interest	Development report or email lists
E. Administrative deviation, etc.	Local notification (within 350 to 500 foot radius)
F. Low impact actions	None

The Task Force discussed Paul’s matrix as he explained it point-by-point. Paul also mentioned that city staff is looking at various permit-tracking software packages and mentioned that one of the key selection criteria is adaptability to flexible notification requirements.

Jim Daire mentioned that Minneapolis, a fully-developed city like Roseville, had adopted a community/neighborhood planning process in the 1960s which involved a significant portion of the city’s population in the planning and communication processes. He asked staff if Roseville had established or defined “neighborhood boundaries” as an aid to its planning process.

Thomas Paschke replied that the city had defined sixteen planning districts but had not defined neighborhood boundaries. Thomas mentioned that the city contained several recognized neighborhood associations, but that there were no mutually exclusive boundaries associated with these recognized neighborhood groups. Grefenberg commented that these “planning districts’ seemed to only exist on paper and that he was not aware of them ever been used in the recent past.

Paul mentioned that these planning districts used by staff and Planning Commission or the “Park Constellations” system used by Parks and Recreation staff and the Roseville Park Commission might also serve for small area planning and involvement/notification purposes.

In summary, the committee identified four groups of citizens who needed to be notified:

- Directly impacted people, including those required by state law to be notified;
- Interested people;
- People interested in tracking governmental actions; and
- Commercial interests.

IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDED POLICIES & STRATEGIES

As Recommended to the Roseville City Council on December 8, 2014

Current Status Report on Some Non-Priority Items

1) **Initiative: Involvement of Underrepresented Groups**

Current Status: *Commission Involvement Begins.* On February 12th the Commission has received a presentation from Advocates for Human Rights on Immigrants and Civic Engagement. At its April 9th meeting the Commission decided to continue to meet with Advocates and discuss a partnership to increase the involvement and participation of immigrants in the Roseville community.

It was the consensus of the Commission to enter into a partnership with Advocates for Human Rights and move forward carefully and inform the City Council of this opportunity at its joint meeting with the Commission. Commissioners Gardella and Commissioner Sanders volunteered to work with Advocates to determine appropriate programs and present these in detail to the Commission for consideration; since February they have met twice with Madeline Lohman, Program Associate at the Advocates for Human Rights.

Next Steps: At its August 13th meeting the Commission will get a report on this initiative. The Commission has not yet formally approved the specifics of this initiative so that step remains to be taken, as well as notifying the Council of this initiative.

Policy Context: Related Commission Authority, Policies and Recommendations

Pursuant to City Ordinance the Commission's charge includes: *Review and recommend ways to improve the City's public participation process and policies, **identify under-represented groups, remove any barriers, and engage and promote increased participation of all residents....***

In recognition of that charge, the Commission has adopted the following recommendations and policies:

Policy # 1.1: The City should work to enrich and strengthen civic engagement at city hall, and encourage employees and elected officials to appreciate civic engagement as an asset.

- c) Recommendation: Recognize the changing demographics of Roseville in order to understand how best to keep all Roseville residents informed and involved.

Policy # 2.1: The City should foster public participation at both the council and commission level

- d) Recommendation: Explore alternative methods to reach those who are not normally involved in civic affairs.

Policy # 2.2: The City should widely publicize openings on all commissions and ad hoc advisory groups, and encourage residents to apply.

- a) Recommendation: Encourage community engagement and civic participation across all demographic lines.

Policy 4.2: The City should invest in civic engagement training for public officials, city staff, and residents to foster a climate of public participation.

- a) Recommendation: Host annual training/conference on the latest trends, technologies, and tools uses to engage citizens. City staff shall plan and publicize the event, in collaboration with the CEC.

2) Reinstatement of the Welcome Packet for New Residents

Current Status: *No Change.* On February 12th Commissioner Mueller raised the issue of moving forward on the Welcome Packet to welcome new residents to Roseville. (In the past such a Welcome Packet had been the responsibility of the Roseville Housing and Redevelopment Agency.) Commissioner Manke and Staff Liaison Garry Bowman volunteer to assist her in this effort.

Next Steps: To Be Discussed at a future Commission meeting. At this time this project appears to be dormant.

Policy Context: Related Commission Policies and Recommendations

Policy # 7.2: The City should emphasize communications utilizing existing systems more proactively and effectively with the intention of engaging residents.

- e) Recommendation: Reinstate the “Welcome Packet” for new residents of Roseville and incorporate information needed to foster volunteerism and effective civic engagement in the “Welcome Packet.”

3) NextDoor

Current Status: NextDoor leads have met three times in order to coordinate their efforts and assist each other in following the NextDoor Guidelines and increasing participation. Initial motivation was to use the NextDoor network to foster neighborhood participation and neighborhood associations. Commissioners Grefenberg and Sanders have participated in all three meetings.

The NextDoor leads at their last meeting on May 5th approved a list of tips and suggestions for all NextDoor leads entitled *Roseville’s Next Door Did You Know Tips*

Policy Context: Related Commission Policies and Recommendations

Policy # 7.2: The City should emphasize communications utilizing existing systems more proactively and effectively with the intention of engaging residents.

- a) **✓** Recommendation: Connect Nextdoor neighborhood leads to facilitate communication between them on issues of city-wide significance.
- b) Recommendation: Devise a process for identifying, maintaining, and updating Nextdoor neighborhood leads.

Current Status: Some progress has been achieved. As referenced above, a comprehensive list of suggestions for NextDoor leads has been prepared by the leads themselves. Although Grefenberg and Sanders have participated in this effort, much of the credit for the drafting of this document should go to the leads themselves.

- c) Consider ways the City could support the efforts of NextDoor leads in disseminating information necessary for neighborhood-building efforts.

Policy # 8.1: Monitor and Evaluate the Success of NextDoor and include goal-related metrics and user satisfaction.

