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Chapter 1

Introduction

The Eugene City Council’s vision begins, “Value all people, encouraging respect and appreciation for diversity, equity, justice, and social well-being. We will embrace our differences as the source of our strength, and the basis for success.”

In an effort for the City to better align its work and its vision, the City is creating a five-year Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan (DESP) and developing a culturally competent outreach guide. The City has contracted with Community Planning Workshop (CPW) at the University of Oregon to create the outreach guide and conduct community outreach for the strategic plan. Specifically, CPW:

- Worked closely with City of Eugene staff and the Diversity Advisory Committee to ensure that the project meets the needs of the City;
- Created a framework for the Outreach Guide that provides recommendations for conducting culturally competent outreach;
- Conducted outreach to targeted communities about the strategic plan based on techniques developed during the outreach recommendation process;
- Helped create the structure of the strategic plan; and
- Developed action items for the strategic plan based on what was heard from the community.

This report summarizes the methodology CPW used to conduct the outreach and the key issues heard from the community related to the topics covered by the Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan. The DESP covers such topics as city leadership, capacity, service delivery, community engagement, workforce and work environment, and city accountability of the plan.

Methods

The DESP is a five-year strategic planning document that will help guide the City of Eugene in its decision-making processes to proactively address diversity and equity issues in an integrated and proactive manner. Both city staff and community members have suggestions for how the City organization can better meet the need of all people in the community. CPW focused its efforts on gathering input from community members, while at the same time city staff worked to document their internal concerns and
ideas. CPW engaged approximately 700 people in the community outreach efforts. We wrote summary memorandums documenting key ideas after each engagement function. These memorandums can be found in the Engagement Summaries section of the Outreach for the City of Eugene Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan Documents Binder or posted on the City’s diversity website. (www.eugene-or.gov/diversity)

For this project, the City instructed CPW to focus on six historically under-represented “communities” within Eugene: race (Latino, African American, Asian), LGBTQ, Women (women balancing work and family, women in non-traditional professions), faith/religion, low income, and (dis)ability. We recognize that no one fits into just one of the communities, in fact, a person could self identify with all of these communities. However, six graduate students worked on this project and we, with direction from the City, decided to divide the outreach efforts in this way. We also considered age as another dimension of diversity and tried to contact a variety of ages within each community.

Phase 1. Pre-Outreach Activities

During phase one of this project, CPW contacted community members to determine the best ways to conduct outreach to historically under-represented populations. We wanted to learn HOW to do the outreach before we actually started conducting outreach for the Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan. The pre-outreach consisted of three activities:

**Stakeholder Interviews (17 interviews)**

CPW conducted stakeholder interviews with 17-community leaders from the six communities. These interviews had two purposes: (1) to hear from community leaders about what outreach methods they believe are the most effective, and (2) to engage community leaders in the planning process and build support for the project.

**Resource Groups (5 meetings, 22 participants)**

CPW held five resource group meetings as another way to build relationships and increase our knowledge about ways to conduct outreach.

We held meetings with people small groups of community members and city staff culturally competent in the areas of race/ethnicity, LGBTQ, women, socio-economic, and religion/faith. We did not hold a meeting with the disability community because the City had already held a meeting with them before CPW was hired.

**City of Eugene Staff Discussions (2 meetings, 17 participants)**

CPW held two city staff meetings to better understand employee perspectives on outreach. Specifically, we were interested in staff needs around outreach, and what they would like in an outreach guide.
Phase 2. DESP Public Engagement Activities

Once CPW had completed phase 1 of the project and had a slightly better understanding of the issues facing some of the six communities and strategies for conducting outreach, we began public engagement activities for the DESP. Most people we talked with in Phase 1 suggested two things: (1) build relationships with people before you start to ask them a lot of questions; and (2) go to the people you are trying to contact instead of thinking that they will come to the City for a meeting. These two tenants formed the basis of our outreach strategy.

Before CPW began its outreach efforts, the City’s Diversity Advisory Committee had drafted goals for the DESP around city leadership, capacity, service delivery, workforce, outreach, measurement and accountability. We created questions that would address each of these areas. (See Supplemental Materials for a list of questions we used in the outreach, this document is also posted on the City’s diversity website.)

