

Human Rights, Inclusion and Engagement Commission
Meeting Minutes
AUGUST 15, 2018

Commissioners Present: Cat Beltmann, John Eichenlaub, Chelsea Holub, Monica Bolinger, Lauren Peterson, James Ryerson, and Etienne Djevi

Youth Commissioners: Elizabeth Hansel

Commissioners Absent: Michelle Manke (excused), and Subbaya Subramanian (excused)

Staff Present: Rebecca Olson, Assistant City Manager

Call to Order/Roll Call

The Human Rights, Inclusion, and Engagement Commission (HRIEC) meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. Ms. Olson indicated Commissioner Subramanian was excused and was his last meeting on the Commission.

Approve Agenda

Commissioner Peterson moved and Commissioner Holub seconded a motion to approve the Agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda

None

Approve Minutes

a. July 18, 2018 Human Rights, Inclusion and Engagement Commission

Commissioner Peterson stated on line 265 the word “minutes” is spelled wrong.

Commissioner Holub moved and Commissioner Peterson seconded a motion to approve the July 18, 2018 Human Rights, Inclusion and Engagement Commission meeting minutes as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

Receive Reports

Party in the Park Recommendations

Assistant City Manager Olson reported after the Commission participated in Party in the Park this past July, there were some ideas and thoughts from Commission Members on things that could be done to help engage the community. She noted Commissioner Holub put together some ideas.

Commissioner Holub presented a memo with a list of ideas with the Commission. The Party in the Park could be grown to include different types of vendors and businesses. Currently, most of the vendors are “fair food” and politicians. By expanding the pool of vendors, the City could showcase its diversity and attract a diverse crowd. The vendors could include:

- Food, international cuisine
- Beer and wine
- Art, craft, jewelry, etc
- Local businesses in general

Other events could also be added to draw different people such as:

- Bocce ball tournament
- Dog meetup or dog event
- Bands, music, or spoken word poetry geared more toward adults

Ms. Olson indicated if the Commission is satisfied with the report they may want to pass this on to the staff that help coordinate PIP.

Commissioner Djevi indicated he liked everything that was in the memo and thought at some point the Commission should have a discussion on how this should be moved into action.

Commissioner Bolinger asked if they needed to get approval before they talked to different groups about possibly engaging in that activity. She thought they could meet with the people who plan the PIP to get their feedback before moving forward.

Ms. Olson stated she could extend an invitation to those who plan the PIP to discuss how to coordinate these actions.

Chair Beltmann thought in a couple of months they could discuss this further to see how they want to be involved in PIP.

Commissioner Peterson asked if all the planning for PIP done by staff only.

Ms. Olson indicated she did not have that answer but could find out for the Commission.

Commissioner Peterson noted there is a separate group for the parade and a lot of them are volunteers, so she thought they might want to encourage some lay people in the community to help plan the PIP which might get some helpful feedback from the community as well.

Commissioner Djevi stated they could present this to the organizing committee indicating that as one of their recommendations and ask how the committee would make it work and what kind of help would they need from the HRIEC Commission.

Commissioner Peterson stated the Commission could find out if the PIP Committee is even interested in their suggestions, noting they may not be necessarily open to them and may have other ideas and plans for PIP.

Commissioner Holub stated from their discussion there might be some particular “asks” that would go to the Council. She thought it was important for the Council to know that the HRIEC Commission is doing stuff and coming up with ideas.

Chair Beltmann asked if there was some sort of consensus on how they move forward. She wondered if the Commission wanted to pass this along and see if they want help or should this be incorporated into a later work plan item.

Ms. Olson recommended passing this along to staff to get it in front of the PIP Committee before they start thinking about PIP for next year to see if this is something they are interested in and let them know the HRIEC Commission is open to discussion on how the Commission can help and assist in implementing some of the items.

Commission agreed with Ms. Olson.

