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The Value of Place-based Organizing

The framework of this project as defined by CURA and the Lyndale Neighborhood Association asks a range of questions about place-based organizing in Minneapolis. They are:

- What is the value of place based organizing? Specifically, we will investigate how place based organizing influences the health and welfare of community members, with a particular focus on the impacts on social capital in neighborhoods.
- What are the current attitudes of neighborhood leaders, policy makers, and funders towards place based organizing? The main focus in this part of the project will be on the perception of people currently doing place-based organizing on the impacts of their work, with the investigation of the attitudes of policy makers and funders as a secondary goal.
- What are the elements of place-based organizing currently being done in Minneapolis? Which strategies and projects being undertaken by place-based organizing organizations have the greatest impact?
- How does the level of resources (time, people, money, political and social capital) influence the effectiveness of place based organizing?

Before it was possible to investigate the impacts of this organizing work, we needed a working definition of the types of actions and activities on which we would focus. The set of organizations to be studied were defined in the project description as neighborhood and business associations in Minneapolis, which gather membership and focus their work based on geographic definitions of their service areas. These organizations engage in a great diversity of activities, projects, and services. To ensure that we had an externally-meaningful definition of their place-based organizing work in particular, we needed to examine the existing literature on organizing, as well as on the work of comparable organizations, which may or may not be characterized as organizing.

With a picture of the scope and, as stated above, the “elements” of place-based organizing being done in Minneapolis, and what the internally- and externally-held definitions of such organizing work are, it will be more possible to examine the questions related to the impacts of such work. Within the scope of this semester’s work, we’ve sought first to create this conceptual framework for place-based organizing. With this framework in hand, we’ve sought to learn the extent to which various neighborhood and business associations in Minneapolis are, in fact, doing place-based organizing. Meanwhile, we’ve asked those organizations to describe themselves in relation to several parameters that the literature suggests contribute to the success of such groups. Finally, we’ve begun to describe, through interview and survey data, the strategies and projects that these organizations believe have the most impact.

What is community organizing?

We found few authors who have applied a traditional definition of “community organizing” to the work of neighborhood and business associations like those we sought to study, though...
there is a rich literature on the impacts of such organizing work by other types of groups, including many whose work was in part defined by geography. In using the term “community organizing”, most authors appear to be invoking or are explicitly referencing the work of Saul Alinsky (1971), in which organizing is defined by the goal of shifting power from existing institutions or positional leaders to disenfranchised groups, which might or might not include residents of a neighborhood. This definition of community organizing, if we are to use Alinsky’s work as a guide, includes conflict with existing power structures and mobilization (through political or other social action) of previously silent or silenced groups, in support of their own needs and goals.

Research and academic writing that is strictly focused on the concept and impacts of community organizing tends to focus on the work of unions, neighborhood groups in low-income or minority-occupied areas, faith-based organizations, and other comparable groups. In contrast, the neighborhood and business associations that are defined as the target of this project often (if not always, thanks to the City of Minneapolis’ Neighborhood Revitalization Program, which is the main source of funding for many of these neighborhood associations) have formal relationships with government, often receiving public funding for their work. At least some of their primary activities, such as housing and business loan programs, hosting and facilitation of meetings and hearings at the request of local government, and formal participation in land-use decision-making, fall well outside this definition of organizing.

Despite this important distinction, we leave open the question of whether these activities are taken on by NAs and BAs in pursuit of some of the same goals as more traditionally-defined community organizing work. Furthermore, the tools and techniques used in these actions, despite being in many ways embedded in the work of government and aimed at externally-defined policy goals, may be pages taken from the book of more conflict-oriented, politically-controversial organizing (Borgos & Douglas, 1996).

Community building & capacity building

While this project is framed in terms of “organizing” among our target organizations, the existing research that best reflects the majority of their apparent organizational goals sometimes refers to their work as “community building” or “capacity building” (Chaskin, 2001; Hyman, 2002). Susan Saegert (2006) has presented a thorough review of the differences between these two approaches (community organizing and community or capacity building), and what she sees as a “rhetorical divide...between community builders, who emphasize bonding and bridging social capital and community organizers who work with disfranchised communities to make demands on the existing power structure through confrontational actions” (p. 276). She observes that though community building “promises to avoid the confrontational and polarizing tactics of more traditional approaches to community organizing....the empirical scholarly literature on community building consists primarily of evaluations...that often lack clear definitions of concepts and expected outcomes” (p. 276).

This non-confrontational quality of community building, despite the problems she finds in observing its efficacy, may be an important factor for our target organizations, especially those
that do not operate entirely outside government structures. Ultimately, one of Saegert’s main goals is “to examine whether in practice community building differs as much from community organizing as it does in rhetoric,” (p. 277), something we may be able to do, to some extent, in this work. She observes the same barrier to this project that we have found in the literature and in this project’s framing, however, namely, “the lack of analytic clarity about what constitutes community building, how in practice it differs from community organizing, and what kinds of relationships of power, influence, and mutual participation are expected as outcomes” (p. 278).

Several authors have described this difference in perspectives as an evolution. They see this shift in focus, from a struggle for power with an outside entity, to a building of power from within a neighborhood or other community, as the inevitable, and positive, evolution of community organizing. Cheryl Honey describes this new focus on community building over conflict as “based in self-help and empowerment principles….They rely on a unitary conception of democracy within the community and de-emphasizes [sic] adversarial democracy” (Honey, 2006). John Kretzmann and John McKnight propose a “post-Alinsky agenda” for community organizing that is adapted to the changing economic and political structure of urban neighborhoods (McKnight, 1996). “It seems clear,” they say, “that new strategies must stress an organizing process that enhances and builds community, and that focuses on developing a neighborhood’s own capacities to do for itself what outsiders will not or no longer can do” (p. 157).

Within this frame, the range of activities that may be described as contributing to community or capacity building is much broader than for the more traditional organizing model. This is, at least in part, because the community and/or the capacity being built in that community may be used toward almost any ends or goals, public or private, conflict-laden or otherwise. Capacity building (or, in McKnight and Kretzmann’s terms, post-Alinsky organizing) is described as being meaningful and useful for communities for its own sake, without the new capacity necessarily being immediately applied to a particular problem. In the case of our subjects in Minneapolis, an initial look at the types of work in which they engage, and at their formal relationships with city government, indicates that their goals may lean in the direction of what the literature for the most part refers to as “capacity building.” That is, they may seek to increase civic engagement, social capital, or other resources in their neighborhoods in general, rather than focusing on a particular power or resource issue or differential. As Saegert points out, though, there may be less difference between organizing and community building in practice than there is in theory, and among our target organizations, practice may be far more meaningful.

Organizational self-concept

Regardless of the definitions of organizing or other activities used in this literature, many of our target organizations employ those with the title “community organizer,” and describe themselves as doing community organizing (we knew this to be anecdotally true at the outset of the project, and it was confirmed in our research, as will be seen below). Other terms, including community building, capacity building, and many others, are also used in some, but by
no means all, their own descriptions of their work. Rather than applying only an outside
definition of organizing to these groups, which as we’ve seen may not be consistent with all the
foregoing literature, we’ve designed this research to let organizations’ self-concepts speak for
themselves. Our survey inquires as to their self-stated missions and strategic plans, if these
have been articulated, and as to whether they consider organizing to be central to their work.
The research is designed to on the one hand determine the extent to which these organizations
are engaging in organizing, and on the other hand consider the ways they use the language and
practices of community organizing or community building in ways that support their
organizational goals.

Models of evaluation for community organizing and related activities

In establishing a framework for the “value” of place-based organizing in Minneapolis, we sought
examples of evaluation of similar work, whether that fit within the definition of community
organizing outlined above, or came from other models of related work or organizations. We
found several examples of evaluative frameworks that define the characteristics and activities
of such work, including those used by funders of organizing groups, organizational consultants,
or collaboratives of organizing groups themselves. We also found a small amount of
quantitative research on the efficacy of organizations like our subjects, which lays out some
qualities and characteristics of effective groups. The most relevant of these models are
described in detail below:

Urban Institute
Candidate Outcome Indicators: Community Organizing Program
(Urban Institute, 2010 (1))

About the Urban Institute and the Candidate Indicators Project: The Urban Institute is a
respected source of information and resources for community development researchers
and practitioners. This set of “candidate indicators” was developed as part of a larger
set of evaluation models intended to be used for 14 different types of community work,
including adult education, health risk reduction, youth mentoring programs, and
community organizing (Urban Institute, 2010 (2)). The Urban Institute suggests that
these indicators be used to help “track [a community organizing] organization’s progress
in achieving the program’s mission. With this information, program managers can
better develop budgets, allocate resources and improve their services.” The Urban
Institute offers a scalable, adaptable menu of possible outcome indicators (“candidates”
for measurement) designed for grass-roots organizations of all sizes and capacities, that
fit the generic program description: “To improve the condition of the target population,
specifically to help protect human, legal and civil rights, by programs and organizing
initiated by a community organization.” Furthermore, it includes a chronological
sequence of expected outcomes for successful community organizing work, which may
be useful to some of our target organizations, though it was not within the scope of this
research.
Our use of the Candidate Indicators: The Urban Institute’s menu of indicators include many that are highly relevant to the work of place-based organizations, and are designed to be used in evaluating community organizing work. The set of indicators is designed to be used piecemeal, as appropriate to the needs of different organizations, and so is easily adapted to our purposes while maintaining its intended use and integrity. As we consider this set of indicators in analyzing the work of our target organizations, it’s important to keep in mind the Urban Institute’s caveat regarding evaluation criteria in general: “Outcome information seldom, if ever, tells why the outcomes have occurred. Many internal and external factors can contribute to any outcome. Instead, use the outcome data to identify what works well and what does not.” (Urban Institute, 2010 (1), p. 1)

We incorporated several of the Urban Institute’s indicators into our survey of neighborhood and business associations. While some of the candidate indicators required a measurement of change over time, and therefore could only be measured through methods not available to us in the scope of this project, the following were well-suited to inclusion in our survey of organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UI Candidate Indicator</th>
<th>How it was included in the Place-based Organizing Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness: people and media outlets targeted by information on issue</td>
<td>Number and nature of contacts with constituents, media, members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased participation: indicated by number of people participating in organizational actions</td>
<td>Number and intensity of volunteerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of participants in programs and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expose new talents/ideas: number of new leaders and volunteers trained and recruited</td>
<td>Number, nature, and turnover rate of volunteer/board leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership training offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved alliances in the community: number of organizations attending meeting/assemblies, or involved in coalitions/issues</td>
<td>Engagement with peers and other local organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource-sharing with other organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build skills/knowledge: community residents (individual donors) providing funding</td>
<td>Fundraising efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s important to note that the Urban Institute’s indicators for community organizing are clearly focused on advocacy and organizing efforts focused on a particular issue. As we’ve acknowledged above, it’s not clear that our target organizations are necessarily using the tools or language of organizing to achieve particular issue-related ends. However, some of the UI’s indicators may still be relevant to the work of these groups, as the intermediate outcomes listed above may align with their organizational goals.
NeighborWorks
Success Measures Outcome Indicators
(Neighborworks, 2007)

About NeighborWorks and Success Measures: “NeighborWorks America is a national nonprofit organization created by Congress to provide financial support, technical assistance, and training for community-based revitalization efforts.” NeighborWorks offers a full range of training, technical assistance, web-based management and evaluation tools, and consulting services, and also engages in policy advocacy related to neighborhood association issues. Clients are nearly all Community Development Corporations and other housing development organizations, but include a few Community Action Agencies and other ethnic and place-based organizing groups (Neighborworks, 2010 (2)).

NeighborWorks does not offer any explanation of the research basis of this tool, though it does call the system, “accessible and adaptable, responding to the latest trends and issues in the field through development of new outcomes indicators/data collection tool sets and state-of-the-art software features” (Neighborworks, 2010 (1)).

Success Measures is part of a proprietary system of evaluation services and tools offered to Neighborworks members. It is intended to be used along with technical assistance and training for organizations from Neighborworks consultants, and is centered around a web-based data system that’s available for an annual subscription fee. According to Neighborworks, “since its launch in mid-2005, Success measures has been used by 170 community development nonprofits and 14 funders and intermediaries to create and measure both short-term milestones and broader, long-term impacts.”

Our use of the Success Measures Indicators: The system tracks outcomes in 4 areas: Affordable Housing Indicators; Community Building Indicators; Economic Development Indicators; and Race, Class and Community Indicators. While much of the Success Measures system is aimed specifically at community development organizations and does not focus on organizing, place-based or otherwise, the Community Building outcome indicators offer one possible framework for defining impacts of related work in place-based organizing. We’ve sought to incorporate the following concepts from these indicators into our survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Measures Outcome Indicator</th>
<th>How it was included in the Place-based Organizing Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Organizational Capacity for Developing Community Leaders”: measures the involvement of residents in leadership, development of new leadership.</td>
<td>Number, nature, and turnover rate of volunteer/board leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership training offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement of membership in decision-making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Organizations Involved in Community Building Initiatives and Resource Committed:

- Addresses involvement and resource commitment of other organizations to the work of the organization in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement with peers and other local organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource-sharing with other organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accountability to Community:

- Addresses the “extent to which residents and other stakeholders are involved in organizational decision-making.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership and constituent engagement in decision-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and volunteer roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number, nature, and turnover rate of volunteer/board leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership for Change: Extent of Leadership:

- Measures positional leadership in the organization, and the extent to which leadership has changed.

| Number, nature, and turnover rate of volunteer/board leadership |

---

**National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy**

**The Grantmaking for Community Impact Project**

*(National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 2009)*

**About NCRP and the Grantmaking for Community Impact Project:** NCRP surveyed and interviewed 15 “organizations that worked with underrepresented constituencies in Minnesota”, with the goal of demonstrating the impacts of less-often-funded types of work by non-profits, specifically policy advocacy and organizing, for an audience of potential funders. Results are intended to be used by private foundations and other funders in considering the potential impacts of funding work in policy advocacy and organizing.