Networking at Events and Meetings (5 events)

In an effort to build relationships and make connections with community members, CPW attended various meetings and events. These provided opportunities to learn about additional outreach opportunities and familiarize ourselves with common issues of concern. Events included:

- Latino Business Network Meeting
- Japanese American Association Meeting
- LGBTQ Town Hall
- Communities of Color Network Social
- 40th Annual Pow-wow

Discussions at Pre-existing Meetings (9 meetings)

As a strategy for going where people already gather, CPW secured time on the agenda of ten existing community meetings to discuss the DESP and gather participant input. Meetings included:

- Jewish Community Relations Council
- Catholic and Community Services’ Young Fathers Program
- Youth Action Board (YAB)
- Lane Council Of Governments Disability Advisory Board
- City of Eugene, Human Rights Accessibility Commission
- Lane Independent Living Alliance (LILA)
• Lane Community College Women in Transition Class (2 sections)
• National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)

**Focused Conversations (76 participants)**

CPW contacted seven community organizations that provide services to diverse populations and then held impromptu group conversations about the DESP. For example, we attended a church service at the Korean Presbyterian Church and then asked people to stay after the service to talk about the DESP. These organizations allowed us to talk with groups of people who access their services:

• Downtown Languages
• Centro Latino Americano
• Eugene Chinese Baptist Church
• Korean Presbyterian Church
• Eugene Japanese Baptist Church
• Lane Community College ESL Program
• Bethel Temple Faith Ministries, Inc

**LGBTQ Community Meeting (17 participants)**

Based on recommendations from interviews with people in the LGBTQ community, CPW held a LGBTQ Community Meeting in the public library to talk about issues related to this community. CPW developed an extensive recruitment strategy; seventeen people attended the meeting.

**Informal One-on-One Interviews (76 participants)**

Similar to going to pre-existing meetings and community organizations, CPW went to places where people gather, and informally asked people to provide input on the DESP process. This technique allowed us to connect with people that might not come to a city-sponsored meeting or are not affiliated with other organizations. We conducted one-on-one interviews at the following locations:

• Food For Lane County, Family Dinner Program
• Lane Council of Governments, Senior Meals Program dining rooms
• Juventud FACTEA Youth Group

**Stakeholder Interviews (29 participants)**

CPW interviewed 29 specific community members that spanned the six communities. These conversations allowed interested individuals to give input into the process and helped us develop important relationships.
Internet Survey (262 participants)
Many of the participants in Phase 1 of our outreach suggested using the internet as a way to communicate with community members; therefore, CPW developed a web survey, in both English and Spanish, to gather input for the DESP. Two hundred sixty (260) people completed the English version and two (2) people completed the Spanish version.

Third Party Surveys (30 responses)
Many people will throw away a survey if they get it in the mail, but will respond if someone personally asks them to complete it. CPW provided surveys in Spanish to the following service organizations to distribute to their clients:

- Latino Housing Program of Catholic Community Services
- Downtown Languages
- Centro Latino Americano

Intercept Surveys (82 participants)
CPW used intercept surveys as another way to gather input from people that may not traditionally provide input to the City. We attended three community celebrations that focus on celebrating diverse populations and randomly asked people to complete a short survey.

- Oregon Asian Celebration
- We Are Bethel Celebration
- Multicultural Festival

Blurbs in Newsletters
Based on a suggestion from the Japanese American Association (JAA), CPW submitted a blurb for the JAA newsletter with information about the plan and a link to the internet survey.

Methodological Limitations
Conducting outreach takes a lot of time and resources. CPW conducted as much outreach as we could based on the project budget and resources; however, we only began to develop relationships and talk with people in the community. Although the Faith and Religious community was part of our six target communities, we conducted a limited amount of outreach to this community. The City should conduct more outreach within this community to better understand its needs and concerns. Additionally, the needs and concerns of minority business owners are not represented here and this group should be engaged by the City in future outreach efforts.
The findings that we present in this report are based on the conversations with the people that we contacted. These findings can not, and should not, be generalized to make broad statements about each of the communities. Each community consists of sub communities and further sub communities with their unique needs and suggestions. However, we have found some consistent themes that we summarize in the Key Findings section of this report.
Chapter 2
Findings

This chapter presents community comments. CPW summarized the outreach findings into six primary categories: Leadership, Capacity, Workforce & Work Environment, Service Delivery, Community Communication & Engagement, and Measurement & Accountability. These categories relate to the preliminary goals of the Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan set forth by the Diversity Advisory Committee.

