

# Report and Meeting Notes for Hennepin-University Partnership Planning Session

May 2009

Topic	Overall Score
1) Increasing Graduation Rates <i>14</i>	Green: Best Candidates (1-3)
2) Ending Homelessness <i>11</i>	Blue: Good Candidates (4-6)
3) Greenhouse Gas Reduction <i>3</i>	Red: Maybe Later (7-8)
4) Vital Aging for Boomers <i>1</i>	Red: Maybe Later (7-8)
5) Child Welfare - Adoptions, Foster Care <i>12</i>	Green: Best Candidates (1-3)
6) Promotion of Healthy Behaviors <i>4</i>	Blue: Good Candidates (4-6)
7) Health Care - Responding to National Change at the Local Level <i>1</i>	Red: Maybe Later (7-8)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

I. Summary Results p. 5 - 6

II. Session Notes p. 7 - 9

- Opening and Introductory Comments
- Small group discussion of proposals
- Large group discussion of proposals

### Attachments:

Attachment A: Attendees and group assignments p. 11  
Attachment B: Meeting Agenda p. 13  
Attachment C: Proposals p. 13 - 19  
Attachment D: Detailed Session Notes p. 21 - 29

On April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2009 the Hennepin-University Partnership convened an Executive Planning Session at the University of Minnesota's Campus Club. Leaders from Hennepin County and the University of Minnesota worked together to identify major public policy issues that would be considered promising candidates for research to be undertaken jointly by the University and Hennepin County (attendee list shown in Attachment A). The agenda included an overview of the Hennepin-University Partnership and acknowledgement of the work that has been conducted since the Partnership was formed in 2005, and a preliminary list of candidate areas for collaboration (Attachment B).

A summary of the results of this session is as follows:

### **I. Summary Results**

The session began with a list of possible areas for collaboration, shown on Attachment C. While there was significant back-and-forth discussion at the planning session and differing opinions on where the HUP should focus resources in upcoming years, the following list summarizes the conclusion of the discussion:

#### TOP CANDIDATES FOR COLLABORATION

##### **Development of Human Capital through Educational Attainment**

- This proposal was renamed from "Increasing Graduation Rates" because many thought that it was important to see educational attainment as the larger issue affecting graduation rates, and wanted to include proposals #14 African American Men and #15 Immigrants.
- Participants mentioned that educational attainment is fundamental in that it affects success in all other areas of life. While there was some debate about whether or not the County should be or could be involved with the education system, there was agreement on the County's important role in supporting educational success, child well-being, and out of school time. The group wanted to stress that this proposal was not about school reform, but rather, is a comprehensive look at what affects each person's ability to be successful in life through their educational success.

##### **Child Well-Being (Focus on Vulnerable Youth)**

- This proposal was renamed from "Child Welfare—Adoptions, Foster Care" because the group wanted to frame it as well-being rather than welfare.
- The group also agreed that the original scope was too narrow, and wanted to include issues such as educational attainment in this topical area.

##### **Building Healthy Communities**

- This proposal was renamed from "Promotion of Healthy Behaviors" because the group wanted to include proposals #4 Vital Aging and #12 Public Health Approach to Children's Mental Health.
- It was unanimously agreed that this is a very important issue and also discussed that other proposals may fit into this proposal as well, including #3 Greenhouse Gas Reduction and #5 Child Well-Being.

##### **Understanding the Impact of an Aging Population**

- This proposal was renamed from "Vital Aging for Boomers" because there was greater interest in the impact on the community of the demographic bulge of baby boomers.
- Impacts of interest include educational, housing, transportation, healthcare.

#### OTHER GOOD CANDIDATES

##### **Ending Homelessness**

- There was a general sense that, while this is a very important issue that needs attention, there is already joint work being done in this area between the University and the County.

- Many expressed interest in maintaining and supporting the work that is already underway, which involves the University acting in a research and evaluation role.

#### **Greenhouse Gas Reduction**

- There was some debate over this proposal as some individuals believed that there is a lot of energy and funding for this area, and some thought that it is important but not as urgent as other proposals.

#### **Rethinking the Role of Government**

- This was considered to be a critical topic for the County to work on but it was not clear as to how the County and the U would work together. Additionally, this topic suffered by comparison to more urgent concerns.

#### **Health Care (preparing for a shift in how health care is provided and paid for)**

- The group was in agreement that while this proposal is important, national health care policy will most likely be imposed upon us, so it is less urgent compared to other proposals.

### NOT RECOMMENDED (OR MAYBE LATER)

There was also some interest in the following topics, but for the most part, these were not considered top candidates for a variety of reasons:

- **Impact of Economic Downturn**  
This is an important issue, without doubt, but the County has a limited ability to effect change in this area, and sees this more as a federal and state level issue, as well as related to larger economic trends.
- **Efficient Delivery of Government Services**  
More interest in effectiveness, which should be woven into all initiatives.
- **Solid Waste Management**  
Not as pressing as other issues raised, but important. The County and the University should still explore partnering on this topic as time and resources allow.
- **Sorting of the Population**  
While participants found this an interesting topic, it was not tied directly to an issue that was determined to be critical at this time.