The study sought to show “quantitative impacts and return on investment” to foundation investments, by asking organizations to identify the “dollar value” associated with their most successful projects. The study uses dollars invested by organizations and their own estimated outcomes (both financial and other impacts) to quantify the impacts of their work. For example, an advocacy coalition that played a role in the increasing of the state minimum wage listed an impact in the report of “added wages of $130 million per year were estimated for 2.5 years until federal minimum wage superceded state level.” *(NCRP, p. 55).*

In addition to ROI, impacts were enumerated by issue area, such as civil and human rights; land use, transportation, and the environment, etc. Numbers of program participants, funds secured from outside sources, individual constituents participating in lobbying and other advocacy work, housing units constructed, and other such measures were also used as indicators for a wide range of projects.
Other, less-easily-measured impacts are also documented, from surveys and interviews with organizations. The NCRP written survey asks respondents to list the “top five most impactful advocacy/organizing successes your organization achieved” (NCRP Interview Protocol, p. 5). Interview questions that were used in the report include open-ended inquiries regarding organizational capacity and perceived impacts of organizing and advocacy work.

**Our use of the NCRP report and interview protocol:** The report is not intended to offer sample criteria for evaluation of organizing work, but does present a model for quantifying some impacts that are relevant to our target organizations. This work is most relevant to our project thanks to the organizational survey model used, which asks groups to report on the various kinds of indicators named above, then follows up with interviews with organizational leadership. We have adopted a comparable system for this research, and have included in our survey many very similar questions regarding organizational structure, membership, funding, and constituencies. This information is helpful in comparing and contrasting the responding organizations and determining organizational capacity.

**Neighborhood Funders Group**

*The Community Organizing Toolbox: A Funder’s Guide to Community Organizing*  
(Neighborhood Funders Group, 2001)

**About the Neighborhood Funders Group and the Toolbox:** The Neighborhood Funders Group created this document, or toolbox, because “Community organizing (CO) is one of the few strategies working to build grassroots leadership, community initiative and constituent influence in neighborhoods and communities that are often forgotten or ignored by those in power. The Neighborhood Funders Group (NFG) considers CO an important strategy for change. We encourage grantmakers to learn more about the vital contributions that CO has made to broader community development and renewal efforts” (from the Introduction). The toolbox is designed to help funders interested in place-based work understand the nature of community organizing and the relationship grantmakers have to place-based organizing. The section of particular interest to this project is the chapter entitled *Measuring Results: How to Evaluate CO Initiatives.*

The toolbox draws on documents from the history and present practice of community organizing, and the section on evaluation refers to several in-depth evaluation efforts that have been undertaken by funders of organizing work, including that done by the Woods Fund (see below).

**Our use of the Community Organizing Toolbox:** This piece is intended to help funder develop their own appropriate and useful evaluation systems for community organizing work, so does not offer a specific range of indicators. It does name criteria that have been used in some funders’ evaluations, though these are mostly based on the foundations’ individual missions and funding criteria, which are for the most part more
issue-oriented than those of our target organizations. In some cases, funders have been interested in general measures of organizational structure and functioning that would be of interest in any funding relationship, such as budget, personnel issues, size of constituency, etc.

The overview of evaluation methods given in the toolbox is informative of the kinds of impacts measurement that have been done on groups engaged in organizing, place-based and otherwise. Like the NCRP research, the focus on funders’ needs and interests means this material is not strictly aligned with our goals, but the enumeration of the various benefits and challenges encountered in the evaluation of organizing work is useful. The Toolbox cites work by the Wieboldt Foundation of Chicago in naming the results of the community organizing work it funds. These results include local leadership development and “an organized infrastructure within a neighborhood that provides a forum for decision-making, creates action, and is ready to take action when needed,” in addition to the more traditional measures of public actions, policy changes, and other advocacy work. This supports our goal of examining the use of the tools and methods of community organizing work toward a broad goal of community capacity-building among Minneapolis neighborhoods.

Woods Fund of Chicago
Evaluation of the Fund’s Community Organizing Grant Program
(Neighborhood Funders Group, 2001)

About the Woods Fund’s Evaluation: According to the Community Organizing Toolbox, “One of the most extensive evaluations of a foundation's CO grantmaking was carried out in the mid-1990s by the Woods Fund, a small foundation based in Chicago. Both the process and the results of the evaluation are noteworthy and offer considerable guidance for funders already involved with CO and those new to the field, as well as to CO groups....The evaluation was extensive - the most substantial evaluation of CO ever undertaken by a foundation....The team concluded that the Fund's $4.2 million investment had achieved significant results when judged by three broad criteria: community improvements, leadership development and democratic participation.” Though the framework and results of this evaluation have been used elsewhere, by other funders and community organizing groups, the goal of the project was to evaluate the impacts of the Woods Fund’s grantmaking.

Our use of the Woods Fund’s work: The evaluation criteria themselves, especially those related to leadership development and democratic participation, though related partly to the Woods Fund’s mission, are closely related to the evaluation goals identified for this project. Of special interest are the challenges to evaluations of community organizing efforts that the Woods Fund’s. Evaluators

“found three major problems to be addressed in designing a meaningful evaluation system:
1. *The key to organizing success is its process, but valid benchmarks for assessing the success of this process have eluded us so far.*

2. *Numbers measures utterly fail to get at intensity, quality, the “spirit and the vision.”*...We need to find ways to supplement membership numbers with other measures that capture quality and intensity of participation. We need ways to supplement leadership numbers with other measures of leadership quality and sophistication.

3. *Listing issues victories fails to isolate the role of CO in effecting the victory; assess the depth of challenge of the victory; or assess what impact the issue victory made on the community, the organization and the people involved.*

These are important caveats to bear in mind as we pursue an assessment of the place-based organizing work happening in Minneapolis. The observation that process, and the intensity and quality of engagement, leadership, and other ingredients in that process, are some of the most important measures of any organizing work, should inform any interpretation of the more straightforward measures we have included in our survey model. Furthermore, the difficulty of isolating the role of organizing work in organizational successes is important to keep in mind. While our study can inquire as to the internally-perceived impacts of organizing in our target organizations, the perspectives of outside stakeholders, constituents, and peers should be considered in any future study that seeks to firmly identify the value or impacts of place-based organizing. These additional perspectives can help answer the questions of impacts on community and individuals, as well as of the “depth of challenge of the victory.”

G. Mesch & K. Schwirian:  
*The Effectiveness of Neighborhood Collective Action (1996)*

**About the study:** Mesch and Schwirian seek to measure the impacts of various factors on the effectiveness of collective action by neighborhood-based groups. Using a multiple regression analysis of information regarding neighborhood groups in and around Columbus, Ohio, gathered in 1993, the authors theorize that factors they describe as “local ecology, organizational complexity, and coalitional embeddedness” determine the effectiveness of these groups’ work, as measured by self-assessments by organizational leadership. Local ecology includes socioeconomic status of the neighborhood, level of investment in the neighborhood by residents, racial composition, and environmental threats (including commercial developments, land-use changes, and unwanted business (p. 479)). Organizational complexity refers to “the degree of task differentiation among roles in the organization” (p. 471). Coalitional embeddedness refers to “the extent to which a neighborhood association is embedded in collations with other associations, institutions, and organizations” (p. 471).
The study found that organizational complexity and coalitional embeddedness had the most consistent positive correlation with organizational effectiveness of these factors, though some local ecology factors had significant influence as well. “[G]reater effectiveness in social action was associated with higher socioeconomic status, higher neighborhood investments, higher environmental threat, greater newsletter production, greater membership attendance at meetings, and more linkages with other neighborhood-based organizations” (p. 479).

Our use of Mesch and Schwirian’s study: Because of the pre-determined methods and scope of this project, we were not able to measure all of Mesch and Schwirian’s influential factors as they apply to our target organizations. It would be quite possible for future research to include socioeconomic, family investment, and ethnic measures of the target organizations’ service areas, though this was not included in our research. We did not inquire as to the level or number of environmental threats, either, though this data is likely available from other sources and could be used to enrich this work in the future. Some of Mesch and Schwirian’s other factors, however, lent themselves well to inclusion in our survey, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor in the effectiveness of neighborhood collective action</th>
<th>How it was included in the Place-based Organizing Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organizational complexity as measured by internal committees | Number, type and membership of internal committees
Size of staff |
| Organizational complexity as measured by newsletter circulation | Frequency of newsletter circulation
Frequency and type of other communications with members and constituents, such as email, social media |
| Organizational complexity as measured by member participation | Membership and constituent engagement in decision-making
Member attendance at programs and events
Number of volunteers, hours volunteered, work done by volunteers |
| Coalitional embeddedness as measured by resources exchange with other groups and coalitional membership | Types of groups with which organization exchanges (either gives or receives) resources
Frequency and type of contact with staff of peer organizations, including through formal coalitions or collaboratives |
Structuring our research

With these various definitions and evaluative criteria in mind, we designed a survey that we hoped would a) gather information on how our target organizations compare to one another, according to the criteria gleaned from existing evaluation methods, and b) inquire as to how staff and/or leadership at these organizations conceive of their own work in relation to existing definitions of community organizing and other types of related work. The complete survey is included in Appendix A. It is divided into several sections, as follows:

1. Organizational profile:
   a. Contact information
   b. Legal structure & history
   c. Budget and sources of funding
   d. Service area and/or constituency
   e. Employees
2. Membership
   a. Definitions
   b. Decision-making by membership
3. Board of directors
   a. Membership
   b. Turnover
   c. Decision-making
4. Volunteers
   a. Hours, numbers
   b. Recruitment
   c. Activities
5. Mission statement & strategic plan
6. Committees
   a. What types/issues
   b. Number of members
   c. Intensity of work
   d. Activities & responsibilities
7. Communications & engagement
   a. Types of communication
   b. Frequency
   c. Participation in programs and activities
8. Organizational embeddedness & relationships
   a. Frequency and nature of contact with peers
   b. Membership in coalitions & collaborative
   c. Resource sharing with other organizations
9. Activities and programs
   a. Types of activities and programs
   b. Frequency
10. Organizing
a. Relationship of organizing to organizational mission & strategy
b. Types of activities characterized as organizing

This survey was offered online using a web-based survey tool, and emailed to staff and/or leadership of 34 business associations (City of Minneapolis, 2010) and 70 neighborhood associations (Appendix B), for a total pool of 104 organizations, in April of 2010. We planned to interview a selection of respondents, based on their survey responses, with the goal of learning more about how this set of groups view their work and impacts in relationship to concepts of community organizing and/or community building, as described above.

Survey Results

As of this writing, we have received 20 complete responses, for a response rate of about 20%. This includes 5 business associations, 13 neighborhood associations, and 2 groups that marked “other” (though both include “business association” in their names). One group identified itself as a garden club, so we have set aside their response on the grounds that their work is far more specialized than that of our target organizations. Another is an ethnically-based business association that serves the entire state, and therefore does not meet our definition of place-based organizations in Minneapolis. A third is focused on serving a particular type of business (microbusiness), not a particular geographic area. While the remaining set of 17 responses (16% response rate) does not allow us to generalize about any trends in or collective significance of place-based organizing in Minneapolis, individual responses may be enlightening as to how these types of organizations work and conceive of their work.