After conducting outreach it became apparent that many of the outreach participants across various communities have similar high level suggestions for the City, and common community concerns began to emerge. For each perception we identify specific examples and ideas from community participants; however, these comments are not meant to be generalized to the entire population within that community. As great diversity exists within communities, the comments of Latino participants (for example) should not be taken as a truth for the entire Latino population. These ideas and examples should instead be used to provide feedback to the City about community members’ experiences. Most issues address structural elements within the City’s operating procedures that need to be reevaluated so that the City is better able and equipped to serve the community’s needs. Once the structural elements have been addressed, the City will be better able to address the specific concerns of its residents.

Summary of Community Comments

Leadership Comments

- Lack of city follow through on diversity issues, little money and staff allocated to diversity and human rights issues
- Lack of high level city support for local diversity issues
- City leadership is not representative of the diverse demographic of the community

Capacity Comments

- Some city staff do not act in a culturally competent manner
- Some community members experience language barriers when trying to access city services
**Workforce & Work Environment Comments**
- The City’s hiring process (applications and interviews) is complicated and not accessible to some people
- Benefits for city employees do not meet the needs of the diverse workforce
- Workforce is not representative of the diverse demographic of the community

**Service Delivery Comments**
- Transportation infrastructure does not meet some community needs; need for better pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, more comprehensive bus service, and improved street repair and maintenance
- Some police are insensitive to diverse community members; more diversity training is needed
- Lack of needed social services including food, housing and health care
- Some parks, recreation programs, and cultural activities/services do not meet community needs; some services are not dispersed equitably, are not well advertised, and/or not affordable

**Community Communication & Engagement Comments**
- The City does not serve as a hub for connecting people, information, and resources
- Current public participation strategies need to be expanded to be more inclusive of the entire Eugene community
- Limited follow-up with participants in city public participation efforts
- Communication with the community is not coordinated across city departments
- Lack of accessible information about city services and decision making
- Lack of collaboration and partnerships between the city and community organizations such as schools, nonprofit organizations and social service organizations
- The City’s website is hard to navigate for community members and does not provide some desired information
- Limited community awareness of diversity and human rights issues
Measurement & Accountability Comments

- Lack of city follow through on diversity and human rights issues
- Diversity and human rights issues are not city priorities

Leadership Comments

**Lack of high-level city support for local diversity and human rights issues**

Participants felt it was the City’s duty to be a leader in diversity and human rights and set an example for the community to follow. According to many participants, those people making and carrying out city decisions should be acting in a culturally competent manner and services/policies should be analyzed before implementation to ensure cultural competency. However, some participants felt that the City is not supportive of or will not take a stand on diversity issues.

Respondents from the web survey commented that the City should take strong decisive measures against racism and prejudice and develop strategies to fight racism, sexism, anti-Semitism and homophobia. For example, according to one respondent, “racial slurs are written on businesses downtown and nothing happens.” Low-income participants said that the City should publicize race issues and problems instead of ignoring them as well as issue statements about intended courses of action to address problems. Youth participants stated that the City needs to utilize its young and old and be more aware of ageist, homophobic, and oppressive language that is used in politics. Women participants said that Latina and African American/Black women are vulnerable and marginalized in our community and that the City should focus on a holistic, preventive approach rather than crisis management.

Youth participants said the City needs to work on suppressed diversity issues so that residents feel that they are being heard. African American participants added that community discrimination of individuals needs to be addressed. Latino participants seconded this by saying that there is a lot of racism between community members, and the City should promote respect among all people.

Additionally, web survey respondents said that the City should address the community’s history. This sentiment was echoed by members of the African American/Black community who thought the history between the City and all communities of color should be addressed before the community can move forward. Latino participants stated that the City does not enforce anti-discrimination.