## II. Session Notes

### Welcome Comments and Introductions

Robert Jones, Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration and Hennepin County Commissioner Janis Callison made welcome comments. Highlights included:



Robert Jones - -

“One of the things that I really enjoy about my job and responsibilities is the opportunity to engage with other anchor institutions. From my perspective, the University of Minnesota and Hennepin County are anchor institutions in the state of Minnesota. This Partnership is something that we value, and I want to pass along that President Robert Bruininks supports this Partnership 100 %.

Since the Partnership was launched in 2005, we’ve had a significant number of successes and some real challenges - at the end of the day, we are very pleased with the partnership between these two large institutions. The Partnership continues to leverage the best of both institutions especially during these critical times.”

Jan Callison - -

“As difficult as this time is, it is also an exciting time, offering us the opportunity to design and deliver services that truly meet the needs of this community. The opportunity before us now is to rethink government. We can’t do this alone and there is no better partner than the state’s largest research institution.

We need your ideas, we need your ability to gather and analyze data, and we need your energy. Your resources give us the opportunity for evidence-based decision-making, utilizing useful and reliable data and tapping available research expertise to better inform policy discussions.

In turn, I believe the University will find Hennepin County to be a valuable partner, offering opportunities to students and faculty to leave the ivory tower and engage in the daily life of Hennepin County residents.

Ultimately, we share the goals of a stronger community and of giving individuals the ability to achieve their full potential.

### Overview of HUP-2005 to Present

Tom Scott, Director Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, Ed Goetz, Professor Hubert Humphrey Institute, and Kathie Doty, Program Director Hennepin-University Partnership provided additional background to help set up the discussion to follow.

Tom Scott indicated that this is the only such major university-county partnership in the country, which is good and bad. On one hand, we’re at the front of the wave, but on the other hand, we have few models to learn from. As far as we know, there is no ‘Association of University/County Partnerships’. Tom went on to outline the purpose of the session - to try to begin to narrow down policy areas that will serve as the focus of the Partnership, which we hope will result in greater impact for both the University and the County.

Ed Goetz thanked those who have been instrumental in making this Partnership happen and offered special thanks to those who have been responsible for dedicating resources. He talked about his own involvement in the partnership, saying he’d been involved on the ground level doing some of the research funded through the Partnership on the impact of transitways such as the Hiawatha LRT line on land use and property values along the corridor. This experience has helped him understand the level of effort required to get a major collaborative research project underway. He related that it took several months to get from the



point of understanding that we had a common interest to getting a series of research projects off the ground. In closing, Ed, who is the newly appointed Director of CURA, said that he looked forward to working with the attendees in his new capacity.

### **Process for Selecting Focus Areas**

Tom Norman, University of Minnesota's College of Continuing and Professional Education, and Kristine Martin, Director Hennepin County's Research, Planning and Development Department, acted as facilitators and outlined process for indentifying major policy areas for the Partnership. The process included participants working together in breakout groups and then reconvening as a large group to determine top candidates amongst 15 proposals. Criteria for selection included:

That the proposal

- Address a significant public policy issue
- Results in research that could lead to publication
- Leads to positive impacts on the community

Small groups were asked to rank the proposal into three areas:

**Green:** Best Candidates

**Blue:** Good Candidates

**Red:** Not strong candidates, or maybe later

### **Overview of Proposals**

Kathie Doty reviewed the following proposals, which were developed through numerous discussions with Hennepin County staff and University faculty and staff (see Attachment C for additional information):

1. Increasing Graduation Rates
2. Ending Homelessness
3. Greenhouse Gas Reduction
4. Vital Aging for Boomers
5. Child Welfare—Adoptions, Foster Care
6. Promotion of Healthy Behaviors
7. Health Care—Responding to National Change at the Local Level
8. Environmental—Solid Waste Management
9. Efficient Delivery of Government Services
10. Rethinking the Role of Government
11. Community Impacts of the Economic Downturn—Housing and Employment
12. Children's Mental Health
13. Sorting of the Population

Proposals added at the meeting:

14. The Plight of African American Men
15. Immigrants in Hennepin County

Transportation/Land Use was also discussed as a possible area to add, but Tom Scott withdrew this idea after it was agreed that we were already working jointly on a major transportation research initiative, the Transitway Impacts Research Program (TIRP), and therefore should expand to other areas.

### **Small Group Discussion of Proposals**

After the proposals were described briefly, the attendees broke out into three small groups (see Attachment A for list of attendees and small group assignments). Facilitators worked with the groups, but



the participants decided among themselves how they wanted to discuss and reach agreement on the ranking of proposals. Two of the three groups decided to “lump” proposals together into new hybrid proposals. All the groups made at least some changes to the proposals to make them better candidates for collaboration.

### **Large Group Discussion of Proposals and Ranking of Proposals**

Each small group selected a ‘reporter’ to present to the large group on their conclusions. In addition to groups reporting out, there was discussion among the groups to better understand the rankings of each group.