Some consistencies across all responses:

- All are either 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6) nonprofits, or affiliated branches of such organizations
- All have small staffs of 4 or fewer full-time employees, while many have less than one FTE or no paid staff.
- All but two describe themselves as having bodies of membership
- All have elected boards of directors, ranging from 4 to 20 members, which meet at least quarterly, and most monthly
- All reported regularly coming into contact with staff and/or colleagues from peer organizations, though the nature of these contacts varies widely

Though as we’ve said, we are unable to draw any conclusions about the complete group of target organizations from this set of responses, we can make the following observations about the responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of inquiry</th>
<th>Observations from survey responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budgets range from less than $10,000 a year to $280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding sources</td>
<td>Among neighborhood associations, most receive a majority (some as much as 90-100%) of their funding from the City of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minneapolis’ Neighborhood Revitalization Program. 11 of 17 listed NRP as their single greatest source of funding. Some receive significant funding from other City of Minneapolis sources. A few listed private foundations, corporate contributors, and fees for service as other significant funding sources. None identified individual funders, either large or small, as sources of more than 5% of their funding.

| Employees | 2 organizations have no employees. 8 have only part-time employees, and the remainder have at least one full-time employee. |
| Employment of paid organizers | 5 organizations reported that they do not currently employ anyone with the title “community organizer”, but have in the past. 3 reported currently having such employees. The remainder (about half) reported never having employed anyone with such a title. |
| Membership definition | Nearly all neighborhood associations described their membership as consisting of residents and, most often, business owners in their geographic service areas. Business associations named businesses and owners in their service areas. |
| Membership dues | Business associations listed dues for members, while neighborhood associations did not. |
| Membership by organizations | 8 respondents stated that their members included other area organizations |
| Boards of directors | Responses were quite consistent in structure, turnover, and responsiveness to membership on the part of the boards. All boards are elected by membership (some through a nominations committee process). Though 13 groups did not list term limits for board members, all but two stated that new board members are brought on at least once a year. |
| Boards of directors: decision-making | Not all respondents gave descriptions of the decisions made by their boards, though a majority did. Descriptions included a wide range of responsibilities, though for the most part, indicated that boards maintain high-level strategies and consistency with mission and planning, set policy, vote on budget and staffing decisions. |
| Volunteers | Only 2 respondents did not report having volunteers, and other groups reported numbers of volunteers from 7 to 100 people each month. Total hours volunteered varied accordingly, though per-volunteer averages were between 1 and 10 per person per month. Activities performed by volunteers varied widely across the categories offered in the survey. |
| Mission statements | 6 respondents did not have mission statements. Among the 11 that did, 3 reported revisiting and/or revising the statement |
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regularly (once a year up to every 6-10 years), and other either did not respond to that question or reported that the mission statement had never been revised, and that the organization had no plans to revisit or revise it in the future. The mission statements that were reported were nearly all written by committees, boards, or membership, with one being written by staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic plans</th>
<th>6 organizations reported having strategic plans, all of which were written by boards or committees, some with staff contributions. All these plans are revisited and/or revised at least every 4-5 years, many once a year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>All respondents reported at having least 2 committees, with an average of 4.8 committees per organization and a maximum of 8. The majority of committees listed were focused on land-use or housing issues, environmental issues, public safety, or administrative tasks such as budget management. Some newsletter and communications committees (6) were listed, as well as some events (7) and membership (2) committees. One organization listed “community building” as the main activity of two of its committees, festivals/events, and parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Engagement: Frequency</td>
<td>All respondents reported at least one form of communication with membership and/or community that is used at least weekly. All reported some form of regular engagement with membership and/or community, such as office visits, open houses, door-knocking, and various kinds of meetings, to take place at least monthly. There is tremendous variation, though, in the number of different methods of engagement and communication being used, and the frequency with which they are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Engagement: Intensity</td>
<td>A third of respondents did not report the numbers of participants in their various events and programs. Among those that did, youth and family activities showed by far the largest participation, with participation numbers ranging up to 2000. Across all categories, there was wide variation (from just a few participants to several hundred) in all categories of programs/events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational relationships: Membership in other groups</td>
<td>6 respondents did report being members of any organizations, coalitions, or groups. Among the 11 who did report such memberships, some listed only the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits, a large, broad-based, statewide organization, while others listed various city- and neighborhood-based groups, as well as several land-use related organizations, such as the Land Stewardship Project. Business associations and groups that appear to be advisory to local government were also listed frequently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational relationships: Contact with peer organizations

| 2 groups did not respond as to the frequency of their contact with peer organizations. 4 reported that they have contact with such groups several times a year, with the remainder reporting that they do so monthly, weekly, or daily. All respondents (even those 2 who did not report frequency) reported on the nature of these contacts. 7 answered “yes” to every category of contact: sharing information, sharing resources, networking or relationship building, collaboration, mutual membership in other groups. At least 2 and no more than 4 groups responded “no” in each of these categories, with the exception of mutual membership in other groups, to which a majority (9) responded “no.” |

Sharing resources and support: receiving resources from others

| When asked from which types of organizations they receive support and/or resources, nearly all respondents (14) acknowledged getting support from individual businesses. Next most common were other neighborhood associations and the City of Minneapolis. Of note is the fact that of the groups who said they did not get resources from the City, 5 reported that NRP is the largest single contributor to their budgets. |

Sharing resources and support: contributing resources to others

| Only 3 respondents said that they do not provide resources or support to other organizations or groups, leaving a large majority (14) who do so. The most commonly shared resources appear to be information, advice, and “moral support,” though there are also contributions of materials resources such as staff time, meeting space, and even financial contributions in a few cases. 7 respondents included other neighborhood associations among those with whom they share these resources. Other beneficiaries included business associations, government groups (including parks and schools), and individual residents and businesses. |

Activities: Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The table in Appendix C shows the frequency with which respondents reported engaging in each of the activities included in the survey. The activities in which more than half of respondents reported engaging more than once a year are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. issue research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. education for residents on issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. hosting public meetings on issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. working with residents to secure housing loans and/or grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. general membership meetings, activities for youth and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. encouraging residents to contact elected officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. hosting festivals and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. supporting or organizing issue-based committees or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizing activities

4 organizations did not answer the question, “Organizations like yours usually have many different goals, and use many different strategies and tools to pursue these goals. Community organizing has many definitions, but it can be an organizational goal, or a strategy or tool to pursue a goal. Does your organization’s work include community organizing?” 3 answered no, and 10 answered yes. The activities that at least half of those 10 reported were key components of their organizing work are:

1. Voter education, registration, and/or get-out-the-vote efforts
2. Issue research
3. Education for residents on issues
4. Media contacts on issues
5. Direct negotiation with government groups or representatives
6. Hosting public meetings on issues
7. Developing a neighborhood plan or vision
8. General membership meetings
9. Activities for youth and families
10. Encouraging residents to contact elected officials
11. Hosting festivals and events
12. Supporting or organizing block clubs
13. Supporting or organizing issue-based committees or programs
14. Welcoming new residents
15. Supporting or organizing online discussion groups
16. Publishing a newsletter or similar materials
17. Maintaining a presence on social networking sites, such as Facebook or LinkedIn
18. Fundraising for your organization
19. Engaging culturally-diverse residents in issues or projects
20. Engaging income-diverse residents in issues or projects
Interviewing respondents

Based on the survey responses, we requested interviews with all respondents who reported that their organization’s work includes community organizing, who had also indicated that they were willing to be contacted for follow-up to the survey. In addition, we requested an interview with Susan Braun of Elliot Park Neighborhood, Inc., at the request of Mark Hinds at Lyndale Neighborhood Association. We were able to schedule and hold interviews with the following:

- Gayle Bonneville, Windom Park Citizens in Action Neighborhood Association
- Debbie Nelson, Victory Neighborhood Association
- Susan Braun, Elliot Park Neighborhood, Inc.
- Rita Ulrich, Nokomis East Neighborhood Association
- Joyce Wisdom, Lake Street Council

Each interview lasted about one hour, and was held in the office of the interviewee.

Windom Park Citizens in Action Neighborhood Association

Windom Park Citizens in Action has an annual budget of $45,000, of which 84% comes from NRP, and another 4% from other City of Minneapolis sources. The organization reported 1% funding each from private foundations, corporate/business contributors, and small individual donors, with the remaining 9% from other sources. Gayle Bonneville is Windom Park’s only employee; she is paid for 20 hours/week at Windom Park, another 6 hours/week at Holland Neighborhood Association, and on occasional contract with St. Anthony West Neighborhood Association.

Regarding decision-making by the board and membership, Windom Park’s survey response was, “Almost all decisions are made by the membership. The board votes on housekeeping/office-related functions, or in the case of an emergency/time constraints…. All [members] can suggest topics for future meetings or action items, all can participate in committees, and all can engage in discussion at meetings. We offer the opportunity to comment via Open Forum, coming to the office, e-mailing us, and occasional surveys, among other methods.” This emphasis on broad-based decision-making, along with the direct election and regular turnover of the board of directors, suggests a highly democratic organization. Accordingly, the first objective listed in Windom Park’s mission statement is to “encourage widespread citizen participation in all decision-making processes affecting the Windom Park Neighborhood.” Gayle Bonneville emphasized this in her interview, saying that the board “keeps the organization running,” the general membership sets the organization’s direction.

The organization uses a wide range of communications and methods of engagement quite regularly, some as often as daily and weekly. An email newsletter is published weekly, online social networking sites and a printed newsletter are used several times a year. Monthly community and membership meetings are held, and other programs and activities are hosted
weekly. Youth and family activities, though held once a year or less, are well-attended (2,000 attendees reported), and membership and community meetings, and other issue-based programs and activities draw 100 people each when held.

Windom Park reported giving and receiving support and resources to and from several other types of organizations, including local government bodies such as the park board and City, local businesses, and peer organizations. Weekly contact of many kinds with staff of peer organizations was reported. These indicators reflect a high degree of what Mesch and Schwirian call organizational embeddedness.

Windom Park reported having the following committees: Public Safety, NRP, Festivals and Events, Community Land Use and Planning, and a Tree and Garden Committee. Regular (weekly or monthly) activities included issue research and education, negotiation and lobbying/advising government, hosting public and membership meetings, neighborhood planning, housing loans and/or grants, encouraging residents to contact elected officials, supporting or organizing issue-based activities and programs, welcoming new residents, creating opportunities for cross-cultural engagement, and engaging age- and income-diverse residents. All of these activities except for “creating opportunities for cross-cultural engagement” were characterized as key elements of the group’s community organizing efforts, as well as hosting festivals and events, supporting block clubs, and publishing a newsletter.

In the interview with Gayle Bonneville, her first comment was that when she received our survey invitation, she felt a sense of immediate recognition about the term “place-based organizing,” though she had not heard it before. She said when she’d first read our project description, she thought, “Yeah! That’s what we do!”

When asked why Windom Park Citizens in Action’s mission or goals included community organizing as a key strategy, Gayle replied that that community organizing is key for any neighborhood association in Minneapolis because they are “at base, community engagement organizations” thanks to their mandates from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program. She cited the high levels of NRP funding to the three groups she works for as indicators of their obligation to fulfill those mandates. “NRP says you’re about community engagement,” said Gayle, and indicated that this means neighborhood association must “earn” this public funding.

Gayle described her concept of “community engagement” as working to engage the “full diversity” and “all sectors” of a community, as local capacity allows. She sees NRP’s mandate as “[to show] that you’ve tried, reached out, made it known that you’re a conduit to be engaged with the City.” NRP, in her view, asks neighborhood associations to show how they’ve tried to engage “all those neighbors,” and how the organization has worked to give a voice to residents in neighborhood decision-making. In return, the organization “has the ear” of elected officials; a relationship Gayle reports is codified in their contract to gather public input in the 45-day public notice process for land-use changes required in the City of Minneapolis.

The current city council member representing the Windom Park neighborhood has, according to Gayle, a background in work with neighborhood associations, and therefore puts significant
stock in the kind of neighborhood input facilitated by these groups. Gayle sees the relationship made possible through NRP as one of mutual benefit, where neighborhood residents have increased access to public processes, while elected officials can look to this set of organizations for “grassroots” access to resident feedback on public decisions. This participation in land-use decisions is the “baseline of engagement” according to Gayle, and organizations like Windom Park build their other work on this foundation.

The meaning of community engagement beyond this “baseline,” according to Gayle, depends upon organizational philosophy and perspectives of board members. Some board members are activists, with “some piece of the community pie that they’re very interested in,” which she believes make them more likely to speak up and engage publicly on other issues, as well. The structure of the neighborhood association supports this. “NRP built activists in a lot ways, which some people didn’t like,” but organizations like Windom Park have built on that foundation to create broader activism an enact “other basic community organizing principles.” This evolution is not included in the contract with the City, but Gayle believes the contract “builds that naturally.” “That’s where I’ve seen growth in neighborhood associations,” she says, “people are ready, willing, and able to take on an issue...to go to elected officials.”

Though reactions to this “activism” may have varied, Windom Park seems to have used their position through NRP to increase community members’ access to elected and other officials. Representatives from the school board, city council, and other government bodies are regularly invited to attend membership meetings, and are generally very responsive to such requests. “We’re lucky to have elected officials who see this as a good vehicle, a two-way street for communication.” Developers and businesspeople pursuing projects in the area can also gain access to community members through the neighborhood association, though they may not always take advantage of this. “You can always tell who’s familiar with Minneapolis [among developers], because some of them know to come to the neighborhood association first, and some don’t,” said Gayle.

Windom Park Citizens in Action plays an important role in mediating conflict, as well, both between residents and business owners and the City, and between residents and developers or property owners, though their participation does not ensure that resident preferences prevail. Gayle offered some examples of this role. One was a situation in which a business owner seeking to expand his business was able to gather resident feedback (and ultimately, support) on his plans, and at the same time resolve a billing-related conflict with the City with support and advice from the association. Another related to a fairly high-profile restaurant development that was opposed by a majority of neighborhood residents, but supported by many from outside the neighborhood. In that case, despite vocal opposition from residents as heard at upwards of 20 public meetings on the issue, the development went ahead thanks to “2 powerful pro-[development] politicians.”