**Lack of city follow through on diversity and human rights issues, little money and staff allocated to diversity and human rights issues**

Many participants said they were frustrated with the City and its inability to make changes in regard to diversity and human rights issues. Some African American participants commented that “nothing ever happens”.
“We’ve been asked about diversity issues for years and haven’t seen any changes in the City.” Some feel that the City is able to run under the radar regarding diversity and equity until it is truly tested by an incident. Some Latino participants echoed this sentiment by saying that, “when people from the City call, we [community leaders] roll our eyes because nothing ever happens. We all have the attitude that we are going to do it [make change] ourselves and can’t wait for the City.”

Participants from the Race/Ethnicity resource group suggested that the City should put money for the DESP. “It does not have to be a large amount; rather it would be a sign of support to demonstrate that the City is willing and ready to stand with communities of color.” Another suggestion for action came from Low-income community participants who said the City should make statements of its intended course of action on problems within the City.

**City leadership is not representative of the diverse demographic of the community**

Latino participants said that city leaders are not representative of the diversity of the community. Many participants felt that more low-income, women, youth and ethnic representatives are needed in city leadership.

**Capacity Comments**

**Some city staff do not act in a culturally competent manner**

Participants expressed that some city staff are not culturally competent and that they are internally focused. Asian and Latino participants said that city staff (specifically police officers and municipal court judges) can be impatient with non-native English speakers. Web survey respondents and other participant groups also said that the police profile community members (by race and LGBTQ status) and can be disrespectful. Participants in almost all communities stated that some city staff have ineffective listening skills, lack knowledge of services beyond their department, can give misinformation, and can be impatient with community members. LGBTQ and Latino community participants said city staff should be competent and caring.

Participants also commented that city staff should acknowledge the different culture/background/needs of community members. Latino, LBGTQ, and Women community participants said that some city staff are not sensitive to people with low education levels, non-native English speakers, youth, transgender, or stay-at-home mothers. One specific example given from Latino participants was about bilingual workers at the Department of Human Services who can speak Spanish but are not sensitive to people with low education levels. This insensitivity makes Latino community members scared to access that necessary service. LGBTQ community participants said all job positions should require cultural competency and questions surrounding cultural competency should be incorporated into the interview process. Web survey respondents added that city employees should have to take a “diversity
test” on a regular basis to ensure they are acting in a culturally competent manner.

Communities of color participants said the City needs to develop better skills in communication, relationships and understanding of diverse communities.

**Some community members experience language barriers when trying to access city services**

Asian and Latino community participants said language is a problem when accessing some city services and in public places. Additionally, immigrants have a hard time getting connected to the larger community and finding out about laws and rules that are different than in their own country. Participants suggested more bilingual staff and interpreters and making city information in multiple languages, especially on the website.

**Workforce and Work Environment Comments**

The City’s hiring process (applications and interviews) is complicated and not accessible to some people

Respondents in several communities felt they would never be able to obtain employment with the City. Asian and Women in Transition participants said they feel like one needs an inside connection to get a job at the City or a position on a Board or Commission. Women in Transition class participants also said that they think they do not have the skills, degree or experience to compete for a city job.

LGBTQ, Women, Low-income, and Disability community participants said recruitment techniques are not equitable. The City should not just post a job on their website and think that is sufficient. The City should go to the community and invite diverse people to apply. Many participants did not know what kinds of jobs are offered. Women participants added that the position descriptions do not accurately describe the job and are overwritten to scare people off. The Young Fathers community participants commented that people with a criminal record cannot be hired by the City.

Web survey respondents and many Women participants said the application process was overwhelming and confusing. Applying for jobs with the government is cumbersome because of all the paperwork and tests. They felt the application process should be shortened and supplemental questionnaires reduced. Additionally, participants indicated that communication from the City about applications can be nonexistent. Applicants should be alerted in a timely manner about the status of their application and reasons why they were not chosen for the position.

African American/Black community participants commented that the language used in hiring, including interview questions is a barrier. Additionally, city hiring practices should reflect cultural competency, diversity and equity; these things should not be lumped into a supplemental question.
Disability community participants said that the City should include “disenfranchised” people on the City’s hiring committees. Other community participants echoed this idea and said that hiring committees should include community residents as well as city staff.

**Benefits for city employees do not meet the needs of the diverse workforce**

Some participants stated that the benefits offered by the City are a barrier to applying for a job. Women community participants said one deterrent of applying for a city job was the perception that the City will not be flexible or accommodating of single mothers or sick children. Low-income participants said the City does not pay living wages and they have not applied because it is not worth working for a low-paying job. Other specific needs identified by community members include: transgender health insurance, domestic partnership certificates, respect for religious holidays, more family friendly benefits/leave, fairer compensation for lower-end city jobs, and more flexible work schedules.