4) Commission Governance and Practices

aka Uniform Commission Code

Current Status: Chair has been advised that the Uniform Commission Code may be acted upon soon this spring. The Commission adopted and presented several recommended policies to the Council in its December Report to the Council. In April of 2015 Chair Grefenberg and Vice-Chair Becker met with the primary authors of the proposed Uniform Commission Code and reviewed the Commission's recommendations on these items. At the July 13th Council meeting Vice-Chair Gardella and Commissioner Grefenberg testified on the Commission's recommendations, and were well received.

Those recommendations adopted by the Council on July 20th are indicated below with a ✓ mark, as well as a few other procedural changes initiated by the City Manager with the support of the Council.

Policy Context: Related Commission Policies and Recommendations

2.1 Policy: The City should foster public participation at both the council and commission level.

Recommendations:

a.) Encourage each commission to hold community meetings.

✓ c.) Have commission meetings follow these same rules and procedures as the city council, and as described above.

Included in the recently enacted Uniform Commission code.

Rationale: The practice of a few Commissions does not make clear that public input can occur during its meeting. Once approved by the Council, the City Manager should advise all Commissions to provide for public comment before and during its meetings. Public comment during a meeting should occur before a Commission takes action on an agenda item.

Achieved: The Council in its Uniform Commission Code also included this as a requirement for all Commissions. In addition, the Code includes a

provision that minutes of Commission meetings *shall be detailed in the same way as the City Council minutes are written.*

- ✓d.) Provide direct contact information for each commission and its leadership on its web page and printed materials such as brochures.

Achieved earlier in the year by the City Manager with the support of the Council, as well as confirmed in the recently-enacted Uniform Commission Code.

- e.) Explore alternative methods to reach those who are not normally involved in civic affairs.

Progress: City Administration has initiated a focused program for working with the Karen Community on some of the issues confronting this new immigrant community. Commissioner Sanders is participating in that effort.

- f.) In so far as possible staff should advise Commissions on items on Council agenda which fall under their purview according to City Ordinance.

Rationale: Since a Commission's function is to serve as an advisor to the Council, as such it requires advance notice of a Council's deliberations in order to give timely advice.

Current Status: Considered by the proponents of the Uniform Commission Code but not included at this time in the newly-enacted code.

- ✓ **2.3 Policy:** The City should develop and enforce an absence policy for commissions.

Recommendations:

We recommend the City:

- a) ✓ Request staff report to the City Council when any commissioner misses more than four meetings in a rolling twelve month period or an equivalent maximum of missed meetings for those few commissions who meet less often.

TIMELINE: Contingent upon when the Council takes up the Uniform Standards for Commissions.

Achieved in the Uniform Commission Code passed by the Council in July, 2015. The City Ordinance now stipulated that the Staff Liaison or the Commission chair report to the Council any Commissioner missing three meetings in a rolling twelve month period, a more stringent than initially proposed by the Commission.

2.4 Policy: The City should provide opportunities for residents to learn about Commissions.

2.4.1: Prior to the annual announcement of Commission openings or at the same time, the City and the Commission should sponsor an open workshop to learn about Commissions, how and why they operate, the role of individual Commissioners, and other information on Commissions, general and specific.

2.4.2: The organization and scheduling of this workshop should be closely coordinated with Staff so that the Workshop itself should be seen as an integral part of the City's process of advertising and filling Commission vacancies.

TIMELINE: Planning and concurrence of staff and Council should be achieved by the end of February, 2015, so this workshop can be seen as a pilot project incorporated into the spring process for filling Commission vacancies.

Current Status: No progress on this recommendation at this time. Next cycle of Commission appointments will be in the early spring of 2016.

GRG: 08-06-2015

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 18

Overall, Ms. McCormick thanked the City Council for their good work.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:01 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:08 p.m.

c. Community Engagement and Human Rights Commission (HRC) Structure Discussion

Mayor Roe referenced the RCA as the City Council considered whether or not to advertise the three current vacancies on the Human Rights Commission.

City Manager Trudgeon reviewed vacancies, and parallel work being done by the CEC, providing some options for consideration. Mr. Trudgeon introduced Kari Collins, Assistant to the City Manager, and staff liaison to the HRC; noting staff liaison to the CEC, Communications Manager Garry Bowman, was also present in the audience. Mr. Trudgeon clarified that he was not advocating for any of the options; but only provided the information for the City Council to explore; and if no change was indicated at the end of those discussions, sought direction from the City Council to move forward with a future agenda action item to proceed in filling the vacancies.

Kari Collins, Assistant to City Manager/City Clerk and Staff Liaison to Human Resources Commission (HRC)

As part of this review and presentation of options, Ms. Collins advised that staff had entered into a service enterprise process and diagnostic of all volunteer opportunities in the organization, including how to grow participation, how to make service meaningful. Ms. Collins noted that this came on the heels of process in assessing the overall organization and exploring the most efficient structure.

As detailed in the RCA, Ms. Collins referenced the three options outlined by staff for consideration by the City Council. Ms. Collins noted this included the frustrations she and Mr. Bowman witness as staff liaisons to their respective advisory commissions; and parallel frustrations of commissioners who varied in their roles as “doers” versus “planners/advisors.” While opining that there were opportunities for either and/or both roles, Ms. Collins noted the frustrations of “doers” who desired to work toward a specific goal for their community; and interest of staff in minimizing struggles between “doing” and “discussing.”

Ms. Collins identified the three options outlined in the RCA and their specific advantages and disadvantages; examples from other community advisory commissions (Cities of Falcon Heights, Arden Hills, Wayzata, and Brooklyn Park) and their community engagement efforts based on the demographics for each respective community. If the City Council considered going with Option C, Ms. Collins urged them to provide greater clarify about the functions and roles; and while there are good intentions for advisory commissions to be organic, it often added to uncertainty for commissioners, subsequently leading to frustration.

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 19

If the City Council does consider a change in advisory commission structure for the HRC and/or CEC, Ms. Collins suggested allowing commissions to continue their efforts for the remainder of the year, and instate that restructuring in April of 2016 as terms expire; and given the activities scheduled by the respective commissions.