When asked how she could tell when her organization’s efforts related to place-based organizing and/or community engagement are effective, she said, “I know we’re nowhere near where we should be, and we probably never will be.” Despite this acknowledgement of the
difficulty of evaluating impacts, she also said that she measures success to some degree by paying attention to the extent to which residents attend meetings, take advantage of home loan and other programs, and call and email the organization about issues. But she also stated some uncertainty regarding these indicators, saying, “on the one hand, you figure if you’re doing things right, you don’t hear from people, and when people do engage, how do you know if it’s your work or the issue?” She cited some issues (such as crime in the neighborhood) and some methods (postcards and newsletters) that were particularly effective in bring people to the organization, though budget does not always allow those methods to be used.

Neighborhood demographics also play a role in engagement, Gayle believes, since families with children and two wage-earners may have little extra time for community meetings and other events. In part to alleviate this problem, she is “always looking for other ways people can be engaged, besides meetings...[such as Facebook, Twitter, and other new media], but that means we have to do everything, and things get watered down.”

Engaging low-income, renter, and some other minority populations in the neighborhood presents some special challenges. A recent home rehab program for low-income residents is one example. Despite the fact that the neighborhood has a number of families that qualified for the program, and extensive promotion by the organization, including door-knocking, participation was much lower than expected. Gayle speculates that residents may have been “too proud to apply,” and that many low-income residents are renters, not homeowners, and therefore did not qualify. She also cited the difficulty, in general, in engaging renters in the organization, saying the organization was not sure how to pursue that population, and had not taken many steps in pursuing that goal. A geographic “dividing line” between the “high-income, prestige area” and other, lower-income areas with more rentals, as well as the tendency of renters to be younger (and therefore perhaps less invested in the neighborhood) both may contribute to this engagement challenge, as well.

In summing up the organization’s struggles to engage the full diversity of the community (and to know whether their efforts are effective), Gayle said, “We all just tend to take the easy way out and say if we have people show up at our meetings, it’s good” but also acknowledged that the organization needs to pursue more information and new methods of engagement, saying, “We know we need to find out more.”

**Victory Neighborhood Association**

The Victory Neighborhood Association has an annual budget of $85,583, of which 46% comes from NRP, and another 18% from other City of Minneapolis sources. 1% of the budget comes from small individual donors, 24% from fees for services, and the remaining 11% from other sources. Debbie Nelson is the organization’s sole employee; she works 20 hours per week at Victory Neighborhood Association and 20 hours per week at the Cleveland Neighborhood Association.

Membership in the Victory Neighborhood Association is open to “any person of voting age who resides in, owns property in or operates or facilitates a business or organization in the Victory
Neighborhood.” The decision-making structure includes the full membership, and is described as similarly broad-based to that of Windom Park. The membership makes “decisions directly affecting defined areas or directly impacting individuals in the neighborhood” as well as modifications to the strategic plan or by-laws, and elects the board of directors.

Victory NA’s mission is as follows: “The purpose of this organization is to protect and promote neighborhood interests and the health, safety and general welfare of the residents within the organization’s geographical jurisdiction in a non-partisan, educational and cooperative manner.” Victory’s mission makes no specific mention of engagement, representation, or voice of residents, though this of course does not necessarily indicate a lesser commitment to grassroots representation in practice.

Victory NA publishes a monthly newsletter, and uses its website and facebook page weekly and daily, respectively. Drop-in visits to the office and public and membership meetings (which generally include about 30 attendees) are also main forms of engagement.

Important organizational relationships include membership in the Northwest Minneapolis Business Association and Camden Alliance of Neighborhoods. Debbie Nelson reported having weekly contact with staff of peer organizations, which consists of sharing information and other resources, networking and relationship-building, and collaboration, but not mutual membership in organizations. Resources and support are contributed to Victory NA by individual businesses, and business and religious organizations, and Victory provides “meeting space, information, [and] activities” to other neighborhood associations. In the interview with Debbie Nelson, it became clear that block clubs represent an important set of relationships, too. She described the NA’s relationship to block clubs as one of support, since “block clubs are like arms of [a neighborhood] organization.” She contrasted the NA’s way of working with that of the local block clubs as partly relating to their pattern of action and motivation. “Block clubs tend only to react, but are not as proactive. They’re often formed when there’s an issue of some kind.” These survey responses indicate a slightly lesser degree of organizational embeddedness than was seen in Windom Park, with fewer relationships of mutual resource-sharing, but an equally high level of contact with peer organizations.

The organization includes the following committees: housing, business association, environmental issues, newsletter/communications, public safety, volunteers/membership, and festivals and events. Nearly all meet monthly. Regular (weekly or monthly) activities include direct negotiation with government, developing a neighborhood plan, housing loans & grants, membership meetings, supporting or organizing block clubs, welcoming new residents, using social networking sites, and engaging income- and age-diverse residents. The survey response identified the following as activities as key to Victory NA’s community organizing efforts: voter education, registration, and/or get-out-the-vote efforts, education for residents on issues, direct negotiation with government and non-government groups, hosting public and membership meetings, developing a neighborhood plan, housing loans/grants, activities for youth & families, encouraging residents to contact elected officials, hosting festivals and events, supporting/organizing block clubs, welcoming new residents, newsletter publication,
social networking sites, fundraising, and engaging culturally-, income-, and age-diverse residents.

When asked why community organizing is a key component of Victory NA’s work, Debbie replied that what she sees as the organizing work of the association is partly a means of learning what the neighborhood’s needs are, and partly a response to the limited staff resources available. “The scope of work we want to do...we can’t do it with part time staff. We want to be working on things that constituents want, need, support, that reflect the needs of the community, and with their [residents] support is how things get done.” As was seen in the previous interview with Gayle Bonneville, Debbie quickly transitioned to using the term “community engagement” to describe the group’s work. She cited two main goals of community engagement: finding out the needs and issues in the neighborhood, and “getting things done.”

Because of Debbie’s work with two neighborhood associations, she was able to offer us a unique perspective, contrasting the two. She reported that Cleveland NA has “less engagement”, which she sees as related to neighborhood demographics and property profiles, which include more foreclosures, rapid turnover of residents, and smaller homes with less room for growing families. While not certain, she said she suspected that the Cleveland neighborhood has more single homeowners and a few, though not as many, long-term residents. She also commented that a higher proportion of rental units in the Cleveland neighborhood means that “people don’t get engaged, because they don’t expect to stay.” The effect on the organization is that there is less capacity to do the work they want to do, though they have “the same number of ideas.” In comparison, the Victory neighborhood has a “more stable population, people who have lived here 50 years.” Perhaps because the housing stock includes more larger homes that can accommodate families, “when people move here, they stay here.” Debbie cited these factors as contributing to greater organizational capacity at Victory NA. Her observations of these differences are consistent with those of Mesch and Schwirian’s findings that what they term “neighborhood investment” has a strong impact on the effectiveness of neighborhood associations.

Debbie reported that she looks to a variety of indicators that either organization’s engagement and/or organizing efforts are working. One readily-observable impact of their work is on the quality of the housing stock and other developments, where she sees positive results such as home improvements, which are being done thanks to the NA’s programs. She also measures success by the “amount of engagement” in programs and activities, number of people signed up for mailing lists, and attendance at events. The organization’s NRP plan, and how much progress has been made in actualizing that plan, was cited as an important way of measuring success, too.

Elaborating on the idea of “community organizing” or “community engagement,” Debbie said that part of her role is “convincing people that we’re not here to do things for them, but we’ll help them get something done.” A common scenario in the Victory NA office is that a resident will call with an issue they’re concerned about -- a problem property or crime issue, perhaps –
and Debbie will coach them through some possible courses of action. She’ll suggest that they take the lead on getting the neighbors together, and may offer other suggestions for action, such as attending an appropriate committee meeting at the NA. She may also give them information on relevant resources available through the NA, such as loans, improvement programs, etc., or on city programs and regulations that relate to their situation. This pattern of action may reflect what’s been described as “capacity building” by some authors, in that it builds the ability of residents and neighborhoods to cope with future issues that may arise.

Victory NA’s relationship to local government is closely related to its role as defined by NRP. Like most other neighborhood associations in Minneapolis, Victory organizes public meetings as needed on traffic, land-use, and related issues. But Debbie sees the organization’s role as much more complex than as a tool of government used for public input-gathering. “NRP made city staff and councilmembers realize that they’re not working in a vacuum, but that we are their constituents...they’re beginning to realize that they need to work with neighborhood associations.” As in Windom Park, the neighborhood association has become a place for government officials, elected and otherwise, to make contact, gather input, and share information with residents. Housing inspection staff, the city property tax assessor, and officials from local schools, libraries, and police have all attended recent membership meetings.

Debbie describes the officials’ roles in these relationships to be “much more responsive than they used to be,” observing that this is because “NRP made city employees responsible to constituents.” Furthermore, she sees NRP as having positioned neighborhood associations as essential to City business: “The City has finally admitted that neighborhood associations are a core function of the city, that they do the community engagement that they’d have to do otherwise.” While this role as nearly-internal to government functioning may be antithetical to the traditional model of power-based organizing described in our introduction, it certainly has an impact on the neighborhood’s capacity to address issues as they arise, as it dramatically increases access to resources, both material and political.

When asked about the organization’s success and challenges in engaging a diversity of residents in their work, Debbie reported that the Cleveland neighborhood has more ethnic diversity, and that this is positively reflected in the population that’s engaged in that NA’s work. In the Victory neighborhood, engaging ethnic minorities has been more of a struggle. While Hmong, African-American, and other non-white residents attend community events, “it’s hard to get them involved in committees,” said Debbie. The organization has used their relationship with the local school to help with this challenge, by sending announcements of programs and activities home with students, whose families represent the full diversity of the neighborhood. African-American residents, who may have resided in the area for much longer, are more likely to be involved in the organization than Hmong residents, but Debbie is undertaking some special efforts, including a budding collaboration with the Southeast Asian Community Council, whose offices are nearby.

The tools of engagement and organizing for Victory NA are things Debbie identified as the ways in which the organization learns about residents’ needs and wishes. Word of mouth is powerful
in this neighborhood of many long-term residents, and Debbie described a “core of people who are already engaged” as an important conduit of information into and out of the organizations. Phone calls and email to the office about residents’ concerns are also common, and Debbie cited the visibility of their office space, which has existed for 9 years, as an important way of building contact with residents.

Neighborhood events, both educational and social, are an important part of Victory NA’s community building work. “We have a lot of community-building activities,” Debbie said, “People might way they’re just for fun, but they’re more than fun.” These programs include an ice cream social, garage sale days, concerts and movies in the parkway, and informal biking and walking around the neighborhood, which the organization promotes. These activities “serve for people to connect with other people in the neighborhood. You feel connected to your neighborhood so you feel a sense of ownership, so you feel a sense of responsibility.” In reflecting on this sense of responsibility, Debbie made an observation about different age groups and their functions and expectations in the neighborhood: “Younger people understand that it’s not going to get solved just by calling your city council person – you have to be a part of the solution. Who’s the city, if it isn’t us? Aren’t we the city?”

Elliot Park Neighborhood, Inc.

Elliot Park Neighborhood, Inc., or EPNI, has a budget much larger than those of our first two organizations, at $280,000 a year, though a similarly large proportion, 70%, comes from NRP. 12% is provided by private foundations, 6% each from other City sources and from business contributors, 5% from small private contributors and 1% from large private contributors. The organization also has a larger staff than others, with 3 full-time employees, including Executive Director Susan Braun.

Membership in EPNI is defined in much the same way as the other NAs we surveyed, as “people who live, work or own property in the neighborhood” and attend a meeting. The large (20-member) board of EPNI consists of 70% individual residents and 30% business or institutional representatives. Members are engaged in decision-making through election of officers, votes on bylaw and NRP plan changes, and through discussion at regular membership meetings.

EPNI’s mission statement is: “Bringing people and resources together to preserve and promote the unique urban character of the historic Elliot Park Neighborhood.” The organization also has a strategic plan, which is revisited every 4 to 5 years.

The organization reported membership in three local organizations: East Downtown Council DEEP 2100 (Downtown East Elliot Park framework), Downtown Neighborhood Leaders Group, and Elliot Park Leadership Group. Staff have weekly contact with staff of peer organizations, consisting of sharing of information and resources, networking, collaboration, and mutual membership in organizations. EPCI receives support and/or resources from all of the types of organizations we asked about, with the exception of the school district. “Advice, best practices, collaborative discussion, information, space, facilitation, and leadership mentoring” are shared with other neighborhood and business associations, “self-organizing groups in the
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neighborhood,” and other neighborhood institutions. Like the other NAs described here, this profile suggests a high level of organizational embeddedness.

Elliot Park reported that they publish a newsletter (electronic or otherwise) less than once a year. Drop-in visits, community meetings, and monthly activities and programs appear to be the group’s main form of engagement with its constituency, along with their website, which they report is used daily. On the surface, this would appear to be a lower level of communication with constituents than some other organizations are engaging in, though the intensity and quality of these communications is not necessarily measured by our survey. EPNI did not respond to the survey questions regarding the number of participants in each of the types of engagement.

Only 3 types of activities were listed as being done by the organization at least monthly: issue research, education for residents on issues, and leadership training for residents. Several other activities are listed as being done several times a year: media contacts, other types of training (than leadership), hosting public and membership meetings, developing a neighborhood plan, encouraging residents to contact elected officials, supporting or organizing issue-related committees or programs, welcoming new residents, and fundraising. Of note, the group does not report engaging in relations with government or other official bodies, though this was described to be a central part of the work of the other NAs we’ve profiled here. EPNI is also the only group we interviewed that answered “no” to the question, “Does your organization’s work include community organizing?”