**Workforce is not representative of the diverse demographic in the community**

Participants from several communities felt like the City’s workforce was not representative of the community and that the City should take steps to correct this matter. Web survey respondents, African American/Black, and Latino community participants said diversity in city jobs is lacking and that representation from community members of color among workforce should be increased. LGBTQ community participants added that the police and the fire department do not hire employees in an equitable manner.

Youth, Young Fathers, Low-income, African American/Black community participants promote the idea of apprenticeships as well as job placement and training program. Using this method will help ensure that the City is hiring people who have learned skills and demonstrate good work habits and that youth are not discouraged from applying for jobs because of their age. Women participants also said the City should open internships in trades that are non-traditional for women, similar to EWEB.

Asian and Latino community participants stated the need for more bilingual staff and interpreters. Asian participants stressed that in person interpreters are preferable to on the phone interpretation. Disability community participants added that the City should have employees who are trained in how to use, and how to provide alternative format and accommodation services.
Service Delivery Comments

Transportation infrastructure does not meet some community needs; need for better pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, more comprehensive bus service, and improved street repair and maintenance

Participants from the disability community said the City should reexamine the “walkability” of the downtown core area for people with mobility devices. This idea was elaborated on by members of the Seniors and low-income community who said that the City needs a stronger pedestrian infrastructure that is more accommodating of varying disabilities and ages. Asian and homeless participants added that more bike lanes and routes are needed throughout Eugene.

While many outreach participants praised the public transit system in Eugene, others identified areas for continued improvement. Issues specifically addressed public transit service capacity and quality. Web survey respondents stated that buses do not adequately serve and connect all areas of the City specifically to outlying areas where more low-income residents live. Additionally, service hours on the evening and weekends are deficient.

Participants in almost every community cited the need for more street repair and maintenance.

Some police are insensitive to diverse community members; more diversity training is needed

In many of the outreach events, community members brought up concerns about the police department and suggested ways to improve police service delivery. Common suggestions included: providing police with additional or more adequate diversity training, increasing the diversity of the police staff, hiring more police staff and putting more money into crime prevention and other programs. Other specific trainings mentioned were LGBTQ, non-violent conflict, sexual assaults and domestic violence. Asian outreach participants echoed that officers and staff need to be trained with how to work with people who do not share the same background.

Many respondents from the internet survey indicated they are fearful and distrustful of the police. Some outreach participants felt like the police do not know and are not sensitive to the people that they are working with. For example, some participants felt like some police profile community members and are racist, aggressive and lack patience. Additionally, many youth participants perceive the police are largely ageist, racist, and homophobic; making the youth intimidated to have any type of interaction with them. Some participants in the LGBTQ meeting said they feel the Eugene Police Department does not believe individuals or take complaints seriously. Respondents from the African American community added that
racism still exists in the community, especially in the form of verbal attacks; yet it is perceived that the police do nothing when such a hate crime is reported. One respondent said that after a verbal attack the police officers told the victim that the attacker has the freedom of speech, and is entitled to his opinion.

Lack of needed social services including food, housing and healthcare

Many participants identified a need for more basic-needs social services. Participants in the Women, Young Fathers, Religion/faith based, Latino, low-income, and web survey outreach activities indicated that safe and affordable housing in the community is lacking. Additionally, participants from these communities addressed the need for affordable and accessible healthcare. Women and Religion/faith based participants highlighted the need for affordable nutritious food. Young Fathers, Religion/faith based, and web survey participants said drug treatment facilities are lacking while the disability community participants stated that a safe place for people who are mentally ill is necessary.

Youth, LGBTQ, Religion/faith based, African American and Seniors community participants commented on the homelessness problem and said they would like to see the City increase efforts on this issue and increase homeless shelters. Members of the LGBTQ and Asian communities also said that the City should examine demographics to ensure all services (not just basic needs) are being provided in an equitable manner.