After the groups reported out, Tom Norman asked the participants to review each proposal together and work to develop a joint ranking. While this process did not fully reflect the sentiments of the small groups (in part due to time constraints), it was useful in developing the following list:

#### **TOP CANDIDATES FOR COLLABORATION**

**Development of Human Capital through Educational Attainment**

**Child Well-Being (Focus on Vulnerable Youth)**

**Building Healthy Communities**

**Understanding the Impact of an Aging Population**

#### **OTHER GOOD CANDIDATES**

**Ending Homelessness**

**Greenhouse Gas Reduction**

**Rethinking the Role of Government**

**Health Care** (preparing for a shift in how health care is provided and paid for)

#### **MAYBE LATER**

**Impact of Economic Downturn**

**Efficient Delivery of Government Services**

**Solid Waste Management**

**Sorting of the Population**

### **Next Steps**

At the close of the session, Commissioner Callison thanked the participants. She also indicated that the conversation was just starting and that we would be continuing to ask participants to give us ideas and to work with us as we shape up focus areas for the Partnership.

**Attachment A**  
Attendees and Small Group Assignments

**Table 1**

Jan Callison, Hennepin County Commissioner  
Lois Thompson, Director, Hennepin County Library  
Phil Eckhert, Director, Hennepin County Housing, Community Works and Transit  
Tim Mulcahy, University Vice President for Research  
Heidi Barajas, Associate Dean, College of Education and Human Development  
Tom Fisher, Dean, College of Design  
Jim Reinardy, Director, School of Social Work  
Greg Lindsey, Associate Dean, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

Facilitator: Kristine Martin

**Table 2**

Hennepin County Commissioner Peter McLaughlin  
Hennepin County Commissioner Mark Stenglein  
Stella Whitney-West, Director, NorthPoint Health and Wellness Center  
Ed Goetz, Humphrey Institute  
Cathy Jordan, Director, University Children, Youth and Family Consortium  
Chris Uggen, Department Chair, Sociology  
Michael Oakes, School of Public Health  
Andy Furco, University Associate Vice President for Community Engagement

Facilitator: Kathie Doty

**Table 3**

Hennepin County Commissioner Gail Dorfman  
David Hough, Deputy County Administrator  
Dan Engstrom, Associate County Administrator, Human Services and Public Health  
Marthand Nookala, Associate County Administrator, Public Works  
Robert Jones, University Senior Vice President, System Academic Administration  
Tom Scott, Director, University Center for Urban and Regional Affairs  
Bob Johns, Director, University Center for Transportation Studies  
Billie Wahlstrom, Vice Provost, Distributed Education and Instructional Technology  
Karen Himle, Vice President, University Relations

Facilitator: Tom Norman

**Attachment B  
Meeting Agenda**

**Hennepin-University Partnership Executive Planning Session**  
April 29, 2009 | 4 – 7 PM | Dale Sheppard Room, Campus Club

**Agenda**

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>4:00 – 4:15 PM</b> | <b>Welcome comments and Introductions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Robert Jones, Senior Vice President for System Academic Administration</li><li>- Janis Callison, Hennepin County Board of Commissioners</li></ul>  |
| <b>4:15 – 4:30 PM</b> | <b>Overview of HUP – 2005 to present</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Richard Johnson, Hennepin County Administrator</li><li>- Tom Scott, Director, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs</li><li>- Ed Goetz, Humphrey Institute</li><li>- Kathie Doty, Hennepin-University Partnership</li></ul> |
| <b>4:30 – 4:40 PM</b> | <b>Process for Selecting Focus Areas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Tom Norman, U of M College of Continuing Education</li><li>- Kristine Martin, HC Research, Planning and Development</li></ul>   |
| <b>4:40 – 5:00 PM</b> | <b>Overview of Proposals</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Kathie Doty, Hennepin-University Partnership</li></ul>  |
| <b>5:00 – 5:50 PM</b> | <b>Facilitated group discussion; ranking of proposal ideas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Break-out groups</li></ul>  |
| <b>5:50 – 6:00 PM</b> | <b>Break</b>   |
| <b>6:00 – 6:50 PM</b> | <b>Facilitated group discussion; ranking of proposal ideas</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Large group</li></ul>   |
| <b>6:50 – 7:00 PM</b> | <b>Next Steps</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Robert Jones</li><li>- Janis Callison</li></ul>  |

**Attachment C**  
HUP Leadership Planning Session Proposals

This list of candidate ideas is a guide for the discussion of what areas the Hennepin-University Partnership should focus on over the next few years. It is not a complete list of all possible ideas, and is not organized to reflect priorities or subject groupings. Example research and policy questions have been identified, but do not cover all possible questions. We hope to gain greater insight into research and public policy issues through the discussion of these topics at the April 29<sup>th</sup> session.

**1. Increasing Graduation Rates**

Key Assumption:

Increasing high school graduation rates is one of the most effective ways to improve the wellbeing of the community.

Research Question:

What are the most effective ways to increase graduation rates?

Policy Questions:

What role should the University and the County play in increasing graduation rates?

How can we better prepare our youth for the next phase of learning— post graduation?

**2. Ending Homelessness**

Key Assumption:

Homelessness can be significantly reduced or eliminated, and individuals, families, and the community all benefit by efforts to end homelessness.

Research Questions:

What are the most effective ways to reduce homelessness?

Which methods yield sustained results?

Do approaches need to be tailored to different populations of homeless people?

Policy Question:

In what ways can the County be most effective in ending homelessness?

What is the University's role, outside of conducting research, in working to end homelessness?

**3. Greenhouse Gas Reduction**

Key Assumption:

Reducing greenhouse gases is a critical step in slowing climate change.