Because of this response, the first interview question for Susan Braun and her colleague David Fields, Community Development Coordinator at EPNI, was “What does community organizing mean for your organization?” Susan responded by discussing the difference between what she called the “Chicago model” of organizing and what EPNI does in saying, “I’ve found that many neighborhoods organize [in the Chicago model] around an issue, but it’s often then of short duration, directed by that board of directors, or sometimes more driven by staff. Here in Elliot Park, for a variety of reasons, including geography, entrenched poverty, our board, mid-NRP, decided that the neighborhood needed long-term strategy for addressing systemic issues. This is different from organizing around issues or against somebody – then, you have to work out a compromise – Elliot Park is more focused on building collaboration, building coalitions around goals.”

Susan highlighted a key difference between EPNI and some of our other target organizations is that EPNI was founded long before NRP, while many other neighborhood organizations were founded as a direct result of NRP. David, whose tenure with the organization is shorter, and who doesn’t, by his own account, “have a background in neighborhood organizing work,” agreed that EPNI has not used “traditional organizing approaches” in his experience. When he began as a board member at EPNI, the organization was focused on “traditional models, like door knocking, engaging minority populations.” Over time, they saw the need “to establish a more stable, consistent presence,” and became more focused on land use issues. Susan and
David described organizing as reactive, while Elliot Park seeks to be more proactive, adding that “however you organize in a given neighborhood has to be responsive.”

In order to gather community input into these long-term goals and strategies, Elliot Park has held community forums and focus groups, to learn what residents see as challenges facing the neighborhood and important assets to the community. Out of this input, the organization “created not just an urban design plan, but a socio-economic plan.” An iterative series of plans, including a master plan, a phase 2 plan (written in 2002-04), and a strategic plan (written in 2005-06) were created. Staff is now focused on implementing the goals laid out in those plans, and ensuring “perpetual renewal,” reconsideration, and renewal of the plans.

Rather than taking on those issues on behalf of residents, though, according to Susan and David, “there’s an inherent assumption that part of what you’re doing is leadership development. The board and others are not there to fix things for other people,...but to [get other people] to participate in solutions.” Through this kind of engagement, they said, people become committed members of the community, learning how to negotiate with government, landlords, police, and others. “As a citizen participant, you’re responsible, invested...[and] you see more sustainable accomplishments because you’re looking at how your project fits into the bigger picture.” This reasoning about the work of EPNI is clearly aligned with models of community capacity building, and Susan and David see it having a deeper and longer-term impact on residents and the neighborhood than the alternative model they see as “community organizing.” Their message, as they describe it, is, “We’re saying you’re the leaders, not us – you’re the ones who can get something done.”

Their way of working with community members, though, is not without its risks, though outcomes may better reflect community members’ interests. “Sometimes it fails,” said David, “but if it really matters to people, they’ll follow through. Otherwise it’s just a neighborhood association doing something.” David, who comes from a professional background in education, described this as “very much like a good teacher’s role,” and Susan added that this approach frames the work of a neighborhood organization as leadership development.

In order to ensure that the organization remains responsive to neighborhood needs, while keeping staff focused on action and effectiveness, they say, “you have to have your ear to the ground all the time...and have a certain amount of patience and detachment.” Observing that “we’re older than most neighborhood association staff,” Susan and David say they may find this easier than others do, and that the effect of a less long-term focus, or less detachment, may be greater conflict for the organization. “If you’re looking for an outside enemy, you’re going to find one.”

When asked how they know when their work is effective, Susan and David agreed that intuition is powerful, saying “you just know” when something’s not working. They value “easy benchmarks...metrics,” less than other, less quantifiable measures, such as the successes they see “when you start telling your story.” Some measures of success may be small or easily-identified issues, such as the resolution of a local eyesore or completion of a construction project, but “most things are more long-range; there isn’t an end” when the outcome or
product is known. They acknowledged the difficulty of ensuring the success of their efforts at engagement of residents, saying, “How do you know if you’re really organizing and representing people, and not just yourself?”

Sometimes successes are observable in both the physical effects on the neighborhood and in the impacts on residents’ engagement and relationships. One such project is the transformation of Triangle Park, a public space in the neighborhood that was, at one time, used for drug dealing and prostitution, and is now an important neighborhood green space. EPNI worked with the city councilor to gain the necessary information and access to the publicly-owned land, in response to resident inquiries. Meanwhile, David facilitated a budding group of residents who became a formal organization called the Friends of Triangle Park, who “didn’t know anything about how to get what they needed” in order to make the changes they wanted to see in the park. In his words, he helped them learn “how to take ownership in community...how to do community organizing.” Susan and David saw this as an important way of building capacity and relationships among neighbors, “moving people beyond their own needs, working with neighbors, [which] reinforces peoples’ sense of being part of the community.”

Like other NAs we’ve profiled here, EPNI’s relationships at City Hall are an important part of the organization’s role in the neighborhood. As David put it, “Almost everything we do, somebody in some [city] department has to have something to do with it.” Staff described EPNI as having a very close relationship with City Hall, “very collegial,” and said that they believe other neighborhood associations have more adversarial relationships with the city. They believe this may be largely because Elliot Park is more welcoming toward development than other neighborhoods. “There are disagreements, we have to work things out,” but David said he believes they have “more credibility at city hall,” possibly because EPNI staff are older than those at some other NAs. These strong relationships with government have a positive impact on the organization’s standing with residents, according to staff, making them, “a very trusted liaison with City Hall.”

The organization’s place-based nature is both an advantage and a disadvantage for EPNI. Being rooted in a location, staff said, helps build relationships with other institutions in the neighborhood, and supports long-term learning about how to work with those groups. Community instability related to socio-economic issues has a negative impact on these relationships, though, in the case of Elliot Park. David said that working with EPNI, he has learned that “everything that happens is place-based; I’ve learned the importance of local identity.” He sees this as an inherent value of organizations like NAs, saying, “people gain identity, commitment when they have a sense of place.”

**Nokomis East Neighborhood Association**

Nokomis East Neighborhood Association has an annual budget of $185,000, of which 94% comes from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program. Another 1% of the budget comes from other City of Minneapolis sources, 2% from state agencies, 1% from small individual donors, and the remaining 2% from other sources. The organization has two full-time employees, of whom Rita Ulrich is one.
The organization sees its constituents similarly to the other NAs profiled here, as “all residents, businesses, and property owners,” though unlike the others, Nokomis East has a membership form that formally asks residents and others to “opt-in” to membership. The organization stated in the survey that members vote on changes to the bylaws, and described the board and membership’s roles in decision-making as follows: “We take only straw polls [of members] on issues, and place more emphasis on substantive comments. The Board makes decisions on the organization's position based on community input and other information or factors it deems relevant.” The board appears to make most formal decisions, including “contractual decisions, organizational policy, organizational priorities and workplan, positions on issues.” The 15-member board is structured to represent all parts of the NA’s service area, meets monthly, and has a new member more than once a year.

Nokomis East’s mission statement is, “The mission of Nokomis East Neighborhood Association is to better the quality of life and build a sense of community pride by sponsoring actions which help our environment, businesses and homes. NENA creates and manages solutions by leading a community-based process that advocates for the neighborhood and empowers members of the community.” The organization also has a strategic plan, which was written in 2002.

The only organization membership reported is in the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits. This distinguishes the organization from the others we’ve profiled so far, which all membership in smaller local organizations, and few (if any) groups with state- or even city-wide scope. Like the other NAs, Nokomis East reported having weekly contact with staff of peer organizations, though this contact was not quite as broad in content as that other groups reported, as it does not include networking, relationship building, or mutual membership in organizations or collaboratives. Nokomis East also reported receiving resources and support from other neighborhood associations, individual businesses, and “other” organizations, and contributing resources to other groups, as well. These contributed resources were described as, “whatever we can, depending on what’s being asked for. We may provide small amounts of funding to parks for events; we may provide advice to another neighborhood, we may provide staff time to a joint initiative.”

Nokomis East has contact with constituents daily through their website and drop-in visits to their office. They publish an email newsletter weekly. Issue-based, youth and family, and educational activities are held several times a year. Visits to businesses and membership and community meetings are also held several times a year. About 150 people are reported to attend membership meetings, and between 10 and 30 attend other kinds of programs.

Committees include housing, finance/budget, environmental issues, public safety, and festivals/events. Most of these meet several times a year, but not monthly. Weekly and monthly activities for the organization included only housing loans, though many other activities were listed as being conducted several times a year, including issue research, education for residents on issues, membership and other public meetings, youth and family activities, festivals and events, encouraging residents to contact elected officials, issue-based activities or programs, welcoming new residents, publishing a newsletter, creating
opportunities for cross-cultural engagement, engaging age- and income-diverse residents, and fundraising for other organizations. General membership meetings, youth and family activities, and housing loan programs were not characterized as part of the organization’s community organizing activities, though all other activities the organization engages in were.

In our interview with Rita Ulrich, she described organizing as an important element in Nokomis East’s strategic plan, in particular as the plan focuses on “neighborhood improvement, leadership, communication, and neighborhood advocacy,” though she also state that the organization doesn’t “generally talk about community organizing.” Rita said, “a core value is citizen participation – we want people involved in making decisions.” This is reflected in the structure of decision-making, though as we saw in the survey responses for this group, membership does not vote on most decisions. Instead, members input at “listening sessions,” after which the board of directors may make a position, resulting in some action such as sending a letter, or testifying to a government body, as appropriate.

Rita sees her organization’s role as to “take the lead on an issue...maybe opposing something,” or perhaps supporting some other change or effort in the neighborhood. One example she gave was the Monarch Festival that Nokomis East has developed. In the survey the group did when establishing their NRP plan, environmental issues were highly rated by residents, and a “naturescape” of native plantings along the lake was included in the plan. The organization’s leadership – “one person has really made this happen,” said Rita -- decided to use this focus on habitat protection, in particular for monarch butterflies, as the basis for a community festival.

This year, the organization hopes to use the festival as a way to engage the area’s growing Latino population, since monarch butterflies migrate to Mexico. Nokomis East is hoping to hire an “organizer” to “get stronger Latino participation” in the festival in 2010, and to get more other people from the neighborhood involved in the festival, as well.

Another local project for which Nokomis East NA took on this kind of leadership role is the restoration and reuse of a Bureau of Mines historic site in the area, near Fort Snelling. The board of the neighborhood association assessed the neighborhood’s interest in the site, and made the decision to pursue the preservation of one of several buildings located there. Though sufficient funding to actualize the plan was not acquired by the NA, Rita cited this project as a case of the organization’s board taking on an issue that was “very much of interest to the neighborhood.” When asked how the board became aware, or made the assessment, that this was a project in which residents had strong interest, she said, “I can tell from board members....You kinda use your gut on those things.” She described how some board members are vocal about what they hear in their immediate neighborhoods, and use that information to set the direction of the organization.

There are other types of issues that Nokomis East does not pursue as an organization. “Some things we stay away from, because it’s more than we can handle,” said Rita, “like social services – we would have a difficult time doing, for instance, foreclosure prevention.” Instead, the organization focuses on projects like the environmental restoration described above, and
providing recreational information to residents, which accounts for a large proportion of traffic to their website.

Meanwhile, the NA faces similar requests from residents to those that were described by Windom Park and Victory staff. Residents making these requests are sometimes simply referred to city officials, and sometimes these contacts are facilitated more closely by staff at Nokomis East. The organization tries to “do both – serving as a liaison to city hall, passing on [a concern], or we’ll just tell people to call 311.”

Occasionally the organization’s role is one of more intense mediation with the city or with other neighbors, if a resident’s needs are not being met, a variance is declined, or conflict arises. Rita told the story of a resident who wanted to enclose his porch, but was meeting with resistance from both the city and his neighbors. Nokomis East staff went door-to-door on his street, in order to ask neighbors why they were opposed to the project, and learned that for perhaps unrelated reasons, the man in question had simply “annoyed all his neighbors” so that they were unsupportive of his request. Through these conversations, though, it became clear to staff that their opposition was not to the porch project itself, so the organization was able to formally support the man’s request to the city to allow for the changes to his home.

When asked how the organization measures its success, Rita, like our other interviewees, cited a variety of indicators. A large number of hits on their website indicate that this is an effective means of communicating with residents, but “neighborhood improvement is much harder to measure.” One of Rita’s main strategies, she says, for ensuring the organization’s success, is to choose projects for which the resources and capacity are readily available. But these choices are not always easy, or popular. Rita says she has, “taken grief from people who wanted to do things that were harebrained,” and she pushed the organization to review their true ability to execute plans. This insistence on realism, as Rita sees it, has resulted in the loss of a few programs, such as a deferred loan program.

Other projects, such as a water quality assessment effort for the Lake, the Blue Water Commission, which had sufficiently strong support from “real pushers” among constituents and partner organizations have been very successful. In the case of the Blue Water Commission, Rita believes success hinged on the passion of a few individuals, and their ability (it’s not clear on what this ability was based), to engage decision- and policy-makers from many key groups, including government. Her observation is that this project “worked because there were citizens there to force officials to do something. It got things moving, got people talking to each other.”