In focusing discussion, Mayor Roe suggested questions to staff at this point, and holding opinions and City Council feedback until public comment was heard to include it as part of the subsequent City Council discussion.

With respect to the HRC, Councilmember Willmus noted mention that they are a venue for human rights complaints or concerns; and asked for elaboration between the local and state human rights league; and retaining that aspect locally.

With most local human rights commissions created during the 1960's in a climate of very real human rights complaints Ms. Collins noted the local opportunities work in officially reporting those complaints to the state. However, Ms. Collins noted the State Department of Human Rights now addressed those complaints directly. Ms. Collins noted the difference in the local HRC providing an entity to voice concerns versus the more formal and intimidating prospect of complaining to the State Department; and differences in voicing those concerns in a less formal atmosphere or cultural vibe. Ms. Collins noted the local HRC can provide that opportunity to allow voicing of those concerns, and attempting to resolve those issues without the formal complaint process.

Based on her experience when serving as an HRC Commissioner, Councilmember McGehee provided an example of local mediation based on cultural differences between neighbors and how the HRC facilitated that understanding without it rising to the formal level of a complaint to the state department. Whether or not that was specifically in the purview of the HRC, Councilmember McGehee noted that the concern had been brought to the attention of the HRC and been resolved amicably.

Specific to the annual Human Rights Essay Contest, Councilmember Willmus asked about the status and interest of Roseville schools in carrying that forward.

Ms. Collins noted HRC Chair Wayne Groff's and HRC Commissioner Arlene Christiansen in tonight's audience to elaborate further if requested. Ms. Collins advised that the Human Rights League invited essay prompts annually, and this year the Roseville HRC had submitted an essay question regarding the right to vote; which had been accepted by the State League, and given the City's high involvement with the League, noted that Roseville's essay question was frequently selected for use in crafting that year's essay effort throughout participants across the state.

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 20

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Ms. Collins noted recent meetings of HRC Commissioners with Roseville Area School instructors in addressing how to fit the essay question into their curriculum. Ms. Collins noted it was often frustrating for instructors to fit it into the curriculum other than through extra credit focus.

Going back a number of years, Councilmember Willmus noted the interest and participation by numerous schools, including those from the private sector; and questioned why that was no longer evidenced, with only one school participating in the 2015 essay contest.

Ms. Collins responded that other schools were invited to participate in 2015, but had not done so. Ms. Collins opined that the HRC has found a niche in working cooperatively with instructors and their curriculum about cultural awareness and education and efforts to bring cultural understanding to the forefront. If that is a continued direction by the City Council to the HRC, Ms. Collins asked that it be clearly communicated.

If the City Council considered Option B, Councilmember Etten asked how a meeting would be structured or a year's worth of agendas to meet the different aspects of a much-broader group and much-broader interests.

Ms. Collins advised that she would recommend a larger commission; and task those participants, at a future meeting, to craft functions for greater clarity on which to focus efforts. If a 9-11 member commission was created, Ms. Collins suggested using different subgroups to address those efforts, which she recommended the City Council direct those charges with the Commission and take time to detail tangible goals versus the current generic goal to "create greater awareness to community..." If the City Council desires a cultural celebration of some variety, Ms. Collins suggested that goal be written down as a collaborative effort by residents and the City Council to develop those details beyond this initial outline represented by the RCA.

Public Comment

Wayne Groff, HRC Chair

In response to why people join the HRC, Mr. Groff noted one reason was because of their concern that people's voices had not been heard historically; and noted the distinction between the HRC and CEC on that note. Mr. Groff noted that most people groups had experienced some form of discrimination in the past; and the local HRC provided a non-threatening voice for them, providing a way to address those concerns locally versus at the state level where their complaint may not rise high enough to be addressed. As an example from his past service on the HRC in another community, Mr. Groff noted the ability to facilitate a quick resolution in providing a human face of the City and in a less formal atmosphere than

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 21

that found at a City Council meeting which many found intimidating or threatening.

Councilmember Willmus clarified that he was not seeking a reason for a local HRC, but simply what its role involved or what it did; not why, but the actual process and differentiating between the formal state level complaint process and the local complaint process.

Mr. Groff responded that the HRC could also ensure fairness in the community for those feeling they've been treated unfairly; and noted the HRC's advocacy on behalf of the Karen community in housing issues and resolving issues that could have potentially resulted in evictions. Mr. Groff opined the HRC provided an interface between the Karen community organization (KOM) and the City administration.

Mr. Groff reviewed other roles of the HRC in hosting naturalization ceremonies, the annual essay contest, and serving as advisors to the City Council. Mr. Groff noted a new youth commissioner is waiting to be sworn in, with her specific interest with the rights and public perceptions for handicapped people.

Arlene Christiansen

As the newest member of the HRC, Ms. Christiansen agreed with the separate role of the local HRC from the State; and as an immigrant, opined there was a need to understand human rights and difference in cultures; with the HRC serving as a safe place to talk about things or help others understand or be aware of issues.

In response to Councilmember Willmus regarding the annual essay contest, Ms. Christiansen provided a review of the 2016 process, and revisions to the process and information to teachers, most in response to meetings of HRC representatives and instructors regarding timing and their curriculum. Ms. Christiansen addressed relevancy of the 2016 question; and crafting of information for students and instructors to make it easier for their participation.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Ms. Christiansen confirmed that the 2016 Essay Contest will be open to all Roseville 6th, 7th and 8th graders at all Roseville Schools, whether public or private. With Councilmember Willmus' concerns regarding declining school participation, Ms. Christiansen expressed her excitement with and provided a sample of the essay contest packet recently created by the HRC for the 2016 contest – and provided to the Human Rights League for their distribution across the state – to build excitement and respond to instructor request for a concise process and information providing more inclusivity. Ms. Christiansen advised that the entry form, poster and instructions would be mailed to the principals of all public and private schools in Roseville using a mailing list provided by staff and then she would personally follow up with a phone call.