Research Questions:

What are the most effective ways to reduce greenhouse gases?

Do changes in transportation policy offer the biggest bang for the buck?

Policy Questions:

What steps should the University and the County take to reduce greenhouse gas emissions produced by their operations?

How do we effectively influence behavioral changes in our residents, student populations, etc.?

**4. Vital Aging for Boomers**

Key Assumption:

The demographics of our county, state, and country are changing with regard to age as the 'baby boomers' grow older and create a significant population of older adults – many of whom will be active and relatively healthy for many years to come.

Research Questions:

What are the anticipated non-medical needs of aging baby boomers? (housing, transportation, adult education, recreation and other active pursuits)

Are baby boomers different from other generations in ways that matter?

Policy Questions:

Should the County change the way it delivers services to recognize the growing and perhaps special needs of the baby boomer generation? And the same for the University?

## 5. **Child Welfare – Adoptions, Foster Care**

Key Assumptions:

Programs for children whose parents cannot take care of them too frequently do not achieve the goal of providing a stable and secure place where such children can thrive. In particular, adoptions often “fail”, and children placed in foster care do not develop a healthy attachment to an adult caregiver.

Research Questions:

What are the needs of children who must be removed from the home, or for whom no home exists and how to these needs vary depending on a child's age?

How does the length of time in foster care affect outcomes for children?

Are there programs that have shown better outcomes than we experience in Hennepin County? Can these be replicated here?

Policy Questions:

How can the County reduce the number of “failed adoptions”?

How can the County increase successful outcomes for children placed in foster care?

## 6. **Promotion of Healthy Behaviors**

Key Assumption:

While much of our national focus is on health care costs, it appears that, overall, personal choices and behaviors have a greater impact on individual health than do health care programs.

Research Questions:

What is the most effective way to improve the health of the community?

Can promotion of healthy choices and behaviors improve health and quality of life for individuals and communities?

Would there be an overall societal benefit if government allocated greater levels of resources on improving health through education and promotion?

Policy Questions:

Should the County and the University get more involved in promoting healthy behaviors/choices?

If so, how should the University and the County allocate resources with regard to health promotion versus health care programs? For communities? For employees?

## 7. **Health Care – Responding to National Change at the Local Level**

Key Assumptions:

It is anticipated that a major shift is about to occur in the U. S. in how health care is provided and paid for.

Research Questions:

What are the implications for health care outcomes associated with a new paradigm?

How will a new paradigm impact individuals and communities?

Policy Questions:

What can the County and the University do to help communities anticipate and prepare for change?

What will be the impacts on County service providers, including the HCMC, NorthPoint Health and Wellness Facility? On University facilities?

## 8. **Environmental: Solid Waste Management**

Key Assumption:

As a nation and as a county, we continue to generate vast amounts of municipal waste in spite of efforts to reduce the amount of waste generated and recycle much of the rest. While many of the worst environmental issues associated with municipal waste have been addressed, there remains an opportunity for improving outcomes.

Research Questions:

What is the future of solid waste management?

- Is it feasible to try to reduce or recycle most or all municipal solid waste?
- What are the most effective ways to achieve desired environmental outcomes?
- Is it more effective to educate the public in order to achieve changes in waste reduction and recycling, or to invest in new technologies to manage waste?
- Is 'producer responsibility' an effective model for reducing the toxicity of the municipal waste stream?

Policy Questions:

What actions should the County consider to achieve better outcomes in managing municipal waste (e.g. waste designation)?

How can the University contribute to this effort as a major generator of municipal waste?

## 9. **Efficient Delivery Of Government Services**

Key Assumption:

The public rightly demands that government operate with efficiency. Shrinking budgets combined with growing demands for services create even greater need for government to find ways to become more efficient in the delivery of services.

Research Questions:

What efficiency measures are most promising in terms of yielding results?

What are the best ways to implement efficiency measures:

- Consolidations: what are the net cost savings associated with mergers and consolidations?
- Efficiencies: do efforts to avoid errors that allow persons to receive services for which they are not eligible result in excessive administrative and audit costs?
- Outsourcing: when does it make most sense to outsource work currently performed by county employees?

Policy Questions:

What are the best opportunities for streamlining, consolidating, and increasing efficiency while maintaining or improving the quality of services?

Would the use of a neutral, third-party review of opportunities be useful (with the University acting as the neutral party)?

## 10. **Rethinking the Role of Government**

### Key Assumptions:

With growing budget constraints, it is likely that government will not be able to continue to provide health and social services in the same manner as in the past. Furthermore, it may be that past practices have not always led to the desired outcomes and should be re-thought regardless of budget constraints.

The Citizen Professional Model re-envision professionals as citizens working alongside other citizens on projects jointly conceived and jointly carried out. The central principles of the model are that: a) community members must be engaged as co-producers of initiatives for themselves and their communities, rather than as clients or consumers of services; and b) government professionals can play an important catalytic role in fostering citizen initiatives.

### Research Questions:

What community outcomes result from employing a 'citizen professional model'?  
Does this model generate outcomes that are better than, or not as effective as current models for service delivery?

### Policy Questions:

If interested, how would the County go about changing its role with regard to many health and human service programs to one of a catalyst and facilitator, rather than a service deliverer?  
What approach to results-oriented management would need to be developed to measure results?