Commissioner Djevi thought they should ask for feedback and find out when the Commission should expect to hear back from the Committee, so they can note at least if the chapter of work can be closed or what else would need to be done.

Ms. Olson thought that was an excellent point and would include that. She indicated she would be happy to follow up on this and report back to the Commission.

Commissioner Eichenlaub thought they should give them a month for a decision.

Chair Beltmann stated later in the meeting there will be discussion regarding a calendar she put together for items to be discussed and future deadlines and she put for January 2019 they should start discussing PIP and thought they might want to discuss this question at that time.

Commissioner Peterson thought if the Commission was going to help plan for some of the PIP events it should be before January.

Ms. Olson thought it might be a question for the PIP Committee to find out when they start planning next years PIP. She indicated she would find out and follow up with the Commission.

Youth Commissioner Report

Youth Commissioner Hansel reported the Teens for Human Rights Club at Roseville is gearing up for the upcoming school year. She noted they are brainstorming new ideas.

New Business

a. Presentation on City Demographics

Ms. Olson gave a presentation on City demographic data. She stated this data is the most recent data they have which is two years old. She thought when they are thinking about designing their best practices for engagement, they must keep checking in because what they did last year may not be what they should do this year.

Commissioner Peterson agreed and said as their population changes and grows or decreases, they should also go along with that as best they can.

Commissioner Djevi thanked Ms. Olson for putting the presentation together. He stated it looks like SE Roseville is one area in the City that needs some attention. He would not present it as a problem but as an opportunity to improve people's lives as opposed to looking it as a problem they should shy away from.

Ms. Olson stated the City Council has identified SE Roseville as a priority and is included in their Policy Priority Plan (PPP Plan), and there are a lot of things they are working on in trying to focus on that.

Chair Beltmann stated it is interesting because she lives in that area and there are pockets in that area that are shifting the information Ms. Olson has provided to them.

Ms. Olson indicated the information will change and has changed but she has not gotten new information yet.

Commissioner Djevi asked how they are going to use this information going forward as far as the work they do.

Commissioner Peterson thought it might be important as they develop their outreach, best practices, to have a primer to that of broad overviews of their demographics with places more information can be found, and highlighting a couple of items the Commission feel might be important depending on the engagement effort and where they are planning to do it.

Ms. Olson stated from a staff perspective, working in the communications area, when they work to try to get information out to the entire City it makes it difficult because of the vast array of people in the community. They do their best by offering a lot of different methods, but they have a difficult time understanding if those methods are achieving the impact and it is hard to measure some of that.

Ms. Olson thought with this demographic data, the Commission could talk about best practices based on different criteria using that data. She thought that would be very beneficial.

Chair Beltmann agreed and indicated this would be useful background information that would inform the Commission of where in the City different groups are located

in order to provide better things in those areas. She saw this as a tool to help them with who to engage in the different communities for that side of the outreach.

Commissioner Bolinger thought this information will give the Commission new places to look to hold different events, some areas that might not be getting the access to events and activities.

Ms. Olson thought it might be helpful for her to understand what engagement practices they are currently doing and where.

Commissioner Holub thought in SE Roseville the disparities are unacceptable and she knows there has been a SE Roseville working group, which she was unsure if it was still around, but the Commission has offered their participation on that group and they have heard nothing back from the Council. She thought it was incumbent on this Commission to make that a priority that the Council understands this is not acceptable for their City to disparities like this and they want to help do something about it. They are offering their assistance to help and need to make that message loud and clear.

Councilmember Eichenlaub asked if there was another data point that could be explored regarding those areas such as the number of ballots counted at a polling place in a precinct.

Ms. Olson assumed there was that information but was not sure if City level data was available. They could ask for that information.

The Commission discussed census tracts in the City.

Chair Beltmann thought moving forward if a couple of Commissioner want to take the information and census maps and dig into key items they should look at in each of the areas. She thought they could do a profile of each of the census tracts for best practices moving forward.