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 22

Councilmember Willmus stated his reason for pressing this issue was his observation of HRC meetings earlier in 2015 and essay contest discussions that provided conflicting information flowing back and forth.

In addressing specific logistics if the HRC and CEC is combined, Mr. Groff questioned how the HRC could get more done than currently being undertaken with constraints of time with a seven member commission of volunteers within a two hour timeframes. If that remains the expectation of a combined commission, Mr. Groff opined that was not a viable solution.

If the City Council decides on the option for one combined commission, Ms. Christiansen asked that they ensure everyone would be heard, since there were a lot of expectations and a variety of goals; and the City Council would need to be very clear as to its expectations. Ms. Christiansen opined that, with the current size of the HRC, they need to not feel they'd been swallowed up by the CEC, or no longer had a voice in whatever commission was created. Whatever a 9-12 member commission was called, Ms. Christiansen opined it was important to have it even bigger with more volunteers (e.g. 12-15 people) to allow participation in a meaningful way, while recognizing the reality that volunteers also had family and other commitments; moved, or had other changes occurring; and their time and needs should be respected. As an example, Ms. Christiansen noted the hours she had spent, in cooperation with Mr. Bowman, in creating the essay contest packet.

City Council Discussion

Councilmember McGehee noted her change in direction with this issue after listening to comment tonight. Councilmember McGehee opined that, if the City Council is serious about the civic engagement process, that process resided with the CEC. Councilmember McGehee expressed her personal value of the HRC in the annual essay contest, presenting ethnicity issues in the community as it continued to become more diverse, and having a non-threatening place to go locally for concerns. In terms of cultural awareness, whether part of Rosefest or not, Councilmember McGehee opined that while they were important programs, ethnic groups could volunteer to promote those important programs. Councilmember McGehee opined that there were two components: a policy or process component, and a community component. Councilmember McGehee opined that the things the HRC has been working on were the community engagement component; and the civic engagement component is where the City Council helped in the process and evaluation. In conclusion, Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of retaining two commissions, or Option C.

Councilmember Etten agreed that his view had shifted some; but opined these were not the only two commissions that should be under discussions; suggesting that maybe the HRC and Ethics Commission should be combined and meet quarterly with their roles and goals clearly revised. Councilmember Etten expressed his appreciation in hearing the passion and relevant ideas of the HRC; and sug-

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 23

gested reviewing and revamping how advisory commissions worked as a whole, rather than simply focusing on these two. While there may be positive reasons to combine the HRC and CEC, after hearing comments from commissioners, Councilmember Etten suggesting leaving them separate for now to see how things grew; while recognizing that maybe some other combination would allow more vitality and excitement for those volunteer participants.

While recognizing the merit in all of the options, Councilmember Laliberte expressed concern in merging the HRC and CEC. Councilmember Laliberte opined that the CEC should not have more responsibilities added to their plate by expanding membership at this time, or by increasing their scope of duties or functions, which she found unfair to them as a newly-created commission. On the other side, Councilmember Laliberte agreed to be open to look at the role of the HRC, opining that the work they did, from her perspective, was not the work of an HRC whether from a complaint-based or other scenario. While it would be great to have that in place if a complaint occurs, of course, Councilmember Laliberte opined she was their role more in the celebration, education, awareness, and diversity and sensitivity training realm. Whether called an HRC or by another name not in line with the state human rights function, Councilmember Laliberte suggested it and the Ethics Commission needed meaningful work to avoid frustration. Councilmember Laliberte suggested that clear direction be provided to any commission going forward, to make sure their charge was meaningful. While appreciating the role of the HRC in bringing the naturalization ceremony to Roseville, Councilmember Laliberte questioned if the HRC needed to continue that handholding, opining staff could potentially continue to sponsor or host it on an annual basis without the HRC owning that work. If there is still live in the annual essay contest, based on her observation and comments heard about its dysfunction in the past and Roseville being the only participate at the state level, Councilmember Laliberte stated she could support that, as long as it was recognized that the City of Roseville's role was not to support state human rights efforts. Councilmember Laliberte stated she was open to renaming two individual commissions, combining them, or changing their schedule pending on the specifics the City Council wanted each to accomplish. However, Councilmember Laliberte opined that the current "loosey-goosey" status could not continue to create frustrations for those advisors.

When creating the Finance and CEC Commissions, Councilmember Willmus noted discussions at that time included the possibility of the HRC becoming the CEC. At that time, Councilmember Willmus stated he had fought for the HRC and CEC to remain separate, with the CEC a standalone commission. Councilmember Willmus stated his further concern in overburdening the CEC as it currently exists; and his comments to staff when first discussing this was to have everyone in the room to weigh in. That said, Councilmember Willmus opined that the HRC, even when fully populated, experienced issues with materials, a lack of commitment from some commissioners making it difficult for remaining mem-

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 24

bers willing to go the extra mile and eventually and unfortunately burning out those committed commissioners. Councilmember Willmus noted the need to be cognizant of that no matter the decision made. For now, Councilmember Willmus spoke to leaving the HRC and CEC as two separate commissions; but reviewing their respective charge and scope of duties to determine what is still viable in today's reality.

Mayor Roe agreed with keeping the HRC and CEC separate, and agreed with reviewing their respective charges. When revising the HRC charge before, Mayor Roe opined that it wasn't revised enough. While also hesitant, as Councilmember Laliberte had expressed, appointing people to serve on the Ethics Commission, Mayor Roe opined it was worth looking at potential combining the HRC and Ethics Commission, and suggested deferring the joint meeting with the HRC scheduled for August to allow them to hold public and internal discussions with their new members as part of that process. Therefore, Mayor Roe agreed that it made sense to make any changes at the start of the new term in April of 2016, and continue discussion on that process later in 2015 in anticipation of that.

Councilmember McGehee noted the ability for any advisory commission in creating out-of-commission task forces as needed.

Mayor Roe referenced the Brooklyn Park model, recognizing that you don't need to be on an advisory commission to become involved as a "doer," allowing residents to determine how and where they can make their community better by ad hoc service from the aspect of volunteer coordination, which could be part of all advisory commissions.

Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of deferring the joint meeting with the HRC, and staff's recommendation to allow the HRC to complete their 2015 work. However, Councilmember Laliberte tasked the HRC with giving thought to their charge going forward or if combined with the CEC or another commission (e.g. Ethics); and expressed her concern in moving forward for the remainder of 2015 with only four commissioners on the HRC, while also expressing concern about appointing new commissioners if the HRC evolves into something else.

Mayor Roe noted the appointments are not all for full terms.

In the next agenda item working on a uniform commission code, Councilmember Laliberte suggested changing that particular HRC tonight to five members for the remainder of 2015. When talking about the scope or function of the HRC, Councilmember Laliberte noted the difference in "doers" and "advisors," but clarified that all of the commissions are intended to be advisory commissions, with the exception of the HRC wanting to be doers, and questioned if that took on some other type of format since she didn't see the HRC coming forward as other commissions did in making policy recommendations to the City Council. Councilmem-

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 25

ber Laliberte noted the care taken in creating the CEC in being clear that it was advisory on policy and process versus “doing,” and reiterating the exception with the HRC. When working on a revised scope for the HRC, Councilmember Laliberte noted the need to be aware of that distinction or history.

Councilmember Etten stated his discomfort in seating three new commissioners on the HRC if it remained up in the air; but expressed his preference in making it work short-term with those current commissioners having an understanding of the HRC and new people having a learning curve. Councilmember Etten spoke in support of deferring the joint meeting the HRC to October and look at a new process in January of 2016.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with Councilmember Etten, opining that the City Council needed to take time to identify any changes to the HRC’s charge, which would be difficult for new commissioners coming on board without having a clear direction for their role at this point.

Mayor Roe sought clarification of a technical point with City Attorney Gaughan regarding code language stating that the HRC had seven members and the current reduced level and what constituted a quorum, 3 or 4.

City Attorney Gaughan responded that it depended on the actual code language; but opined that the City Council had a mandate to fill any vacancies within a reasonable timeframe; and typically a quorum was based on the actual number of members. After further review of the code, City Attorney Gaughan noted the HRC “shall” consist of seven members, and the City Council was therefore mandated to appoint seven members.

Further discussion included vacancy timeframes and expirations of terms, with City Manager Trudgeon advising terms expired respectively in 2016, 2017 and 2018; with the result that vacancies did not need to be filled at this time if a quorum was available.

Mayor Roe opined that it made sense to not appoint new commissioners for the short-term and continue to work with those available.

Additional discussion included the historical perspective of commissioners versus those newly appointed; potential amendment of the code specific to the HRC to accommodate any quorum issues in the interim for adoption at the next meeting; and further review of specific issues by the remaining four members of the HRC at their next meeting and before the next discussion by the City Council.

Councilmember Laliberte asked the HRC to advise City Manager Trudgeon of their discussion and preferences for dissemination to the City Council.

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 26

Mayor Roe concluded that the City Council was supportive of retaining two commissions; agreed on the need to work on the duties/functions of the HRC and their title and any other issues; agreed to defer the joint meeting of the HRC and City Council; and work to resolve not filling or increasing membership until the HRC's new charge is defined.

City Manager Trudgeon expressed concern in getting that accomplished by the next meeting of the City Council; with Mayor Roe and Councilmember Laliberte strongly encouraging that be accomplished; or a special meeting scheduled if other items were also pending.

For clarity, City Manager Trudgeon reiterated the request of staff was to determine what would constitute a quorum, and how to deal with changing the specific number of commissions for a quorum.

As a second and separate piece, Councilmember Laliberte noted the deferral of the joint meeting from August to later in 2015.

d. Discuss Uniform Commission Code

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly addressed issues in developing a uniform code to governing the organizational structures for advisory commissions occurring over the last few years in attempting to consolidate common threads of regulations, resulting in the creation of a new Chapter 201 to City Code (Attachment B). As provided in current City Code, Title 2 – Commissions (Attachment A) – and the new draft (Attachment B), Mr. Trudgeon noted those additions and those areas for deletion unless statutory requirements; and thanked Councilmembers Willmus and Laliberte for their input, as well as other Councilmembers over the past few years. Mr. Trudgeon clarified that this draft is not intended for adoption tonight, and only as a starting off point for discussion and consideration of the concept of a uniform commission code.

New Chapter 201 – Advisory Commissions (Attachment B)

Councilmember Etten spoke in support of the new chapter, suggested several revisions and additional elements to the draft.

Page 2, Section 201.06: Organization

Section C: Specific to creation of committees, subcommittees and/or task forces within commissions, Councilmember Etten noted the need to differentiate between those that needed to come before the City Council for approval and those not necessary to do so.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed; opining that she saw them almost as opposites based on various comments and input to-date. However, Councilmember Laliberte suggested that the first sentence provide that differentiation with the key words,

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 27

“their own members,” with those subcommittees made up of their own commission members, and reporting to the full body.

Regarding the formation of other subcommittees or task forces, if more clarity is needed, Councilmember Laliberte suggested that prior to a commission creating a new task force, in many cases that may bring in other people without a sworn oath to work on a specific issue. Before they begin inviting the community to participate, Councilmember Laliberte suggested the commission make sure the sitting City Council is in agreement with that effort, and not created outside the purview of the commission’s charge from the City Council. Councilmember Laliberte clarified that this was the intent of the language that such initiatives be brought to a joint meeting of the City Council and commission for their direction and approval before beginning.

Mayor Roe suggested the last sentence provided that directive, “...only after approval of the City Council...” Since subcommittee are only to be made of up commission members, Mayor Roe suggested striking the second reference to “subcommittees.”

Councilmember McGehee questioned why volunteers needed to take an oath.

Mayor Roe noted this was a separate topic outside the amendments to Section 201.06.C.

Page 2-3, Section 201.06: Organization

Section D: Under the last sentence, Councilmember Etten suggested listing that sentence: “commissioners also agree to be available to residents of the city by providing a preferred phone number or email address that can be used on the city website and/or on print materials;” as a separate lettered item entitled, “Public Accessibility.”