## 11. **Community Impacts of the Economic Downturn – Housing and Employment**

### Key Assumption:

The current economic downturn is having dramatic effects on individuals and families in terms of housing (mortgage foreclosures) and employment (declining incomes, growing unemployment and underemployment).

### Research Questions:

How are current economic trends affecting communities?  
Are effects differential from community-to-community, with some feeling little impact while others are dramatically changed?  
Will the landscape be permanently changed by the current downturn; how will the anticipated recovery play out?

### Policy Questions:

What are the County's and the University's roles in helping communities respond to the negative impacts of the current economic downturn?  
What should both be doing in the present to address the longer-term effects of the current economic downturn?

## 12. **Children's Mental Health**

### Key Assumption:

Hennepin County, in their role as a local mental health provider and as the local public health authority, has observed that traditional approaches to serving children with mental health needs often do not reach certain populations, particularly children from culturally specific communities. Research suggests that a 'public health approach' might be more effective than present practice. Such an approach would endeavor to engage whole communities, promote social and emotional well being, develop supportive environments, and focus on the entire populations.

### Research Questions:

What are the elements of employing a “public health approach”?  
How would adopting such an approach impact children’s mental health outcomes?

Policy Questions:

Should the County change the way it delivers children’s mental health services?

If so, how can the University contribute to such a change?

### 13. **Sorting of the Population**

Key Assumption:

It has been posited that, over the last 50 years or so, the U. S. has experienced a national trend that has resulted in a clustering of like-minded Americans. Through self-segregation, people have moved *from* neighborhoods that were well mixed politically and based primarily on proximity to jobs and cost-availability *to* neighborhoods filled with people who hold similar political, religious, cultural, and other values.

Research Questions:

Is the U.S. population sorting itself out on political, religious, and cultural grounds?

Is this happening to the same extent in Minnesota; in the Twin Cities area?

What are the social implications of such a sorting?

Are communities weaker or stronger as a result of such a sorting?

Policy Questions:

Should the University and the County seek to ameliorate negative effects of population self-sorting? If so, how?

What are the implications of self-sorting for Hennepin County communities? For County services?

Does the County’s current plan for decentralizing human services need to take this trend into account?

### **Proposals Added at the Meeting:**

#### **14. The Plight of African American Men**

African American men are a consistently “at-risk” group and we need to better understand how to address their issues in order to reduce the risks associated with being an AA man.

#### **15. Immigrants**

As more and more people immigrate to Hennepin County from all over the world, we need to consider their special needs and develop or modify services to address those needs.

**Attachment D**  
Detailed Session Notes

**I. Welcome comments and Introductions**

**University of Minnesota Senior VP for System Academic Affairs, Robert Jones**

- I want to pass along a message from President Bruininks- he really appreciates opportunities to make strategic partnerships like this.
- All of the joint projects between the University and the County confirm our level of commitment, but there is more that can be done—there are more innovative ways to serve the common good

**Hennepin County Commissioner Jan Callison**

- I have only been at the County 4 months, and this is an honor to be here
- We were here [on campus] for the State of the County Address, and we had the opportunity to talk about biggest challenges facing Hennepin County—the budget is our main challenge, but it's also an opportunity to rethink and redesign government
- But the County can't do it alone, and there is no better partner than an anchor institution like the U of M
- The University has the ability to look for ideas, analyze things, and it has a commitment to excellence
- Hennepin Count wants to respond to facts to make policy
- The County and the University share common goals-- improvement of community, we both want citizens to realize their full potential
- I am eager to be part of this conversation and the Partnership

**II. Overview of HUP – 2005 to present**

**Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) Director, Tom Scott**

- CURA was assigned at the University to carry out the HUP
- Robert Jones and I have worked together with Kathie Doty, the Liaison, since 2005 when the Partnership began
- Discussions of this partnership began before 2005
- There were a series of discussions around particular topics, and we also discussed how to make the connection between the County and the University more vital
- These discussions went on for a year, and then the County stepped up and said we need a person to devote time and energy to the partnership
- The U agreed to participate and Kathie Doty was hired
- About a year ago we pulled together an advisory group to assess where we were at in the relationship and also to look to the future
- This group met 3 times
- We have found that the HUP is the only such county/university partnership in the country
- This is good because we are in front of the wave, but it also means we don't have a model
- The advisory group suggested that the Partnership should begin to focus on a fairly limited number of issues that we can make substantial impact on
- That's why we're here today-- we need to narrow down those topics so that in the long run we can have greater impact than we've had so far
- The people gathered here today represent many areas and many different kinds of expertise
- We want to step up a few feet to the 10,000 ft. level to look at what the broad basic kinds of questions are that will have the potential for substantial impact for the County and the University and can be more effectively developed through the Partnership
- This meeting will be an opportunity to revisit ideas and also get new perspectives on what should be done through the Partnership in the future

**Humphrey Institute Faculty and newly named CURA Director, Ed Goetz**

- I want to just say a few quick things-- thanks to those have been instrumental to this partnership, and thank you to those who have dedicated resources

- I look forward to working with you in a new capacity

### **Kathie Doty – Model for Collaboration**

- I'm going to briefly review **one model** for collaboration that began with connections made through the Partnership. The "Transitway Impacts Research Program" was born out of a need to better understand how a major transitway project, such as the Hiawatha light rail line, affect the surrounding areas.
  - property values near stations?
  - stimulate economic development? What kinds?
  - housing patterns around stations?