Engaging diverse residents is a challenge for Nokomis East, according to Rita. “We would like to have more people of color involved,” she said, “it’s very difficult and labor-intensive to get [Latino] people involved, and people are going to decide for themselves what kind of involvement they’ll have…not necessarily the kind of involvement you want them to have.” When asked what tools were most important in their efforts at this kind of engagement, Rita said “you can flyer, you can translate all you want, but it’s all about people.” She said one-to-one, personal requests to serve on the board, or on a committee, had been most effective, adding, “that’s how you get committed involvement.”
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Rita was more confident in the organization’s representation of people with disabilities, and in the income diversity of the group’s leadership, which she says represents the full income diversity of constituents. In discussing how the board is accessible to people of different incomes, she said, “We make it very clear we expect every board member to make a contribution, but it’s private,” adding, “I can always tell about people’s incomes by how they respond when staff raises come up.”

Overall, Rita reported that the board is responsive and adaptable to residents’ concerns and interests. “Issues bubble up from committees and task forces,” she said, “and if the board isn’t seeing the picture, someone will bring it to their attention.”

Since Nokomis East Neighborhood Association has existed since before NRP, Rita was able to comment on how NRP has changed the organization. One changed was the formalization of non-profit status, when the group became a 501(c)(3) because of their participation. Since then, she says, the organization has “developed more policies, tighter regulations, for we’ll do,” some of which are mandated by NRP, and some of which are not. Rita sees the requirement of an annual financial audit, for instance, as a positive development, because “it forces you to keep things in order. If you really f***ed up, you deserve to get nailed – you’re using public funds.” Also thanks to NRP, the organization started producing an annual report in 2002 and has done so ever since.

Far from feeling limited by the requirements of NRP participation, Rita cited examples of work that represented a new direction for the organization, and which was made possible by NRP. During a library branch funding crisis, Nokomis East was able to use NRP funds to support expanded hours at the local library. Through NRP, Rita says, the city has been “supportive of advocacy work” as well, and the group’s relationships with NRP staff at the City are very positive. “The other thing about NRP,” which Rita was clear is part of Nokomis East’s mission, independent of the program, “is that you have to give everyone an opportunity to be involved.” This alignment of mission seems to be seen as a strength the organization draws from its participation in NRP.

When asked about the advantages and disadvantages of being a place-based organization, Rita had several observations. First, she said, the geographic boundaries of the constituency limit who can serve on the board, which she feels sometimes limits organizational capacity. Maintaining relationships with a range of organizations, such as schools and social service agencies, that may or may not serve the same specific area is a challenge. An advantage, though, is in the organization’s ability to know the resources that are available locally, and to know them well. This allows Nokomis East to refer residents to child care, English classes, and other programs offered by other groups, but in the immediate area.

Another advantage of the unique position of a neighborhood association, Rita said, is that “we don’t feel any particular competition.” A difficult and very close relationship with a local business association (the relationship and the business association are both now dissolved) seems to have held some of this kind of competition for resources, and perhaps, with many
organizational overlaps, some conflicts of interest. But Rita believes these difficulties could be avoided if the business association is revived in the future.

**Lake Street Council**

Lake Street Council is the only business association we interviewed, and as such has some characteristics that are distinct from the other groups profiled above. Founded in 1967, Lake Street Council is a 501(c)(6) organization, but is applying for 501(c)(3) status. Their annual budget of $240,000 comes from business contributors (40%), private foundations (30%), and the City of Minneapolis (30%). There are three full-time staff members, including Joyce Wisdom, executive director, whom we interviewed.

The organization defines its constituency as “Lake Street area businesses and other stakeholders,” and membership as follows: “Criteria for membership include completing an application for membership and paying annual dues. Members are entitled to vote and have equal rights and preferences in matters not otherwise provided for by the Board.” Members include institutions and organizations other than businesses, including non-profits and religious institutions. The general membership elects the board and approves the strategic plan, while the wider constituency, whether members or not, are surveyed to gauge opinion on some issues, both neighborhood-wide and related to organizational strategy. The 19-member board has new members about once a year, and makes strategic and financial planning decisions for the organization.

Lake Street Council’s mission is “to ensure the vitality and prosperity of the Lake Street corridor through business and community partnerships.” It was written by a committee in 2005, and revisited once a year. The group also has a strategic plan which is newly revised as of 2010, and is revisited at least once a year.

As compared to the other organizations profiled here, Lake Street Council is a member in a larger number of other groups, including several other local business and commercial organizations, as well as the Midtown Farmer’s Market, Minnesota Retailers Association, and the Resource Center of the Americas. Like others, staff reported having frequent (in this case, daily) contact with staff of peer organizations, consisting of information and resource sharing, networking, collaboration, and mutual membership in organizations. Lake Street Council reports receiving support and resources from city and county government, individual businesses, and other neighborhood and business associations, and contributes resources to neighborhood and business associations and individual businesses.

Communication with members and the broader community is of fairly high intensity at Lake Street Council., which makes daily or weekly use of facebook and other social networking sites, an email newsletter, and in-person visits at businesses’ locations and Lake Street Council’s offices. Membership meetings and visits to businesses reach several hundred people each.

Committees include communications and arts, finance and economic development, public safety (which includes environmental quality), and a membership and events committee.
meet monthly. Lake Street Council engages in the following activities at least monthly, some weekly or daily: direct negotiation with governmental and non-governmental groups, welcoming new residents, supporting online discussion groups, maintaining a presence on social networking sites, fundraising, creating opportunities for cross-cultural engagement, and engaging with ethically-, age- and income-diverse residents. Nearly all activities Lake Street Council reported engaging in were characterized as part of their community organizing work, with the exceptions of activities for youth and families and voter education.

In our interview with Joyce Wisdom, we first heard about the organization’s efforts to change their status with the IRS from 501(c)(6), a business association, to 501(c)(3), a non-profit organization. Joyce feels strongly that this shift would better reflect the way the organization now works, because, as she says, “it’s about who’s served – it’s not just business members, but growing the membership, and serving other people and businesses.”

“We get all kinds of calls,” said Joyce, from members and non-members alike, mostly small businesses, about issues they believe the organization can help with, “and we step up and help however we can.” The organization also seeks to mediate conflict between residents and businesses in their service area, in part by working with the neighborhood associations that serve the same area.

Because of their extensive experience, especially with long-term road construction projects like the one Lake Street recently went through, the Council has become a resource to other similar organizations throughout the Twin Cities. Joyce believes they’ve also brought together business associations from commercial corridors around the Cities in collegial relationships that are new, and useful for all concerned. As a group, these organizations can building greater support for their work among state and local government groups.

Negotiating with government on behalf of businesses is an essential part of the organization’s work. Joyce cited several examples of ordinance and regulation changes that the Council has lobbied for successfully, in response to the needs of Lake Street businesses. These have included changes to the definition of “specialty grocers” to allow them to sell products other than imported foods. Helping these businesses serve as more general shopping outlets to neighborhood residents, in the highly ethnically diverse environment of Lake Street, is an important way of “preserving the ethnic experience” in neighborhoods the Council serves, something Joyce says is a high priority.

Joyce sees its place-based identity as one of her organization’s strengths, and an important difference between the Council and some other groups with which they have worked. When major road construction started in 2005, “all eyes were on Lake Street,” and many non-profits, foundations, CDCs, and government agencies brought resources to the neighborhood to support businesses through this challenging time. Now, however, “a lot of organizations that were here in ’05 to ’07 have moved to University Avenue, because there’s investment there now.” Meanwhile, Lake Street Council has maintained its relationships and service area, and Joyce believes this has been extremely important to the continuing health of the district.
The particular place served by the Council presents some challenges, as well as advantages, for the organization. “It’s a big area with lots of jurisdictions,” and a huge range of cultures and uses along the length of the commercial corridor. “If you can get all the officials and policymakers along the corridor on one page, it’s a huge advantage,” said Joyce, “but if not, it’s a challenge.”

Balancing the Council’s staying power and long-term relationships with a dynamic and adaptable approach is a priority for Joyce. “Maintenance doesn’t have glitter and glitz,” she said, but it’s essential to long-term success. And in a changing, complex service area like Lake Street, “you constantly have to be changing and adapting in order to maintain.” This balance requires the right combination of people: “People seem to think we divide people into visionaries and operations people…but you have to have vision for your operations. And if the visionaries don’t have some sense of how to implement, that doesn’t work either.”

While acknowledging the importance of a rich set of organizational relationships, as well as continued efforts at engagement, Joyce said she also has learned to be protective of her time and attention. “I’ve become more and more conscious of how many meetings I go to, and how many are just conversation, the same conversation we’ve had before….You have to be really careful, because I could spend 24 hours a day, 7 days a week just meeting and not getting things done.” She said it’s easy to stay aware of how effective one’s work is when constituents are business owners, who tend to be action-oriented and time-conscious. “Working with business owners raises the stakes – they won’t just sit around and talk.”

When asked why community organizing is an important strategy or goal for Lake Street Council, Joyce said that in the business community, their work is “not about competition, it’s about synergy,” which she believes is better served by an organizing-type orientation. She sees her constituents understanding, more and more, that their success is greater when they work together, and “that’s how I term organizing.”

She also related the organization’s emphasis on organizing strategies to its efforts to evolve and better reflect the diversity of the corridor’s businesses and residents. Partly because the organization was founded in 1967 and has leadership patterns that date from that time, it has been, sometimes, a challenge to improve the diversity and responsiveness of the Council. Community organizing strategies appear to be, for Joyce, a key element in making this change, and a way for the organization to take responsibility for the evolution. “It’s not about them coming to us, it’s about us going to them.”

The high level of engagement that Joyce believes has come as a result of this approach means that personal relationships are one of the organization’s greatest assets. “Our work is face-to-face,” she said, “People want our database, but I tell them if they want to engage these business owners, it has to be face to face.” One staff member spends nearly all her time “on the street,” engaging one-on-one with business owners. She talks to these business owners about issues they might be struggling with, gathers input, and sometimes hears about new issues that the organization wasn’t previously aware of.
Joyce described a “big disconnect” between city planning and inspections departments, which the Council has worked to alleviate by serving as a voice for the needs of small businesses. Collaborating with the Chamber of Commerce and other groups that tend to represent larger businesses, they have lobbied the city on regulatory issues that matter to their constituents, including better alignment between land-use planning and enforcement. Lake Street Council, she said, “is able to bring a small business voice to that [lobbying], which the big boys need.” One of the main impacts of this work, Joyce says, is that city council members and other decision-makers are more aware of the “silos” city departments may work in, which create challenges for businesses trying to navigate a complex system of regulations.

One of the “next steps” that Joyce believes the Lake Street Council can help with is to bring business owners and neighborhoods (in particular neighborhood associations) together for better decision-making and communication. She sees NRP as having, of course, a significant role in how neighborhood associations relate to development and business, saying, “I really value neighborhood input in developments.” She is positive about the process that NRP has helped build between NAs and developers, but sees it as sometimes holding development back. Some neighborhoods are more resistant to development than others, of course. Joyce pointed to the two ends of Lake Street, where neighborhoods along River Parkway and Lake Calhoun tend to be more resistant to development. “If they could make Lake Street go away, they would,” she said. So far, Lake Street Council’s role in these negotiations between neighborhoods and developers has been to have staff attend planning and public input meetings, but Joyce says, “the next step is to bring business owners.”

Joyce has often seen NAs function mainly as critics in the development process. “Community organizers for the neighborhood associations would go to these meetings and say ‘what is it we oppose about this project?’” Lake Street Council has, she said, worked to encourage NAs to think and communicate more in terms of pros and cons, leading, she believes, to more constructive dialogue.

Despite this change for the better, Joyce said, “I still have issues with many of the neighborhoods, because they don’t have a process that’s somewhat consistent….My perception is that they approach different people in different ways [in considering developments and businesses]. I think there’s some racism there.” She proposes that more consistent processes and questions from NAs to business owners and developers could help make the process fairer for all. She was careful to qualify her statement, saying, “You cannot say all the neighborhood associations are like this, and this is Joyce’s opinion, not Lake Street Council’s.”

Joyce also questions the extent to which NRP has deeply changed the level and type of engagement of residents in some areas. “Before NRP, people still got together. People would get together and grouse about what was wrong, and with NRP, they had some resources.” The change she sees over time with NRP is that “those louder voices” that were already engaged in public conversations about local issues have “dominated the conversation, and I question whether they’re really representing their neighborhood.”
All that being said, Joyce added, “My job is a lot easier than a neighborhood director’s.” She pointed to the main distinction between her organization and a neighborhood association, namely the alignment of interests. All of Lake Street Council’s constituents are businesses on Lake Street, which gives them a common motivation and set of interests. Joyce sees this as quite different from neighborhood association, where geography may not give residents much in the way of shared interests or goals.

When asked how she would characterize Lake Street Council’s relationships with city and other officials, Joyce said that a key difference is that unlike neighborhood associations, “they don’t have to come to us for anything – it’s more based on mutual need.” At the same time, she sees a parallel with NAs in their function as an access point to a certain constituency. “If the neighborhood associations are their access to residents, we are their access to this group of small businesses.” This access is sometimes used for public processes, such as preparing for construction projects. The Council is also able to work with government to get conflicts resolved, as they did in the case of the regulatory issues related to ethnic grocers.