New Section F: Councilmember Etten further questioned if there was a need to have each served by a staff liaison, since it is mentioned at one point that a staff liaison will be available, but don’t actually know who will serve that function at that point. As a new item “F” under organization, Councilmember Etten suggested stating that each commission will be served by a liaison – as a conduit – and include a definition for that liaison role in this document.

Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of having that definition included.

New Section G: Also under organization, Councilmember Etten suggested an additional item “G” regarding “New Commissioner Training,” that ensures newly-appointed commissioners will receive such training by the Chairperson and staff liaison prior to their first meeting. Councilmember Etten opined that training

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 28

could be defined later but should include conduct, topics the commission is working on, and anything else that will help bring them up-to-speed.

Councilmember Laliberte also supported that addition. Councilmember Laliberte noted training also involved annual ethics training. Councilmember Laliberte suggested adding language to include that orientation specific to that commission as a separate section of broader training for expectations in addition to ethics training.

Councilmember Willmus responded that in addition to ethics training, the training referenced by Councilmember Etten would be unique to that individual commission. Councilmember Willmus noted the need to include meeting a generic orientation for each commission, including protocol and conduct with televised meetings.

Councilmember Etten concurred, noting the intent for it to serve as an orientation for new commissioners: how to conduct business, the main items being worked on by the commission, and provided for by the chairperson and staff liaison.

Mayor Roe suggested training for specific commissions included open meeting laws, data privacy, etc.; and can be broad and cover those issues, but supported the addition of it as a new item "G" under organization.

Page 2, Section 201.04: Terms

Section B: Councilmember McGehee questioned the need for oaths; with Councilmember Laliberte responding that it was similar to those taken by the City Council.

Mayor Roe suggested adding to that section a statement, "... and standards of conduct (not yet available.)"

City Attorney Gaughan cautioned that requirements could not be created that didn't yet exist.

Mayor Roe suggested referencing when and if something exists; with Councilmember Willmus expressing the preference to amend language at that time.

Page 2, Section 201.05: Compensation

Mayor Roe noted there were times when commissioners may purchase supplies and seek reimbursement, with language stating they would serve without compensation.

City Attorney Gaughan clarified this was reimbursement, not compensation.

Page 2, Section 201.07: Meetings and Reports

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 29

Section G: Councilmember Etten questioned if the expectation for subcommittees was to record their meetings to be articulated back to the larger commission.

Councilmember Willmus opined it would be beneficial if there was informal meeting notes at a minimum, to which Councilmember Laliberte agreed.

Mayor Roe noted that if the subcommittee reported to the full body their discussion, it would be recorded in the official commission meeting minutes.

Councilmember Etten sought to ensure those noted were discussed with the full body and televised.

City Manager Trudgeon suggested additional language to Section “201.06: Organization, Item C:” to the effect that subcommittees and/or task forces will report back to the full body by extension in meeting minutes.”

Public Comment

Gary Grefenberg, 91 Mid Oaks Lane

Speaking on behalf of the CEC recommendations of 2014, Mr. Grefenberg noted that one missing item was requiring all commissions to provide for public comment.

Councilmember Laliberte and Mayor Roe referenced Section 201.07.F.

Mr. Grefenberg opined that it needed to be made clearer that it may not necessarily be related to generic public comment, but to a specific agenda issue.

Mayor Roe clarified Mr. Grefenberg’s intent for having it as a standing item on each agenda similar to that of the City Council.

Councilmember Laliberte recognized the need for two different comment sections, one calling verbally for comment at the beginning of a meeting, and then for each item; but expressed her difficulty in wording that intent.

Mr. Grefenberg opined that “...at the meeting...” seemed ambiguous, but suggested language provided more clarification as long as it was assured that public comment on each agenda item would be heard prior to them taking action on it.

Discussion ensued regarding when and how to provide for this intent, with suggestions of individual councilmember. At the conclusion, City Manager Trudgeon suggested the following language, supported by the body without opposition: “A commission must allow public comment for each agenda item and for a general time for public comment at the beginning of each meeting.”

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 30

Regarding restructuring the HRC, Mr. Grefenberg referenced language related to civic engagement.

Mayor Roe, as he had mentioned earlier, noted the need to remove that language.

Mr. Grefenberg suggested removing language from the specific HRC chapter (page 2, D.3) under “Scope, Duties, Functions,” which had been added during the time the HRC was responsible to advise the City Council on civic engagement.

Suggesting consensus of the body and expressing appreciation to Mr. Grefenberg for that point, Mayor Roe advised that, for the time being, language would remain as is as it also touched on broader things.

Mr. Grefenberg opined that much of what the City Council had accomplished was excellent, even though it was a long time coming. Mr. Grefenberg supported the need for accountability for commissioners in attending meetings; and concluded by noting the CEC recommended adoption of this document soon.

Chapter 201 (Attachment B)

Councilmember Laliberte sought assurance from her colleagues of their understanding that the new section addresses “Scope, Duties, and Functions,” and a way of operating as a general by-law for all commissions under which to operate, and would not provide separate by-laws for each group.

Councilmembers concurred with that statement.

Councilmember McGehee opined something was still needed to address conduct.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed, but admitted it was not yet available, and as noted by City Attorney Gaughan, the City Council could not adopt something not yet ready.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Councilmember McGehee agreed that she was willing to adopt this document, as revised, but wanted to ensure the other piece about conduct was not forgotten.

Public Comment

Gary Grefenberg

Mr. Grefenberg opined that the CEC oath of office didn’t refer to the duties of a commission, but instead referred to the constitution; and suggested that standard oath needed revised.

Mayor Roe corrected that the oath said: “...discharge the duties of the office of the... (e.g. CEC);” with Councilmember Laliberte and City Manager Trudgeon agreeing with that verbiage.