These questions were identified by Gary Erickson, Marthand's predecessor at Henn Co, and his staff as the Partnership was getting off the ground in 2005.

In my role as the liaison, I brought this research interest back to the U, and found that the HHH Institute was also interested – my initial connections were with Ed Goetz who in his role at that time as Assoc Dean of the HHH, agreed that the Humphrey would like to take on research on this topic.

So Step 1 was where we started. (and this is an important and not always easy step – as you'll see when we begin our work in a bit). But after several rounds of meetings with interested practitioners and researchers, nothing was actually happening beyond admiring the problem.

It became apparent that we needed to develop a game plan for proceeding, but for starters, we broadened the list of participants. We knew that the Met Council was currently preparing a "before and after" study for the Federal Transit Administration in relation to the Hiawatha light rail line – so we began including them in discussions.

Henn Co provided some seed money for preliminary work, and we broadened the list of participants to include other counties, cities, and State agencies – in part because that just made sense, and in part because that was a way to increase funding for research.

We also enlisted support from CTS and the State and Local Policy Program to help develop a Program Management Team and a Technical Advisory Group – both of these groups include representation from the entities I mentioned earlier.

Step 2 took more work than we'd have anticipated – I believe we were in this phase for about a year, and by this time, Marthand was at Henn Co and he and Bob Johns were taking a more active leadership roles.

Step 3 started in 2007, when the first research modules began.

Professor Ed Goetz agreed to review impacts on

- property values,
- land use, and
- housing mix associated with the Hiawatha LRT line.

As of today, we have 2 other HHH researchers involved in 3 additional research modules, and the initial research results are beginning to be reviewed and discussed in the public forum. As your handout shows, we now have independent, scholarly research findings to support the belief that location near a light rail station can have a positive impact on property values.

Ultimately, we hope to generate more research that will support public policy discussions and decisions about the development of a transitway system in the Twin cities. In addition, better understanding these impacts has become even more important as the new Administration in Washington signals that other impacts besides costs and ridership will be taken into account when funds are granted for major projects.

This is just one example of how to get a longer-term, more substantial research program going, but we wanted to review it so you'd get a sense of the general approach we'll be taking to get collaborations going on the areas you think are the most promising for the Partnership.

### III. Process for Selecting Major Policy Focus

#### **Hennepin County Research, Planning and Development Director, Kristine Martin**

#### **University of Minnesota College of Continuing Education, Tom Norman**

- I've had a great opportunity to work with the HUP, I have benefited personally from a great connection with Gretchen Wronka at the Hennepin County Library

### IV. Review proposed policy areas

#### **Kathie Doty**

- Review proposals for consideration by participants

#### **Additional Proposal Ideas**

#### **#14 Plight of African American Men (Commissioner Mark Stenglein)**

- Getting them engaged

#### **#15 Immigrant Population (Commissioner Mark Stenglein)**

- Changing the landscape of Minnesota

#### **#16 Transportation/Land Use (Tom Scott)**

- [Tom withdrew this idea after discussion that we were already working jointly on a major transportation research initiative, the Transitway Impacts Research Program (TIRP), and therefore should expand to other areas.]

### V. Facilitated Group Discussion: Ranking of Proposal Ideas

<b>Group #2 (Ed Goetz reported)</b>
-------------------------------------

#### **Green Proposals**

#### **#1 Increasing Graduation Rates**

#### **#3 Greenhouse Gas**

- This would involve land use, transportation, housing

#### **#4 Vital Aging for Boomers**

- It's very important to look at what the impacts of this demographic shift are—education, healthcare, housing, transportation

#### **#6 Promotion of Healthy Behavior**

- Our group was unanimous on this proposal

- It involves so many aspects-- land use, transportation, individual behavior

- We would also involve "Creating Opportunities for Greater Integration of African American Males"

- This ties into graduation rates

[Didn't discuss blue and red proposals with group]

### **Group #1 (Tom Fisher reported)**

- Our group took a “lumping” approach
- We asked ourselves, what would be most useful to HC?

#### **Green Proposal**

#9 Effective Delivery of Govt. Services (renamed)

- We would want this proposal to be called “effective” instead of “efficient”
- It would also include several other proposals
- This proposal could involve two populations: children and aging adults, which would also achieve #5 Child Welfare and #12 Children’s Mental Health
- We would want the proposal to be changed to “well-being of children,” not “child welfare”
- You could also include #12 Children’s Mental Health, #4Vital Aging, #6 Promotion of Healthy Behaviors

#### **Blue or Red Proposals**

#11 Community Impacts of the Economic Downturn – Housing and Employment

- Not as highly important

#8 Environment: Solid Waste Management

- This proposal is too narrow, or there is work already being done so it’s not as critical
- Hennepin can’t do as much about this proposal

#### **Additional Comments**

- We could use these two big questions: how to enhance the lives of children, how to enhance the lives of adults?
- The HUP should gather faculty and County staff and have a follow up discussion on what significant research questions are
- We aren’t really on the ground enough at the U with research
- If we are having colleagues at the County going after resources, then have faculty engaged
- On the University side, we could involve public policy, public health, education and human development
- It would give faculty a unique opportunity to do some on the ground research
- [The group highly recommends holding a second meeting]