The cyclical change inherent to relationships with government are a key feature of the Council’s work. “Every time somebody new comes into elected office, there are new staff downtown, we have to rebuild those relationships. And usually they [staff and elected officials] get that, too.” Despite this, Joyce still sees neighborhoods and residents as having an advantage in the public dialogue: “The neighborhoods, I hope that they value the ear that they have with councilmembers, because I think councilmembers pay a lot more attention to residents, and don’t see businesses as their constituents. And often they’re not – they don’t live in the Lake Street neighborhood.” As we’ve seen, this essential difference between Lake Street Council and the other organizations described here has a profound impact on the way they work.

**Recommendations for future study**

As is clear from the interviews presented above, the range of views and interpretations of the concepts surrounding “community organizing” and “capacity building” are as diverse as the neighborhoods and constituencies represented. If future study is to be focused on the framing questions presented at the beginning of this work, regarding the impact and value of “place-based organizing,” results could be more meaningful if refocused in one of two ways: first, research could seek to document the impacts of the work, in general, of neighborhood (and perhaps business) associations, without discriminating regarding whether that work is “organizing” or not. Alternatively, the study’s framers could establish some set of activities, strategies, or characteristics that they believe define “place-based organizing.” As the research questions are currently framed, it’s unclear which of these is the topic of inquiry.

In the research presented here, we relied on the target organizations themselves to create a definition of “place-based organizing,” but have found such a vast range of interpretations of this term as to make any conclusions or generalizations of limited utility. Furthermore, our interpretation of organizations’ self-concepts as communicated in survey responses and interviews leads us to believe that while some respondents see their work within a strong, pre-existing framework for terms such as “organizing” and “capacity building,” others do not.
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Those for whom these terms or definitions are new or unfamiliar will have very different responses to our questions than others, and this difference may be the most important factor in those responses, rather than any meaningful pattern in organizations’ activities or goals. This calls into question any generalization that might be made about the meaning of these groups’ work in relation to external concepts of organizing, and further emphasizes the importance of resolving the questions of the goals of the research named above.

If the set of evaluation models we’ve outlined here are aligned with any future focusing of this work, further use of the survey tool may be useful. Because of our low response rate thus far, the data collected don’t allow us to draw any conclusions about the overall impacts of the work of the target organizations in Minneapolis, nor about this work’s relationship to organizing or capacity building concepts, but if further responses were gathered, analysis might be fruitful. If this is pursued, caution should be taken to ensure that a diverse cross-section of the target organizations are represented, as we believe it’s possible that better-resourced organizations and those in more affluent areas have, thus far, been somewhat more likely to respond to the survey, and to have staff time available for interviews.

Among those organizations we did successfully survey and interview, we heard a diverse set of responses to our questions, yet also observed a few themes that might be interesting subjects for further inquiry. Additional questions that have emerged include: If part of what is meant in this project’s use of the term “place-based organizing” points to the engagement and empowerment of less-advantaged or minority populations in Minneapolis neighborhoods, what tools, incentives, and capacity do these organizations have to make progress on this front? If “organizing” is, at least in part, a means of gaining access to resources and decision-making for people who have been in some way disenfranchised, how does a government-funded and –framed program like NRP support these goals?

If any future study seeks to investigate the question, “How does the level of resources (time, people, money, political and social capital) influence the effectiveness of place based organizing?” our survey results on the budgets, staff, and organizational relationships of the target organizations may be useful. From the limited information available from our small set of interviews, though, it appears that staff professional identities and organizational self-concept (as held by staff and board of directors, primarily) may have a significant effect, as well, on the nature and impacts of the work these groups do. Further interviews focused on these self-perceptions might help enumerate these effects.

Some of the questions framed in the introduction to this project cannot be answered by inquiring only with the organizational leadership of neighborhood associations. If social capital is an intended outcome of place-based organizing, and future study seeks to measure the impact of neighborhood associations on social capital, some means of assessing social capital in Minneapolis neighborhoods should be used. Residents are generally engaged in such assessments, such as the method available from University of Minnesota Extension (University of Minnesota Extension, 2010).
If more general impacts of NAs on the “health and welfare” (as it’s stated in the research questions) of neighborhood residents are to be measured, the work we’ve done here to identify the primary activities and missions of the organizations may be a useful beginning. Since the framework of NRP and other structures and funding sources influencing the work of NAs is relatively flexible and diverse, organizations respond to neighborhood needs by doing many different things. The implication for research into impacts is that those activities should be enumerated and described before generalizations can be made about the set of organizations as a whole, since their activities may vary so widely. A preliminary analysis of survey results showing the overall frequency of various activities among respondents is included in Appendix C.

The perceptions of the work of place-based organizations by policy makers and funders (in many cases, as we’ve seen, one in the same) are, it seems from our small set of interviews, of interest to staff of neighborhood associations. The quality and characteristics of NAs’ relationships with both elected officials and city staff were a topic on which much commentary was volunteered, and appears to have a significant impact on the effectiveness of the organizations, in terms of both influencing policy and engaging with residents. Gaining more information about the other half of these relationships by interviewing officials who work with the NAs, would help paint a more complete picture of these dynamics.
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Appendix A

Place-based Organizing in Minneapolis

This survey is being conducted as part of a project on place-based organizing, sponsored by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota. It should take about 30 minutes of your time to complete.

We're interested in learning about your organization's work and relationships. Some respondents may be contacted for follow-up interviews. As part of the survey, you'll have a chance to indicate whether you are willing to be contacted or not. Your responses are an essential part of our work to explore and strengthen the work of organizations like yours in the Twin Cities. Thank you for participating!

About your organization
First, we'd like to find out which organization you work with. Remember, if you work with more than one neighborhood or business association, please complete a separate survey for each organization.
1 What is the name of your organization?
2 Phone number:
3 Web address:
4 Is your organization
Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ A neighborhood association
   ○ A business association
   ○ Other

About You
5 What is your name?
6 What is your position with your organization?
7 May we contact you to follow up on your responses to this survey?
Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
8 What is the best way to contact you? Enter the appropriate email address and/or phone number below.
9 Email address:
10 Your direct phone number:

More about your organization
11 In what year was your organization founded?
12 Has it operated continuously since then?
Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes
- No

13 What is your organization's legal structure? If you choose "other", please describe in the comments box to the right.

Please choose only one of the following:

- 501(c)(3) Nonprofit
- Other

14 What is the approximate total of your organization's annual budget? Please enter a whole dollar amount, without a dollar sign or decimals.

15 Please tell us about the sources of your funding. For each option below, enter the approximate percentage of your budget that comes from that source. You do not need to include a % symbol. Please be sure the numbers you enter add up to a total of 100.

- Private foundations
- Non-profit organizations
- Corporate or business contributors
- City of Minneapolis
- Neighborhood Revitalization Program
- State agencies
- Federal agencies
- Small individual donors (less than $100 per year each)
- Large individual donors (more than $100 per year each)
- Fees charged for services
- Other

Your staff and organizational structure

16 Please describe the geographical area you serve.

17 Please tell us about your staff:

- How many paid, full-time staff members does your organization have?
- How many paid, part-time staff members does your organization have?

18 Some organizations like yours employ people who are professional organizers. Does your organization have staff or contractors whose job description or title includes "community organizing," or have you in the past?

Please choose only one of the following:

- Yes, we currently employ at least one organizer.
- We don't currently employ any organizers, but we have done so in the past.
- No, we don't now and we have never employed organizers.

19 (Conditional on answer 1 or 2 to #18) Please tell us the following about the organizers you employ or have employed:

- How many people are or were working for your group as paid organizers?
- How many hours per week, in total, did or do your staff organizers work for your organization?
Your organization's membership
20 Who does your organization seek to represent or serve?
21 Does your organization have members?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
22 (Conditional on answer “yes” to question 21) If so, how does your organization define membership?
23 Do you have members who are not individuals, such as other organizations, businesses, non-profit agencies, religious organizations, etc.?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
24 (Conditional on answer “yes” to question 23) If your organization has members who are not individuals, such as other organizations, businesses, non-profit agencies, religious organizations, etc., please describe them:

Decision-making by members
25 Sometimes organizations make group or neighborhood decisions through their boards of directors, and in other cases, the organization’s full membership may debate and vote on an issue, or may decide an issue by consensus. In your organization, are there decisions on which all members are allowed to vote?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
26 If so, what kinds of decisions are these?
27 Are there decisions in which all members are engaged in ways other than voting, such as surveys or public meetings?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
28 (Conditional on answer “yes” to question 27) If so, what kinds of decisions are these?

Your board of directors
29 How many people serve on your board of directors?
30 How often does your board of directors meet?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   ○ Weekly
   ○ Every 2 weeks
   ○ Monthly
   ○ Every other month
   ○ Quarterly
   ○ Annually
   ○ No answer
31 How are your board members selected?
32 Are your board members subject to term limits?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Yes
- No
33 (Conditional on answer “yes” to question 32) What is the maximum number of years a board member may serve?
34 About how often does your organization have a new board member?
Please choose only one of the following:
- More than once a year
- Once a year
- Every other year
- Once every 3 to 4 years
- Once every 5 to 6 years
- Less often
35 On average, how many hours do board members spend per month on organizational business and activities? Please enter a number of hours.
36 What kinds of decisions does your board of directors make for the organization?

Your volunteers
37 In an average month, about how many people volunteer with your organization?
38 In an average month, about how many hours do those people volunteer in total? Please enter the total number of volunteer hours contributed by all volunteers combined.
39 In an average month, about how many hours does an average volunteer at your organization spend volunteering? Please tell us the average number of hours contributed by an individual volunteer.
40 How have your organization's volunteers been recruited?
41 Please tell us about the kinds of work volunteers do at your organization, and how often they do these kinds of work. For each option on the left, choose how often the task is performed by a volunteer.
Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving on the board of directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and/or hosting events on behalf of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct contact with constituents, such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls, door-knocking, or attending outside community events to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represent the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving on a committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting members or volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as liaison to another group or organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting government officials on behalf of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting programs or activities hosted by the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Your organization's mission**

42 Does your organization have a mission statement?
Please choose only one of the following:
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

43 If so, please insert it here:

44 Who wrote this mission statement?

45 When was it written? If possible, please enter the year in the space provided. Otherwise, please be as specific as you can be.

46 How often is this mission statement revisited and/or revised?
Please choose only one of the following:
- ☐ Once a year
- ☐ Every 2-3 years
- ☐ Every 4-5 years
- ☐ Every 6-10 years
- ☐ Less often
The statement has never been revised, but we plan to revisit it within the next year
The statement has never been revised, and we have no specific plans to revisit it in the future.

47 Does your organization have a strategic plan?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Yes
- No

48 Who wrote this strategic plan?

49 When was it written? If possible, please enter the year in the space provided. Otherwise, please be as specific as you can be.

50 How often, if ever, is your strategic plan revisited and/or revised?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Once a year
- Every 2-3 years
- Every 4-5 years
- Every 6-10 years
- Less often
- The plan has never been revised, but we plan to revisit it within the next year
- The plan has never been revised, and we have no specific plans to revisit it in the future.

51 How often does your board revisit or reevaluate the organization's work as it related to your mission and/or strategic plan?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Monthly or more often
- Quarterly
- Once a year
- Every 2-3 years
- Every 4-5 years
- Every 6-10 years
- Less often
- The board has never evaluated this, but plans to within the next year
- The board has never evaluated this, and has no specific plans to do so in the future

52 How often, if ever, does your staff revisit or reevaluate the organization's work as it relates to your mission and/or strategic plan?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Monthly or more often
- Quarterly
- Once a year
- Every 2-3 years
- Every 4-5 years
- Every 6-10 years
- Less often
- Staff have never evaluated this, but plan to within the next year
- Staff have never evaluated this, and have no specific plans to do so in the future
**Committees 1**

53 Which of the following types of committees does your organization include? For each committee you have, please use the box on the right to tell us how many members the committee includes.

Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:

- Housing
- Business association
- Youth-oriented
- Environmental issues
- Newsletter, newspaper, or communications
- Finance/budget
- Arts
- Public safety
- Neighborhood Revitalization Plan
- Volunteer and/or membership recruitment
- Parks
- Festivals and Events
- Other

54 If you checked "other", please list the other committees your organization includes:

[Only answer this question if you answered 'Other' to question '6ai']

**Committees 2**

55 For each committee that your organization includes, please tell us how often that committee meets.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter, newspaper, or communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Revitalization Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer and/or membership recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals and Events</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other committees</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56 For each committee that your organization includes, please tell us what types of actions and activities that committee engages in. Please choose all that apply and provide a comment:

- Housing
- Business Association
- Youth-oriented
- Environmental issues
- Newsletter, newspaper, or communications
- Finance/budget
- Arts
- Public safety
- Neighborhood Revitalization Plan
- Volunteer and/or membership recruitment
- Parks
- Festivals and Events
- Other committees

**Communication**

57 How often, if ever, do you use each of the following methods to communicate with your members and/or constituents? Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed newsletter</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email newsletter</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your organization's</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook page</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Communication Methods**

58 How often does your organization have the following kinds of contact with members and/or constituents?

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open houses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in visits to your location</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door-knocking</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to businesses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership meetings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational offerings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and family activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language, culture, or ethnicity based activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue-based activities or programs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 How many people, on average, attend or are contacted through each of these types of events? For each type of event that you conduct or participate in, please fill in a number in the box to the right.