Some parks, recreation programs, and cultural activities/services do not meet community needs; some services are not dispersed equitably, are not well advertised, and/or are not affordable

Many aspects of the parks, recreation programs, and cultural activities were praised widely by participants in various communities. However, some improvements and limitations were noted. Many Web survey participants feel that recreational opportunities are expensive and do not serve all areas of the City. Latino participants also had this concern and added that recreational opportunities are not widely advertised throughout the community. Women participants said teenagers need more recreation activities to keep them positively occupied and engaged. Women, Young Fathers, African American, and Latino participants said that Eugene needs more affordable recreation for families and children, especially in the winter time. A need for more cultural activities was also cited by many participants as well as a centralized list of activities on the City’s website.

Women and Latino community participants said that kids who attend a 4J school but who do not live in Eugene should still be allowed a library card. Asian community participants stated that the library should have longer hours and that children’s books and magazines are limited.
Lastly, web survey participants were concerned that park maintenance and improvements are disproportional across the City and that wealthier areas are enjoying more of these services.

**Community Communication & Engagement Comments**

**The City does not serve as the hub for connecting people, information, and resources**

Some community participants felt the City should act as the hub for community-wide networking and information. Asian participants said Eugene lacks a central community information center. Latino community participants added that new people coming into the City, especially immigrants, have a hard time getting connected and finding out about services. Latino participants also said the City needs to have a repository of knowledge and expertise to help bring people together and know what’s going on throughout the community. Overall, participants felt like there should be a central place to go and learn about programs and social services that are provided in the City.

Specifically, Women participants said the City needs some sort of program that would help women make connections with other women for support and exchange of information about services and programs. Disability community participants gave a similar example by saying the City should help to develop a registry for people that need care and caregivers. Web survey respondents commented that the City should support community networks.

**Current public participation strategies need to be expanded to be more inclusive of the entire Eugene community**

Many participants stated they are usually not reached by current City outreach/involvement methods but they want to contribute ideas and opinions. Many participants gave advice on how to do outreach with the community and others commented on the barriers to participating in the public process. (CPW synthesized these ideas and created the City of Eugene Public Participation Framework. See this document for more information about this topic.)

Youth participants said the City should employ multiple communication mediums keep community members involved and to help residents follow public decisions and allow them to voice issues or concerns they have with the City. LGBTQ community participants added that the City needs to use multiple forms of communication to advertise public participation events and reach more than just the normal suspects.

In general, participants from several communities including -Jewish, African American, Latino, and LBGTQ- said that City staff needs to continue to reach out to the community and build relationships. Participants said they would like city leaders and elected officials to be involved in outreach and more accessible to the community. Additionally,
the City needs to make sure the public participation work it does is not a one-time thing; it needs to show-up continually and build relationships.

Low-income community participates said that public forums do not protect people’s anonymity and online forums should be used to accommodate people who do not like to get up and talk in front of people. Many women in the LCC Women in Transition Class commented that they would not come to a public meeting at City Hall because it is always the same people in attendance.

Other common barriers to outreach cited by varying communities include: bureaucratic vocabulary/jargon, location, distrust of the City, time constraints, lack of childcare at meetings, not knowing how to find information about meetings, historical issues with the City, and transportation. Disability community participants added that all documents should be available in large print format upon request. There should be more Sign Language interpreting and assisting listening devices available at city meetings. Lastly, the City should establish deadlines and protocols for submitting documents in public meetings to ensure availability in alternative formats.

**Limited follow-up with participants in city public participation efforts**

Some participants said they feel frustrated when they participate in an outreach activity and then never hear anything about it again. They feel their time was wasted and their opinions were not important. Latino and African American community participants stressed this opinion and added that some people are starting to feel like their opinions do not really matter to the City. Women participants added that they want to feel like their input was valued and their time was not wasted. Young Fathers participants commented that when the City solicits and receives information from people, those people should be invited to further discuss and support the information they provide.

**Communication with the community is not coordinated across city departments**

Participants from several communities felt that city departments act as silos and do not coordinate with each other before doing community outreach. Multiple city staff could contact the same community leader on the same week about public participation efforts or city issues. Participants from the Race/Ethnicity resource group said that “these leaders are expected to be continuous gatekeepers, but receive zero compensation for having to do other people’s work.”