### **Group #3 (Karen Himle reporter)**

- Our group worked as being between a lumpers and a splitter
- We chose to put the proposals into clusters

#### **Green Proposal Clusters**

Addressing the Cultural and Systemic Barriers to Educational Success (renamed)

Includes:

#1 Increasing Graduation Rates

#14 The Plight of African American Men

#15 Immigrants

- African American men and immigrants are integral to #1, Increasing Graduation Rates
- It’s important to start early with African American men, have them participate in K-12
- That participation will move the agenda forward
- Graduation rates also involves truancy and the corrections system
- The U could do research by managing and monitoring outcomes
- It’s also important to look at how to get kids and families engaged
- The County has become a participant in education— it spends 45 million per year on education
- Will this proposal work as a collaboration?
- Graduation/education is so key to success in the other areas/proposals, it’s a very important proposal

## Rethinking Government and the Delivery of Government Services (renamed)

Includes:

#9 Efficient Delivery of Government Services

#10 Rethinking Government Services

- These ideas keep coming up, former County Administrator Sandy Vargas used to talk about it with University faculty and staff
- The Governor has talked about it, current County Administrator Richard Johnson has also talked about it
- This proposals is hard to get your hands on it, but we are at a critical point to do this kind of work
- There is more interest in government to contract with private vendors, and what is the role of non-profits?
- If you don't talk about this topic now, it will be put off
- The U interested in the County's OIT
- CIOs are in conversation with U
- This work aligns with the Bush foundations new goals—building leadership within communities
- It's about how to put decisions in the hands of citizens
- There is also a leadership minor at the U that could be involved

## Vulnerable Youth (renamed)

Includes:

#5 Child Welfare,

#12 Children's Mental Health

- The County has a program called Road to Independence
- The number of foster care failures for Hennepin County is 12,000
- This is an important issue

## **Blue Proposal Clusters**

Environmental (renamed)

Includes:

#3 Greenhouse Gas

#8 Solid Waste Management

- The County already has the Cool Counties initiative
- The County is not ready with designation
- Solid Waste and Greenhouse Gas are interrelated
- Solid waste has an impact on greenhouse gas
- With the economic downturn, there is not as much waste
- There is good work already being done, this one is less important than others

## Building Healthy Communities (renamed)

Includes:

#6 Promotion of Healthy Behaviors

#4 Vital Aging

- This is important, but the other proposals are more urgent

## Housing and the Economy (renamed)

Includes:

#2 Ending Homelessness

#11 Economic Downturn

- The University is doing research at the Humphrey Institute and the School of Social Work, but those are short term projects [Lisa Thornquist from Hennepin working with Maria Hanratty at Humphrey and David Hollister at School of Social Work]
- The County wants to teach kids about homelessness— it should be incorporated more into University curriculum
- This is very important and good work is being done already between the University and County, it's key to keep this relationship moving forward and maintain what is already being done

- Because work is already being done, it's important to maintain that and not concentrate on this proposal as green

### **Red Proposals**

#7 Health Care

#13 Sorting of the Population

#4 Vital Aging for Boomers

### VI. Facilitated Group Discussion: Ranking of Proposal Ideas (continued)

To assist in developing consensus positions, Tom Norman asked the participants to review each proposal together and discuss a joint ranking. The results of this discussion were as follows:

#### **#1 Increasing Graduation Rates (GREEN)**

##### Group #1 Comments

- Graduation rates are symptomatic of larger group of issues
- We agree that it's an important issue, but thinking of the impact that the County could have, it seemed to be indirect because the school boards are most involved
- The County doesn't necessarily impact school time, but it impacts after school time and child well-being
- We need to ask, what is the specific target—it's not just increasing grad rates, it's a larger issue
- We need to be looking at the things the County has a direct impact on, the things that contribute to decreased grad rates
- We need to look at deeper issues
- [If the title is reframed like group #3 and is "Addressing the Cultural and Systemic Barriers to Educational Success," then #1 group would agree that it's green]

##### Group #2 Comments

- Graduation rates is a measure or a target, but there is agreement that it's a deeper issue
- A lever that Hennepin can use is truancy intervention through the county attorney [like Ramsey County, suggested by Michael Oakes because he is involved in this work]
- It's important to try to intervene and keep kids in school

##### Group #3 Comments

- Graduation rates is one of the most fundamental issues we will face for the future
- We preferred to lump other categories into this
- This proposal should be more about human capacity development
- This is at the core of future economic vitality of region and the University of MN (students will come from HC)
- We will most certainly face this challenge for the future and it needs to be addressed
- It's important to consider out of school time-- the College Readiness Consortium at the University is working on how to get tools to kids and parents early to get them thinking about college early
- There are many things Hennepin can do to support that

##### Additional Comments

- All groups like group #3's title-- "Addressing the Cultural and Systemic Barriers to Educational Success"
- What do we mean by "cultural barriers?" [Heidi Barajas questioned]
- That could mean for example, how immigrant groups don't always understand that kids need to go to school every day
- Jerry Stein in the School of Social Work is doing Learning Dreams—which involves the entire community in learning
- We also have to think about domestic diversity
- We should think about the word "barrier"—instead use "influence"
- [The group decided that we should rename it **Human Capital Development Through Educational Attainment**]