Recess

The Commission recessed at 7:40 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 7:48 p.m.

b. Survey Questions and Engagement Research

Chair Beltmann updated the Commission on the previous joint meeting with the City Council. She indicated that the Commission is moving forward with a survey of City of Roseville staff regarding current and past outreach and engagement practices, procedures, outcomes and desired outcomes.

Chair Beltmann asked for observations from the Commission. She noted some proposed questions were drafted up and staff amended a few of them. She suggested the Commission go through the questions and get agreement on them, make sure they are final, then they can set a timeline for getting the survey out, getting the information back and performing an analysis on the information in order to perform a follow-up survey and discuss which staff members and departments they want to interview before this goes forward to the City Council.

Chair Beltmann asked staff if an online entity such as Survey Monkey could be used.

Ms. Olson indicated they could use Survey Monkey.

The Commission indicated they read through the proposed questions.

Chair Beltmann asked for Commission feedback on the questions.

Commissioner Bolinger stated she liked question 14 because she felt that question can help them to move into another phase and answer some questions that help them to move into their second prong nicely.

Commissioner Peterson inquired about logistics and if they are doing this through Survey Monkey will they follow up one on one with the person who submitted the survey. She wanted to make sure people took the time to fill out the survey and put some thought behind it.

Ms. Olson stated in their weekly staff meetings she has been talking about the survey, preparing them that the survey is coming. She would like to give the questions to staff once they are finalized for them to think about them and then send out the link for Survey Monkey. She asked staff to put some thought into this.

The Commission felt this was a great idea.

Commissioner Holub asked if Ms. Olson had an inclination that people are fine with putting their name on surveys or if there might be more willingness to fill the survey out truthfully if it was anonymously done.

Ms. Olson thought the Commission will get the Department Head's name and title on this because it is going to come from their department. She thought either the Department Head will fill the survey out or it will be a collaborative effort. She thought instead of Name and Title it should only be Department Head. She thought the survey would be coming from each Department and not staff within each Department unless the Commission wants to do it differently. She stated that is how she envisioned the survey to work.

Commissioner Djevi thought this was a good plan. He stated if they go to the Department rather than staff then there will not be the possibility of a staff person leaving and the survey not being useful.

Commissioner Holub stated when she has had people fill out surveys, they like to have a few multiple-choice questions in the beginning which gets them some good qualitative data they can use. She noted a lot of people do not like short answer questions because some thought goes into those. She wondered if they could add some multiple-choice questions. She suggested a multiple-choice question asking, “On a scale of 1-10 how would you rate your department in engagement”,

Ms. Olson thought question 5 could become a multiple-choice question rather than an essay type of question.

The Commission discussed possible multiple-choice questions, below are some brainstorming questions submitted:

- What percent of time is spent on engagement
- How many people do you reach
- What percentage of staff does engagement
- What does community engagement mean to your department and how does it look

Ms. Olson thought the Commission should have a landing page which will help define what “Community Engagement” could be.

Chair Beltmann stated they could ask a question regarding what community engagement looks like in their department, what does it mean to their department.

Commissioner Eichenlaub asked if agree and strongly disagree questions would be included, or should they be excluded in the multiple-choice section.

Commissioner Holub thought they could be included if there was a specific question in mind to use it for.

Chair Beltmann thought one of the benefits of keeping this more open ended is it gives them the qualitative data, which is what they are looking for in this process.

Commissioner Bolinger stated if the survey is going to be directed per Department then staff can take more time on the survey.

Commissioner Djevi thought the goal of the survey is to figure out what has been done and propose best practices. If that is the case, he thought it would make more sense to find out the departments definition of engagement as they see it.

Ms. Olson thought question 6 they could change to “What does community engagement mean to your department and how does it look”.

The Commission agreed.

Chair Beltmann thought their landing page could encompass “We are looking at a community engagement which typically looks like xyz, but it could be broader...”, give an example to help give some framework but not make it leading.