Regular City Council Meeting
Monday, July 13, 2015
Page 31

Individual Commission Chapters

Mayor Roe noted the need to correct each individual Chapter in reference to Chapter 201 to indicate “Chapter,” rather than “Section” in all references throughout the individual Chapters. Mayor Roe also suggested finding a better way to address that initial reference would be in Section 202.01: Establishment and Membership: by adding language such as (e.g. Chapter 202 Planning Commission): “A City Planning Commission for the City is hereby established, *[which shall be subject to Chapter 201 of this code]...*” and then striking those redline areas from individual chapters.

Chapter 205 Human Rights Commission

Councilmember Etten questioned if “Section 205.01: Establishment and Membership” was the area to add language to appoint one new commissioner; with Mayor Roe responding that added specificity.

Councilmember Laliberte noted some commission language included appointment of youth commissioners, and asked if that specificity was desired across the board.

Mayor Roe noted that Chapter 201 talked about youth commissioners for all commissions.

Councilmember McGehee opined it was dependent on the interest of students.

Discussion ensued, with the consensus to strike the entire sentence referencing youth commissioners from Chapters 204 (Parks & Recreation), 205 (HRC), and 209 (CEC), as that language was addressed in Chapter 201, Section 03.B.

Mayor Roe noted that the language stated, “may,” and therefore was not a mandate for the City Council to do so unless appropriate and applicable.

Based on the Council discussion, Mayor Roe directed staff to bring back another draft, and after discussion on the anticipated meeting to review that draft, consensus was for staff to have it available at the August 10, 2015 meeting.

e. Twin Lakes Infrastructure TIF Bonding Discussion

As detailed in the RCA, City Manager Trudgeon noted mandatory timing until September 3, 2015 for the City to spend tax increment financing (TIF) dollars in Twin Lakes District 17 at which time any future expenditures will be significantly impacted, creating the need to spend funds by that date or lose the ability to use the majority of funds going forward. Mr. Trudgeon advised that, if the City pursues the bonding process, the funds would qualify as spent. Given the tight timeframe, Mr. Trudgeon noted staff’s intent to bring this forward at the next meeting for City Council consideration for initiating the process of issuing bonds; and given the tight timeframe, it would be necessary to take action one way or another at that meeting to meet bond issue requirements.

**Roseville Community Engagement Commission
Definition of Terms for Consideration - REVISED
August 13, 2015**

PREFACE

Community and civic engagement are relevant no matter where you live. As an inner-ring suburb, Roseville has the best of urban life and suburban living, but like many other inner-ring suburbs, the City faces the challenges of rapid change, sprawl, and the growing isolation of urban and suburban culture. These challenges can be met with a strong community and civic engagement infrastructure. Engaged citizens have a stronger sense of self and of their community, and they have knowledge of and access to community networks and resources. Engaged citizens are invested in making their community the best it can be - for themselves and their neighbors.

In 2014, the Roseville City Council created the Community Engagement Commission to advise them on the effective and meaningful involvement of Roseville residents in their community, and to make recommendations, review policies and suggest strategies that will help to improve city communication and increase a sense of community. To that end, the Community Engagement Commission is adopting the following definitions and principles to serve as guides to our work and the work of the City.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community engagement is an intentional process that includes multiple strategies to promote the participation of residents in community life, especially those who are excluded and isolated, by engaging them in collective action to create a healthy community. Community is defined as those who are affiliated by geographic proximity, culture, special interests or similar situations with respect to issues affecting their well-being.

Principles/Practices of Authentic Community Engagement

- Stay in it for the long term. Community engagement is about relationships, not just issues, and relationships take time.
- Honor the expertise in the community. People are experts in assessing the long-term needs of their community and developing solutions to address their challenges.
- Work WITH communities not FOR communities. When you work with communities you help to build their capacity and leadership, and ensure that the engagement efforts leave the community better.
- Move beyond consultation or input. True community engagement goes beyond consultation to authentically facilitate community involvement in decision-making.
- Context matters. Understand the historical context in which previous attempts of engagement have been occurring. What are the stories of success, lessons learned, barriers, and tensions?
- Know the community. Establish relationships, build trust, work with the formal and informal leadership, and seek commitment from community organizations and leaders to co-create solutions.

- Be intentional in addressing power. Power imbalances will affect the ability of the community to participate and act as an equal partner.
- Recognize, respect and appreciate the diversity/differences within and across communities. Awareness of the factors impacting communities' ability to exercise their power (like historical trauma, oppression, disenfranchisement, etc.) must be intentionally addressed while co-creating, planning, designing, and implementing approaches to engage a community.
- Expect tension. Authentic engagement is not necessarily easy or peaceful.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT OR CIVIC PARTICIPATION

Individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civic engagement can take many forms – individual volunteerism, volunteering on city commissions and committees, involvement with neighborhood groups or other non-profit civic organizations, and/or organizational involvement for electoral participation. It can include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy.¹

Principles of Civic Engagement²

- Those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
- Community members are assured that their contribution will influence the decision, and will be told/shown how their input affected the decision.
- Seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
- Community members have a say in how they want to participate.
- Community members have access to the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

¹ *American Psychological Association*

² *Adapted from IAP2 USA - <http://iap2usa.org/resources/Documents/Core%20Values%20Awards/IAP2%20-%20Core%20Values%20-%20stand%20alone%20document.pdf>*



WWW.BUILDTHEFIELD.ORG

Contact: Janice Barbee, janicegwb@yahoo.com or Theresa Gardella, tgardella@nexuscp.org

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ASSESSMENT TOOL

Created by:

Building the Field of Community Engagement partners

You are free to share, copy and distribute this material. We ask that you give appropriate credit to Building the Field of Community Engagement and/or its partners.

We encourage you to share your feedback with us and tell us how you are using the tools and documents on our comment page at www.buildthefield.org.

The partners in the Building the Field of Community Engagement initiative intend these documents and tools to introduce practitioners, funders, evaluators and community members to community engagement, to give the field clarity in its language and principles. However, community engagement is not a field that can rely on written materials alone; it takes a community of experienced practitioners to support people new to the field in practicing community engagement effectively, meeting its challenges, and tapping the strengths within each unique context. We encourage you to seek out experienced practitioners to support you in implementing these tools, principles and concepts.