- Open houses
- Drop-in visits to your location
- Door-knocking
- Visits to businesses
- Community meetings
- Membership meetings
- Public hearings
- Educational offerings
- Youth and family activities
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• Language, culture, or ethnicity based activities
• Issue-based activities or programs

Relationships
60 Of which organizations, coalitions, or other groups is your organization a member? Please list in the space below.
61 How often do you, personally, come into contact (either in person or otherwise) with staff and/or colleagues from organizations like your own? Please choose only one of the following:
  ○ Daily
  ○ Weekly
  ○ Monthly
  ○ Several times a year
  ○ Less than once a year
  ○ Never
  ○ Refuse to answer
62 When you do come into contact with colleagues from other organizations, how would you characterize this contact? Please choose all that apply:
  □ Sharing information
  □ Sharing other resources
  □ Networking or relationship-building
  □ Collaboration on projects or programs
  □ Membership in ongoing coalitions and/or collaboratives
63 Groups like yours sometimes ask for advice, moral support, provision of meeting places or other material support from other community groups. Which of the following groups would you say provide that kind of support to your organization? Check all that apply. Please choose all that apply:
  □ Individual business
  □ Neighborhood association
  □ Business association
  □ School district or school board
  □ Religious organization
  □ City government
  □ County government
  □ Park board
  □ Other
64 Does your organization provide these kinds of resources to other groups? Please choose only one of the following:
  ○ Yes
  ○ No
65 If so, what kinds of resources do you provide?
66 To which groups or organizations do you provide these resources? Please be as specific as possible.
Your organization's community work

67 Organizations like yours engage in many different kinds of activities. These actions may be taken by staff, volunteers, members, or others affiliated with your group. Please tell us how often, if ever, your organization engages in the following activities:

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voter education, registration, and/or get-out-the-vote efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for residents on issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media contacts on issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training for residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political action training for residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of training for residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized protests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct negotiation with government groups or representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct negotiation with other, non-governmental groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized lobbying, testifying, or advising to government groups or representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting public meetings on issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with residents to secure housing loans and/or grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General membership meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for youth and families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging residents to contact elected officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter-writing, petition, or email campaigns on issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting festivals and events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting or organizing block clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting or organizing issue-based committees or programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming new residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting or organizing online discussion groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing a newsletter or similar materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a presence on social networking sites, such as Facebook or LinkedIn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Organizations like yours usually have many different goals, and use many different strategies and tools to pursue these goals. Community organizing has many definitions, but it can be an organizational goal, or a strategy or tool to pursue a goal. Does your organization's work include community organizing?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Yes
- No

(Conditional on answer “yes” to question 68) Which of these activities do you consider to be key components of your community organizing work, either now or in the last 5 years? Please check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refuse to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising for your organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising for another organization or issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation in support of an issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating opportunities for cross-cultural engagement among community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting programs or projects that are specific to a certain ethnic group or background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging culturally-diverse residents in issues or projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging income-diverse residents in issues or projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging age-diverse residents in issues or projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Voter education, registration, and/or get-out-the-vote efforts
- Issue research
- Education for residents on issues
- Media contacts on issues
- Leadership training for residents
- Political action training for residents
- Other types of training for residents
- Organized protests
- Direct negotiation with government groups or representatives
- Direct negotiation with other, non-governmental groups
- Organized lobbying, testifying, or advising to government groups or representatives
- Hosting public meetings on issues
- Developing a neighborhood plan or vision
- Working with residents to secure housing loans and/or grants
- General membership meetings
- Activities for youth and families
- Encouraging residents to contact elected officials
- Letter-writing, petition, or email campaigns on issues
- Hosting festivals and events
- Supporting or organizing block clubs
- Supporting or organizing issue-based committees or programs
- Welcoming new residents
- Supporting or organizing online discussion groups
- Publishing a newsletter or similar materials
- Maintaining a presence on social networking sites, such as Facebook or LinkedIn
- Fundraising for your organization
- Fundraising for another organization or issue
- Litigation in support of an issue
- Creating opportunities for cross-cultural engagement among community members
- Hosting programs or projects that are specific to a certain ethnic group or background
- Engaging culturally-diverse residents in issues or projects
- Engaging income-diverse residents in issues or projects
- Engaging age-diverse residents in issues or projects
Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Armatage</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Jennifer Swanson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjnz@msn.com">sjnz@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Audubon Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Laura Hoenack</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mail@audubonneighborhood.org">mail@audubonneighborhood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Bancroft</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Celia Kutz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@bancroftneighborhood.org">info@bancroftneighborhood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Beltrami</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Karen Brown (Chair)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karenlouise01@yahoo.com">karenlouise01@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Bottineau</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Chris Gams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BNA@bottineauneighborhood.org">BNA@bottineauneighborhood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 Bryant</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Melissa Waskiewicz</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ladybugmm@gmail.com">ladybugmm@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Bryn Mawr</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Patty Wycoff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mail@bmna.org">mail@bmna.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 CARAG</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Scott Engel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CARAG@carag.org">CARAG@carag.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Webber-Camden</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Roberta Englund</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@webbercamden.org">info@webbercamden.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cedar-Riverside</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Abdirizak Mahboub</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mahbouba@puc-mn.org">mahbouba@puc-mn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Cedar-Isles-Dean</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Ed Bell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ebell@CBBURNET.COM">ebell@CBBURNET.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Central</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Jim Parsons</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mplscando@gmail.com">mplscando@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cleveland</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Debbie Nelson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cna@clevelandneighborhood.org">cna@clevelandneighborhood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Columbia Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Kathy Buchanan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathybuchanan@att.net">kathybuchanan@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Corcoran</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Amy Arcand</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amy@corcoranneighborhood.org">amy@corcoranneighborhood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Downtown East, West</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Christie Rock-Hantge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christie@hutchtel.net">christie@hutchtel.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 East Harriet</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Emily Winter</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@eastharriet.org">info@eastharriet.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 East Isles</td>
<td>Org Chair</td>
<td>Ross D’Emanuele</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.emanuele.ross@dorsey.com">d.emanuele.ross@dorsey.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 East Calhoun</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Monica Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nrp@eastcalhoun.org">nrp@eastcalhoun.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Elliot Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Susan Braun</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susanbraun@elliotpark.org">susanbraun@elliotpark.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Field, Regina, Northrop</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Donna Sanders</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frng@mtn.org">frng@mtn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Folwell</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Roberta Englund</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@folwell.org">info@folwell.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Fuller Tangletown</td>
<td>Org Chair</td>
<td>Ryan Fisher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@TANGLETOWN.ORG">president@TANGLETOWN.ORG</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Fulton</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Rhea Sullivan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhea.sullivan@gmail.com">rhea.sullivan@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Hale, Page, Diamond Lake</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Rosie Doege-Dryden</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hpdl@bitstream.net">hpdl@bitstream.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Harrison</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Larry Hiscock</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hnampls@qwest.net">hnampls@qwest.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Hawthorne</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Laban Ohito</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lohito@hawthorneneighborhoodcouncil.org">lohito@hawthorneneighborhoodcouncil.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Holland</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Kevin Reich</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin@hnia.org">kevin@hnia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Jordan</td>
<td>Org Chair</td>
<td>Michael Browne</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kipbrowne@hotmail.com">kipbrowne@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Kenny</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Ruth Olson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@kennynighborhood.org">info@kennynighborhood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Kenwood</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Pat Scott</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pscott01@hotmail.com">pscott01@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Kingfield</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Sarah Linnes-Robinson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kfna@email.com">kfna@email.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbohood</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Lind-Bohanon</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Amy Luesebrink</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LindBohanonNA@aol.com">LindBohanonNA@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Linden Hills</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Scott Engel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott@lindenhills.org">scott@lindenhills.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Logan Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Jay Fetyko</td>
<td><a href="mailto:loganparkna@aol.com">loganparkna@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Longfellow</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Melanie Majors</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melanie@longfellow.org">melanie@longfellow.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Loring Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Jana Metge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clpc@visi.com">clpc@visi.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Lowry Hill</td>
<td>Org Chair</td>
<td>Craig Wilson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:craigw@kandiyo.com">craigw@kandiyo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Lowry Hill East</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Caroline Griepentrog</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lhena@thewedge.org">lhena@thewedge.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Lyndale</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Mark Hinds</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark@lyndale.org">mark@lyndale.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Lynnhurst</td>
<td>Org Chair</td>
<td>Christopher Dark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christophersdark@yahoo.com">christophersdark@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Marcy Holmes</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Melissa Bean</td>
<td><a href="mailto:office@marcy-holmes.org">office@marcy-holmes.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Marshall Terrace</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>no staff</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marshallterrace@msn.com">marshallterrace@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 McKinley</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Chris Morris</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mckinleycommunity@yahoo.com">mckinleycommunity@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Nicollet Island/East Bank</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@niebna.org">info@niebna.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Nokomis East</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Rita Ulrich</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rulrich@nokomiseast.org">rulrich@nokomiseast.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Northeast Park</td>
<td>Org Chair</td>
<td>Brian Steele</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bribytes@aol.com">bribytes@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Near North, Willard Hay</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Sherrie Pugh Sullivan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:spugh@nrcc.org">spugh@nrcc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Powderhorn Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Kari Neathery</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kari@ppna.org">kari@ppna.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Prospect Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Joyce Barta</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bartajm@yahoo.com">bartajm@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Seward</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Mike Rollin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike@sng.org">mike@sng.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Sheridan</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sno@sheridanneighborhood.org">sno@sheridanneighborhood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Shingle Creek</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Amy Luesebrink</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scna@stribmail.com">scna@stribmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Southeast Como</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>James De Sota</td>
<td><a href="mailto:secomo@secomo.org">secomo@secomo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 St Anthony West</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Gayle Bonneville</td>
<td><a href="mailto:neighbors@stawno.org">neighbors@stawno.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 St Anthony East</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Kristi McKay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:saenanrp1@aol.com">saenanrp1@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Standish Ericsson</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Shirley Yeoman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shirleyy@standish-ericsson.org">shirleyy@standish-ericsson.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Stevens Square</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Steve Gallagher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steven.gallagher3@gmail.com">steven.gallagher3@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Victory</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Debbie Nelson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vina@mninter.net">vina@mninter.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Waite Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Gary Arntsen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:waiteparkcc@gmail.com">waiteparkcc@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Whittier</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Marian Biehn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Marian@WhittierAlliance.org">Marian@WhittierAlliance.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Windom</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Amanda Vallone</td>
<td><a href="mailto:council@windomcommunity.org">council@windomcommunity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Windom Park</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Gayle Bonneville</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@windompark.org">info@windompark.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 EPIC</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Carol Pass</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cpass@runbox.com">cpass@runbox.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 Midtown Phillips</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Todd Rasmuson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:todd@daystarus.org">todd@daystarus.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Ventura Village</td>
<td>Org Chair</td>
<td>Ray Peterson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rpeter@tcinternet.net">rpeter@tcinternet.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Phillips West</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Crystal Trutnau</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pwno2005@yahoo.com">pwno2005@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 North Loop</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>David Frank</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@northloop.org">info@northloop.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 American Indian</td>
<td>staff contact</td>
<td>Pamela Standing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pamelastanding@msn.com">pamelastanding@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less than once/ year</th>
<th>Several times a year</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Is it part of organizing work?</th>
<th>Number who do it more than once/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Voter education, registration, and/or get-out-the-vote efforts]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Issue research]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Education for residents on issues]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Media contacts on issues]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Leadership training for residents]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Political action training for residents]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Other types of training for residents]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Organized protests]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Direct negotiation with government]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities: [direct negotiation with other, non-governmental groups]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities: [organized lobbying, testifying, or advising to government groups or representatives]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities: [hosting public meetings on issues]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities: [developing a neighborhood plan or vision]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities: [working with residents to secure housing loans and/or grants]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities: [general membership meetings]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities: [activities for youth and families]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Encouraging residents to contact elected officials]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Letter-writing, petition, or email campaigns on issues]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Hosting festivals and events]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Supporting or organizing block clubs]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Supporting or organizing issue-based committees or programs]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Welcoming new residents]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Supporting or organizing online discussion groups]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Publishing a newsletter or similar materials]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Maintaining a presence on social networking]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Fundraising for your organization]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Fundraising for another organization or issue]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Litigation in support of an issue]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Creating opportunities for cross-cultural engagement among community members]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Hosting programs or projects that are specific to a certain ethnic group or background]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Engaging culturally-diverse residents in issues or projects]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities: [Engaging income-diverse residents in</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>issues or projects]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Activities:  
[Engaging age-diverse residents in issues or projects] | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
Appendix D

Complete survey results, included as separate Microsoft Excel document PlaceBasedSurveyResults.xls