

Minutes Neighborhood Advisory Commission May 4, 2016

Minutes of the Neighborhood Advisory Commission (NAC) held on May 4, 2016, at the City Hall, 3rd Floor Conference Room, 31 E. 5th Street, Tempe, Arizona.

(MEMBERS) Present: Nancy Buell, Jack Escobar, Carol Shixue Hu, Matt Korbeck, Kiyomi Kurooka, Robert Miller, Bill Munch, Scott Smas

(MEMBERS) Absent: Karen Adams, Isela Blanc, Nancy Lesko, Candyce Lindsay, Josephine McNamara, Julie Ramsey, James Wennlund

City Staff Present: Elizabeth Thomas, Neighborhood Services Specialist; Shauna Warner, Neighborhood Services Manager.

Guests Present: None.

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m.

Agenda Item 2 – Public Comment

None.

Agenda Item 3 – Consideration of Minutes: April 6, 2016

Commissioner Buell made a motion to approve the April 4 minutes as presented, Commissioner Korbeck seconded the motion and it passed with four aye votes and four abstentions from commissioners who were absent from the April meeting.

Agenda Item 4 – Neighborhood Award Nomination Form and Rater Form Work Study Session PRIOR/APRIL MINUTES EXCERPT

Staff called attention to the April 4 NAC minutes, Agenda Item 6, **Neighborhood Award Nomination Form and Rater Form Discussion and Review** as a reminder of the April meeting and where the initial discussion and where it left off. Commissioners briefly discussed if the documents should be reviewed and updated closer to the next State of the Neighborhoods event in 2017.

Staff reminded commissioners of multiple outreach and print deadlines being only months away as well as the need to get commissioner input while it is fresh. There was agreed that it is timely and necessary to identify and make the desired changes now.

An email with input from Commissioner Lindsay, who could not be present at the May meeting, was shared. Portions of her feedback along with multiple observations and suggestions from the commissioners' robust discussion are noted below.

Nomination Form:

- Photos are required to be considered for evaluation-state that clearly. *If we need them, how many?* Then, they must be received in order to be considered.
- If there is a self-nomination, require nominator to provide at least one letter of support from whomever they choose. How else can we assess whether they are having broad impact on the neighborhood if we don't know what the people are saying?
- Under official nomination instructions-the language says NAC decision will be based on what is provided in the application only, commission needs to stick to that commitment for the sake of integrity of the process. No individual history of people to make a decision. Keeping to the instructions is the best way to go.
- What are we looking for? Whom do we want to honor and celebrate?
- Unique and/or substantial characteristics have often defined Neighbor of the Year and Chuck Malpede Award winners.
- The Chuckie is clearly for more sustained, longevity candidates.
- Longevity defined as?
- The nomination form and the rater form must correlate. Any changes made to one need to align with the other.
- We need to simplify and streamline process and communicate process to encourage nominations.

Evaluation Tools/Rater Form:

- Provided suggestions are applicable for all three awards.
- Reduce the scale to 1-3 with measurable criteria. Much of what is currently included leaves the group to interject lots of our own perspective without concrete details (i.e. Candidate's involvement has been unique and/or substantial – this is not measurable and should be deleted).
- The rater form is not a friendly form and the numbering should be modified to read 1, 2, 3 ascending from left to right.
- Agreement to keep Neighbor of the Year and Chuck Malpede grids on the same rater form.
- Can try to create more metrics or mini metrics.
- We just need to review, refine our existing criteria.
- We had a number of metrics in the past which only added to the confusion.

General:

- Quality of this year's nominations varied widely.
- Number of nominations received this year was a big disappointment.
- Nominees are only as good as their nominators. Nominators tell their story.
- Some nominations do not sufficiently reflect nominee contributions.
- NAC members can and do submit nominations and/or ensure their neighbors, neighborhood, co-workers, family and friends are aware of the opportunity to do so.
- We need to simplify, streamline and communicate better to encourage nominations.

- Consider bulleting some of the awards background information and/or providing a highlights sheet to encourage nominators to read and follow directions.
- There is no mandate to give a golden shovel, golden rake or Chuckie any given year.
- It would be very labor intensive but can someone work with the applicants and help identify nomination inadequacies and help them to get these corrected before voting meeting?
- Any way to provide more guidance to nominators?
- Some nominators seem to know how to do it, play the game, better than others.
- This favors the more active neighbors and neighborhoods.
- Perhaps a power point with instructions could be provided on neighborhoods website?
- Nominator testimonials about nominees would be helpful.
- Tendency is to favor the most professional looking nominations and those with the most testimonials and the most flattering portraits. Is this what this is really about?
- Can we provide prior nominations on website? Staff agreed to follow up but noted that this could have legal implications or otherwise be problematic (i.e. may even dissuade would be nominators).

Staff added that the background information about the awards, the process and deadlines including the current criteria, is readily available and shared through multiple outreach tools each grant cycle. In addition, staff is available to answer questions and speak to any would be nominators and often do. The number of and quality of nominations has always varied. Some are quickly assembled and others are prepared over months. Commissioners need to address what they are seeking and who they are intending to award with a higher honor and how. (All nominees are recognized with an honorable mention, a framed certificate and a photo opportunity with Mayor and Council.)

Commissioners agreed that the discussion needs to continue into June. This will allow time to review all comments to date and absent members who participated in this year's event, as well as past years, can then engage. Staff then read over the evening's recorded comments for confirmation of any points of agreement and understanding.

Agenda Item 5 - Proposed Agenda Items for June or Future meeting

- Neighborhood Advisory Commission Retreat Planning – Members present agreed that an August 6 meeting date was their preference. Staff agreed to follow up with other members and to look into availability of Tempe History Community Room as a preferred location choice as well as the Library/Connections Café meeting room.
- Outreach Initiatives/Collective goal – Foster more involvement and participation of neighborhoods or areas that are not as involved or active

Agenda Item 10 –Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Prepared by: Elizabeth Thomas, Neighborhood Services Specialist
 Reviewed by: Shauna Warner, Neighborhood Services Manager