- This is NOT about school reform

#### **#4 Vital Aging/Changing Demographics (GREEN)**

Group #3 Comments

- We should combine this one with Promotion of Healthy Behavior

Group #1 Comments

- It's our opinion that we should do away with boomers and just call it Vital Aging

Group #2 Comments

- We should split health behaviors and health care

- The idea of changing demographics became a larger issue because it touches on so much

- We should still include vital aging in this proposal, because it has such an impact on rest of community

#### **#5 Child Welfare/Adoptions and Foster Care (GREEN)**

Group #1 Comments

- We wanted to change to "well-being" instead of "welfare"

- Grad rates could also be included in this

Group #2 Comments

- It feels too big

- We didn't discuss it too much, but as phrased it is too narrow

- We don't want to make it unresearchable or hard to make policy

Group #3 Comments

- We wanted focus on this proposal, but also included grad rates in it

#### **#6 Healthy Behaviors (GREEN)**

Group #1 Comments

- We connected it to aging

- It's possible to tuck it under many others

Group #2 Comments

- Our group felt it is most important, we are strong advocates

- There are pie charts on what we spend on health care, and how to invest in healthy behavior, this could be part of it

Group #3 Comments

- Individual behavior can impact health in so many ways, so this is important

#### **#2 Ending Homelessness (BLUE)**

Group #1 Comments

- There is a County plan on homelessness, so this is not as important because Hennepin is working on it

Group #3 Comments

- The role of University in this right now is research and evaluation

- We should maintain this work and keep in place

- This is connected to economic downturn

- Probably not for this round of projects

#### **#3 Greenhouse Gas (BLUE)**

#### Group #2 Comments

- We scored this highly because there are instances that we can act locally to put it in place
- We can get assistance from each other about how to think about it locally
- This would be a smart investment and it would be useful
- There is already energy around it to tap into- local and national
- It is very multi-disciplinary

#### Group #1 Comments

- This is a “hot, sexy topic”
- There is funding for it
- It’s important but not at the top

#### Group #3 Comments

- This is second tier, but still important

### **#7 Health Care (BLUE)**

#### Group #3 Comments

- Policy about this will be imposed, so maybe set aside

#### Group #2 Comments

- We ranked this as mid-range

### **#9 Delivery of Government Service (BLUE or background issue)**

#### Group #1 Comments

- Change Efficient to Effective
- Should add children and adult populations as focus
- Very important because it is central to Partnership
- Water quality could be one area related to this

#### Group #2 Comments

- Isn’t this what the Partnership is all about?
- Maybe not a priority, but this should be woven into all other work
- Are there specific research questions and the measures—what are the measures? Other than the outcomes that are embodied by other categories
- We ranked it low because of the lack of research questions
- Should we say that effective and efficient need to run throughout all other themes?
- This seems hard to research, and maybe not as of as much interest to the University?
- Who will do the research? Only 3 professors at the Humphrey Institute
- Is there grant money?
- We should apply this to each topic area
- This is a big movement, we should park it in blue

#### Group #3 Comments

- We should thread it throughout the other proposals and make it about the best way to serve, use evidence, be cost effective
- Should look at collaborations and mentoring between the County and the University
- Make it a priority
- There is no better time and we can drive change this way, versus when we’re flush
- Big opportunity to take advantage of
- Could look at new delivery methods, through more management and governance research
- We maybe don’t have the horses to put into this
- This is a central question for all local government
- Might be of interest to new federal administration, it’s related to what HUD does

- There is some grant money, there is a project in the Humphrey looking at use of non-profits contracting for services
- This is a big deal, but we're not as on top of it, or well equipped
- This is a constant question, and it's frightening that there isn't research capacity— isn't this the time to frame this question?
- Would hate to miss the opportunity
- It depends on the application area-- transportation, public private partnerships are already being looked at
- You could find hungry researchers
- If there are no researchers, then use consultants
- It's trying to redesign government, that is a big task
- It could be a feature of everything we do, or we could weave it into one other topic?

#### Additional Comments

- [The entire group agreed to weave it into everything the HUP does, or make it a feature of one topic]

#### **# 8 Environmental: Solid Waste (RED)**

- Tossed!

#### **#11 Economic Downturn**

#### **#12 Children's Mental Health**

- Should combine it with another proposal

#### **#13 Sorting of the Population (RED)**

- [There was not enough interest nor knowledge in this proposal]

#### **#14 African American Males**

##### Group #1 Comments

- We are talking about diverse issues that need to be thought about in all topic areas, along with immigrants
- We need to think broadly like this in all the proposals

##### Group #3 Comments

- We combined it into graduation

##### Group #2 Comments

- Should fold it into changing demographics (vital aging)

#### **#14 Immigrants**

- Should fold it into all areas (same as African American Men)

#### VII. Closing Remarks: Commissioner Jan Callison

- Topics are not closed, let Robert Jones, Kathie Doty, or myself know if you have additional thoughts
- This is an ongoing process, we will be getting back together
- The HUP will develop them further and will get back to you about your ideas
- The goal is to choose 2 topic areas