**Lack of accessible information about city services and decision making**

Web survey respondents rated the City a “4” out of “5” in how well the city gives community members an opportunity to provide input to the City. But while the opportunity to provide input rated high, many participants in other outreach venues felt that information dissemination
from the City needs improvement. Some Asian and Latino community participants experience difficulty accessing City information. They stated the way information is disseminated in this community is inaccessible for those with language barriers or those that lack knowledge of local government. One of the Women interviewed also commented that Eugene should have a language line that incorporates all languages spoken in the community. The disability community participants echoed this sentiment and stated that information and resources should be offered in alternative and multiple formats.

Many participants also cited a lack of knowledge about what the City does or the services it provides. Most women participants were not clear about which services were city sponsored and which were services sponsored by other community or governmental organizations. They felt that city services are not very well known.

One Religion/Faith Based participant added that there is the perception that economic interests control politics and people do not have a voice because of lack of economic backing.

Lack of collaboration and partnerships between the City and community organizations such as schools, nonprofit organizations and social service organizations

Some participants felt that the City should partner with and support community organizations that are helping the community. These organizations include, but are not limited to: schools, ethnic organizations, nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, publications that reach ethnic communities, and social service agencies.

LGBTQ community participants said the City should form strong relationships with local organizations that already serve the community as a way to maximize outreach efforts. Disability community participates seconded this feeling and said the City should proactively network with social service agencies to utilize the services and structure in place.

Communities of color participants said the City needs to build better relationships with communities of color and be more creative in developing these relationships. City staff should attend community events as a way to build relationships. Latino community participants wanted the City to consider the following question: how can the City add value to what other groups are already doing (even in the absence of money)?

Lastly, Low-income community participants cautioned that if the City does support an organization it should audit it so that the treatment of residents at that place does not violate people’s rights.

The City’s website is hard to navigate for community members and does not provide some desired information

Participants from all communities commented that the City’s website is hard to navigate and is confusing. Youth specifically said the website
should be more youth accessible and they are unsure where to find information about city events. LGBTQ community participants added that the City website is not helpful and should include a page about upcoming events and a page designed for new residents.

**Limited community awareness of diversity and human rights issues**

Many participants felt like they have issues and challenges that the larger community does not understand. They suggested that the City launch a campaign to explain racial and ethnic differences and promote awareness of diverse communities. Asian and Latino participants highlighted that even within racial groups there is great diversity and sometimes they feel lumped together like they are all the same. This issue stretches beyond race; low-income, single mothers, and gay and transgender communities also feel like they are alone and no one understand their situation. Women participants would like to see more education and outreach about basic rights. Youth participants think that by keeping diversity issues at the top of the City’s list, residents will pay more attention to these issues.

**Measurement & Accountability Comments**

**Lack of city follow through**

This issue was addressed in the Leadership section under the issue *Lack of city follow through on diversity issues, little money and staff allocated to diversity and human rights issues.*

**Diversity and human rights issues are not city priorities**

This issue was addressed in the Leadership section under the issue *Lack of high-level city support for local diversity issues.*
Chapter 3
Recommendations

In Chapter 2, we identified the Key Findings from our outreach about each of the six categories of the Strategic Plan: Leadership, Capacity, Workforce & Work Environment, Service Delivery, Community Engagement, and Measurement & Accountability. In this chapter we propose action items for the Strategic Plan that directly link to the community comments. We encourage the City to evaluate these action items, add them to the actions suggested by city staff, and then prioritize and select which actions will be in the Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan (DESP).

I. Leadership

Community Comments

1.1. Lack of city follow through on diversity and human rights issues, little money and staff allocated to diversity and human rights projects

1.2. Lack of high level city support for local diversity and human rights issues

1.3. City leadership is not representative of the diverse demographic of the community

Action Item Recommendations:

• Create a schedule for top city leadership to regularly attend a variety of community meetings and events.

• Develop an annual opportunity for leadership to listen to community needs.

• Regularly speak to diversity and issues of social equity in public addresses.

2. Capacity

Community Comments

2.1. Some city staff do not act in a culturally competent manner

2.2. Some community members experience language barriers when trying to access city services

Action Item Recommendations:

• Infuse cultural competence into standard city trainings.