The partners in Building the Field of Community Engagement are available for consultation. Please contact us at www.buildthefield.org or email Janice Barbee at janicegwb@yahoo.com.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ASSESSMENT TOOL

Q: WHAT KIND OF RELATIONSHIP DO YOU HAVE WITH COMMUNITY MEMBERS?

OUTREACH	UNSURE WHICH WE ARE DOING	DOING PRIMARILY OUTREACH	BEGINNING TO TALK ABOUT MOVING TO CE	WORKING TOWARD CE	DOING CE	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships are primarily TRANSACTIONAL, for the purpose of completing a project. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships are FOUNDATIONAL, continually built between and among people and groups. Staff/institutions continually build the relationships they need to know their community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships are often NOT INCLUSIVE of all racial or cultural groups in the community. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships reflect the DIVERSITY within the community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships can be LIMITED to a few community members, often giving influence to those with the loudest voices. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships are built not just with current leaders, but also with people with an interest and/or POTENTIAL TO BE LEADERS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships are SHORT-TERM, so staff have to rebuild them as other projects or issues come up. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationships are transformational and LONG-TERM, so community leaders/members can engage in projects and issues as they come up.

Q: WHY ARE YOU ENGAGING PEOPLE?

OUTREACH	UNSURE WHICH WE ARE DOING	DOING PRIMARILY OUTREACH	BEGINNING TO TALK ABOUT MOVING TO CE	WORKING TOWARD CE	DOING CE	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To accomplish a project or a SPECIFIC GOAL defined by the organization. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To create space for people to CONNECT, RAISE CONCERNS, BUILD POWER and ACT IN THEIR OWN INTERESTS.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To SEEK BUY-IN OR APPROVAL of something the organization has already planned. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To CREATE SPACE for the community's assets to be recognized and utilized.

Q: HOW ARE YOU GETTING PEOPLE INVOLVED? WHEN?

OUTREACH	UNSURE WHICH WE ARE DOING	DOING PRIMARILY OUTREACH	BEGINNING TO TALK ABOUT MOVING TO CE	WORKING TOWARD CE	DOING CE	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary activities with community include FLYERING, SURVEYS, FOCUS GROUPS, WORKSHOPS, etc. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary activities with community include LISTENING SESSIONS, ONE-TO-ONE MEETINGS, CELEBRATIONS, LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT, COMMUNITY-BUILDING PROJECTS, etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information is given or feedback is requested AFTER A PROJECT IS PLANNED. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning is done WITH THE COMMUNITY from the beginning

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ASSESSMENT TOOL

Q: HOW DO IDEAS GET GENERATED?						
OUTREACH	UNSURE WHICH WE ARE DOING	DOING PRIMARILY OUTREACH	BEGINNING TO TALK ABOUT MOVING TO CE	WORKING TOWARD CE	DOING CE	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAFF/ INSTITUTIONS GENERATE IDEAS they think the community will support. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff/institutions SUPPORT COMMUNITY MEMBERS in generating their own ideas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff/institutions generate SOLUTIONS TO A PROBLEM they have defined. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff/institutions engage in CONTINUAL SELF-REFLECTION to respond to and incorporate people's ideas, feedback, talents, and challenges into the work.
Q: HOW DO YOUR ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES AND STRUCTURES SUPPORT ENGAGEMENT?						
OUTREACH	UNSURE WHICH WE ARE DOING	DOING PRIMARILY OUTREACH	BEGINNING TO TALK ABOUT MOVING TO CE	WORKING TOWARD CE	DOING CE	COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational culture is primarily focused on OBTAINING SPECIFIC OUTCOMES. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational culture is focused on learning and it values EMERGENT AND LONG-TERM OUTCOMES.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board and staff may NOT REPRESENT the community. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board and staff REFLECT the community.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization ADHERES TO WAYS OF OPERATING that reflect the DOMINANT CULTURE, such as using Robert's Rules for meetings, prioritizing staff to speak, etc. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization CREATES SPACE FOR DIFFERENT CULTURAL WAYS, such as offering cultural foods and social spaces/ times, giving elders a special role, etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Racism and power may not be discussed or may be DEALT WITH SUPERFICIALLY. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational culture supports discussions to UNDERSTAND AND DISMANTLE structural racism, to help heal historical trauma and to claim individual and community power.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization adheres to ORGANIZATION-DRIVEN policies and structures. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organization demonstrates a willingness to revisit organizational policies and structures to RESPOND TO COMMUNITY NEEDS AND IDEAS.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ASSESSMENT TOOL

THERE ARE MANY WAYS PRACTITIONERS AND ORGANIZATIONS CAN USE THIS TOOL:

- As an individual, to assess your strengths and areas for professional growth.
- With the staff in your organization to see where there is agreement, disagreement or tensions about your community engagement efforts.
- With board members to begin or deepen a conversation about community engagement within your organization.
- With new staff or board members to assess what skills they can contribute to your efforts to engage your community.
- To assess where an external partnership could improve community engagement by closing a gap posed by the limitations of your organization.
- To identify where staff or board members require new knowledge or training.
- To glean lessons learned after an event, project or initiative.
- With potential partners (government agencies, other nonprofits, community institutions, etc.) to assess whether your approaches are complementary.
- With community members, to assess how they see your work.

QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF OR DISCUSS AFTER COMPLETING YOUR ASSESSMENT:

- Why did you rank yourself or your organization as you did?
- Where do differences exist between your individual work and the overall work of the organization?
- What would you and/or your organization like to do differently?
- Do your responses align with your organization's mission? What changes could advance your mission?
- Where does the staff or board of the organization agree? Disagree? Where is there tension?
- Where does your organization need additional support?
- Where do you need to build the capacity of your organization?
- What are the opportunities for and challenges to doing community engagement?