Commissioner Holub thought it should be as least leading as they can be.

Chair Beltmann asked if there was any other feedback on the survey questions.

Commissioner Djevi asked if it would be too much to add a little background to say this is what they are thinking and not being critical of what any departments are doing.

Chair Beltmann thought that could be on the landing page as well.

The Commission thought that was a great idea.

Ms. Olson anticipated having an email sent out to the Department Heads to a link to the survey so in the email she would be happy to include something along those lines and then the landing page could be as what the Commission discussed.

Ms. Olson asked for the Commission to review the survey questions in detail, so she knew what to include.

Chair Beltmann read through the questions:

1. Name (removed)
2. Title (removed)
3. Department
4. Email (removed)
5. Landing Page with description and preface of what they are doing.
6. What percentage of your staff does community engagement work?
7. How many people does the department reach (scale given)
8. What does engagement mean to their Department
9. (Old Item 5) Why does the department interact with the community (Multiple choice options)
10. (Old Item 5) Why do you interact with the Community? (are there specific reasons, initiatives, topics, issues, statutes)
11. (Old Item 6) How do you typically interact with the Community?
12. (Old Item 7) What engagement strategies does your department use? (i.e. events, social media, workshops, open houses, etc)

13. (Old Item 8) What is the demographic profile of the groups your typically engage? (i.e. age, race, gender, education, etc)
14. (Old Item 9) What is the demographic profile of the groups you wish to engage? (i.e. age, race, gender, education, etc)
15. (Old Item 10) How are you currently, or have you in the past, successfully engaged in the community:
 - a. Describe the initiative(s).
 - b. What audience did you intend to engage and who actually participated?
 - c. What were the goals or preferred outcomes of the engagement effort?
 - d. Did you meet your goals or preferred outcomes? Why or Why not.
 - e. If you did not meet your goal/preferred outcome where did the initiative miss the mark?
 - f. How do you define successful engagement?
16. (Old Item 11) Are there specific areas where you would like guidance to improve future outreach and engagement efforts?
17. (Old Item 12) Are there community engagement best practices or resources that you would like to make sure the HRIEC is aware of?
18. (Old Item 13) Are there new initiatives that you think should be considered by the City?
19. (Old Item 14) The HRIEC plans to develop a strategy for building relationships with community members from a variety of backgrounds. Are there community leaders or active members we should include in our contact list? Please provide their names and contact information.

Commissioner Djevi asked what the difference was between questions 12 (Old 7) and 15 (Old 10). He thought question 15 (7) was more detailed but in terms of substance of the question, they appear the same or similar.

Chair Beltmann stated question 12 (7) is looking for the specific strategy that is used. Question 15 (10) is digging into specific initiatives, specific work they have done.

Ms. Olson stated on question 15 (10) they are asking about the successful engagement whereas question 12 (7) is asking about all the methods used.

Commissioner Holub thought items d and e in question 15 (10) are repetitive and could probably go. She thought the overall question could be changed to “describe a significant engagement event undertaken by the department”.

Commissioner Djevi thought if they just want to focus on engagement strategy that has been successful then d and e seem to have their place.

Ms. Olson thought it was important to find out what has been successful and then find out why something was not successful but was not sure it belonged in the same grouping. She thought both items would give different answers and insights into what works and what does not.

Commissioner Bolinger thought they might have a question asking about an initiative that did not go as planned and why does the department believe it did not meet the outcomes.

Chair Beltmann recapped the question discussed.

Ms. Olson thought the first part discussing the successful engagement initiative, item f should be listed first and then go into the other questions.

Chair Beltmann stated as far as next steps, she will redraft and have staff put into Survey Monkey, a timeline will be developed, and the survey should be sent out by August 28th with it being due September 21st. They could review the responses and summarize them at the October meeting.

The Commission concurred.

Chair Beltmann asked if they wanted to add follow-up interviews to their September agenda or wait until all the responses come in. She stated the last piece of this item is to review and discuss outreach/engagement research, she wondered if anyone had comments.