• Develop a plan to increase city-wide language access and interpretation resources
3. Workforce & Work Environment

Community Comments

3.1. The City’s hiring process (applications and interviews) is complicated and not accessible to some communities

3.2. Benefits for city employees do not meet the needs of the diverse workforce

3.2. Workforce is not representative of the diverse demographic of the community

Action Item Recommendations:

• Explore more flexible benefits plans that include childcare, flex schedules, etc.

• Institute a “stay” interview process for all employees, especially focusing on those from underrepresented populations, to better understand what the City is doing well and could continue and amplify.

• Put together short-, medium- and long-term plans at division and department levels for developing internal and external “pipelines” for representative applicant pools that will lead to a well-rounded, qualified workforce.

• Provide mandatory supervisor training on recruitment and selection which incorporates conceptual and practical information supporting diversity goals.

• Develop and make available on the City intranet questions and other tools for supplemental questionnaires, oral interviews and other resources that will better enable hiring supervisors to evaluate cultural competency (diversity-related elements).

• Assess and revise current recruitment (application process) procedures to be more equitable and accessible to all community members.

4. Service Delivery

Community Comments

4.1. Transportation infrastructure does not meet some community needs; need for better pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, more comprehensive bus service, and improved street repair and maintenance

4.2. Some police are insensitive to diverse community members; more diversity training is needed

4.3. Lack of needed social services including food, housing and health care
4.4. Some parks, recreation programs, and cultural activities/services do not meet community needs; some services are not dispersed equitably, are not well advertised, and/or not affordable

4.5. Transportation services do not meet some community needs

**Action Item Recommendations:**

- Create a multi-cultural community center either separately or through better integration into existing city facilities.
- Continue to address community complaints about the police department and create a campaign to improve public perception.
- Infuse cultural competence into standard city trainings.

**5. Community Communication & Engagement**

**Community Comments**

5.1. The City does not serve as a hub for connecting people, information, and resources

5.2. Current public participation strategies need to be expanded to be more inclusive of the entire Eugene community

5.3. Limited follow-up with participants in city public participation efforts

5.4. Communication with the community is not coordinated across city departments

5.5. Lack of accessible information about city services and decision making

5.6. Lack of collaboration and partnerships between the City and community organizations such as schools, nonprofit organizations and social service organizations

5.7. The City’s website is hard to navigate for community members and does not provide some desired information

5.8. Limited community awareness of diversity and human rights issues

**Action Item Recommendations:**

- Assess the effectiveness of the City’s public engagement processes and structure and create a framework to ensure follow-up, relationship building, consistency, and coordination.
- Create an Outreach Coordinator position to form community relationships, consult on city outreach processes, and coordinate outreach for city departments.
- Expand public information role to incorporate accessibility, cultural and linguistic competency, and a community relations focus.
• Develop resource groups in the organization and community to advise and collaborate with the City on diversity related dimensions and issues.

• Continue to develop the Outreach Guide to serve as a resource for community engagement.

• Develop citywide public participation guidelines.

• Train city staff on culturally effective outreach methods.

• Invest in new and emerging technologies to effectively enhance communications with our diverse populations.

• Develop and implement an effective, culturally competent, media and public information plan.

• Continue to offer community trainings and dialogues about diversity and human rights to build capacity, encourage communication and strengthen networks.

• Update city website to be more user-friendly.

• Offer free trainings to community members about how the City works and the services it provides.

• Support study circles on race and study circles on diversity.

• Clarify and communicate to the public the process to manage external conflict and complaints.

• Regularly speak to diversity and issues of social equity in public addresses.

6. Measurement and Accountability

Community Comments

6.1. Lack of city follow-through on diversity and human rights issues

6.2. Diversity and human rights issues are not city priorities

Action Item Recommendations:

• Provide a “Diversity Scorecard” annually. Publish a scorecard for the City to see if it is achieving cultural competence or not.

• Assess the effectiveness and capacity of current diversity system structures (Diversity Advisory Council, department diversity committees, and training) to support the implementation of the Diversity and Equity Strategic Plan.
• Include diversity indicators, benchmarks and best practices into department annual reports.

• Develop benchmarks and collect associated data to determine the impact of plan implementation.

• Publish and disseminate an annual report to share plan progress with city staff and the community. Provide the annual report to the City Council.

• Pursue national and regional recognition and awards for city diversity programs.