Commissioner Bolinger found this very challenging with the open-ended question. She had trouble getting any concrete data from different cities. She stated she did find a couple of things; The City of Falcon Heights has something called “Neighborhood Liaison” that the neighborhood community commission oversees, and she was thinking this as a Community Liaison that the last question in the survey would work well. This would be someone to a contact person, someone the City can communicate through.

Commissioner Bolinger stated the St. Paul School District is looking at a different way to bring the whole family in to get to some of the underrepresented communities. There is a whole process needed to build trust before needs can be identified.

Commissioner Bolinger stated she found a community video that demonstrated community pride in Montgomery Ohio. Another engagement program she found that was very effective was having a booth at all their events showing all the engagement programs available in the city along with volunteer programs. She also found some cities have a resident welcoming packet.

Chair Beltmann wondered if they could use a shared drive, such as google drive, so if someone finds research they can post it to a shared drive for other Commissioners to review.

Ms. Olson stated with the shared drive they must be cognizant with the information collected and created as a Commission and the data practices and privacy laws because if they are housing it in an official capacity then it is subject to all those requests. She would need to do more research into how they could make that work.

Commissioner Djevi suggested a summary of research findings and what is applicable to Roseville with links to research documents.

Commissioner Peterson liked the idea of the shared drive because future commissions would then have the history available to them versus written summaries where the information might get lost.

Commission consensus was to start with written summaries with links to information until Ms. Olson can find out if a shared drive is possible.

c. Discuss 2018-2019 Essay Questions

Ms. Olson reviewed the last meeting discussion.

Commissioner Eichenlaub reviewed some of his teacher consultations regarding bullying question with the Commission. He did not think an introductory paragraph would be necessary.

Chair Beltmann asked the Commission to finalize the wording of the essay contest question.

Commissioner Eichenlaub moved and Commissioner Reyerson seconded a motion to approve essay question as amended in the packet. Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Olson stated the essay question will be sent to the teachers the last week in October.

d. Proclamation Updates

The Commission reviewed the Proclamations.

Commissioner Holub indicated for Race Equality Week she wrote a paragraph stating she did not think they should do this proclamation.

Ms. Olson read Commissioner Holub's memo to the Commission stating her reason why this should not be a proclamation.

Commissioner Holub stated for Indigenous People's Day her proposal was to change from Native American month to Indigenous People's Day in October because it is a more relative proclamation. She indicated this still needs some review from community groups.

Commissioner Peterson stated she can take on this proclamation.

Chair Beltmann asked if they needed to do anything regarding Race Equality Week.

Ms. Olson suggested when this proclamation package is brought forward to City Council it should be a part of the Commission recommendation that Race Equality Week is no longer relevant and is being removed from the package of proclamations being presented.

Ms. Olson suggested the joint Council meeting be moved from October to November because this item is being pushed back to October.

Chair Beltmann indicated she would take over the Constitution Week proclamation.

Commissioner Eichenlaub stated he would take over the Older American's Month proclamation.

Ms. Olson indicated draft proclamations will be due September 11th.

Chair Beltmann asked this item should be moved up on the agenda in September and she asked the Commission to come with ideas for the Pilot Proclamation.

e. Workplan Calendar

Chair Beltmann reviewed the workplan calendar with the Commission.

Other New Business or Reports

a. Engagement Efforts

Assistant City Manager Olson reported on the following:

- City Engagement Efforts

Announcements

Future Agenda Items

- a. IAP2 Training
- b. 2020 Census
- c. New American Forum Update

September Agenda Items

1. Pilot Proclamation
2. Proclamations
3. Review of any survey results submitted
4. Essay Contest Timeline
5. Summaries of community engagement research
6. Census Tract Profiles
7. Parade Planning – October meeting

Chair Beltmann adjourned the meeting at 9:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Osbeck
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.