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[Start 10:20]

Pettit: Let’s start with introductions and why you are here.

Coulton: I think the future of NNIP is to get more help for Kathy.

Parks: I came to hear as a future member.

Kingsley: Volunteer NNIP booster.

Ron-Ferguson: Working on our application as well.

Hefferman: This is my first meeting.

Linn: Working on our application as well.

Pettit: You heard some of the history at the beginning of the meeting. Some is funding and vision driven. Casey has been funding us for 20 years, which is too good to be true really. Macarthur we’re trying to get one more round from. We’re working on a concept paper to start circulating around to other foundations. We don’t want to be reacting to funding opportunities without a structure to judge. It’s a chance to step back and see how we can do better. It’s something we think about all the time as we go along. I guess one thing to start is contact between meetings. People are supportive of 2 meetings a year. We feel not like doing a good job in between meetings. Do you have other networks? Ways to connect?

Gradeck: We do the check-ins.

Pettit: Urban does the check-ins.

Coulton: How often is the video from the NNIP meetings watched?

Pettit: So do a better job of pushing it out?

Coulton: We invest in the video. Seems like a good asset. Even beyond the network. I get links to meetings I didn’t even know was happening.

Ahmed: One national meeting and one local meeting.

Pettit: We’d need to figure out how to staff those.

Coulton: Is it franchise? Who plans it?

Pettit: Laura wants the Texan partners to work together.

Linn: Do partners visit each other?

Gradeck: It’s limited. We put it in the work plan as an idea.

Pettit: Good idea. To encourage that. It’s a lower cost way.

Linn: There could be ways to lower the cost of it.

Deitrick: I use a brown bag series to invite others.

Kingsley: What works cities uses slack channels to network their cities.

[People use slack internally]

Gradeck: I find an overwhelming number of channels and another thing you have to do.

Pettit: We need to figure out the partners google group and how to integrate. It could be good for work groups. The benefit is that it’s published.

Gradeck: Maybe it would be good to set up a time for this. Maybe every few weeks we slack.

Pettit: Maybe a pilot with one topic. One place we know we’re week is onboarding new staff. We have a maze of systems and keeping track of staff names we’re not good at it. We need to invest in a comprehensive system. Salesforce is a good example of that.

Deitrick: Like a form when you leave the organization.

Coulton: Maybe have a people inventory like we have the data inventory.

Pettit: A quarterly NNIP orientation.

Heffernan: Have new staff do a webinar and a history of NNIP presentation.

Gradeck: Tying that into slack not before the meeting.

Kingsley: We did a board buddy system that worked well.

Pettit: We do buddy system at meetings but not outside the meeting.

Gradeck: I’ve seen varying quality of buddyship.

Parks: How are cross-site projects going. What’s the future of cross-site in NNIP?

Pettit: We’ve tried to be deliberate about them but it hasn’t work well. I thought an idea for a pre-session would be have a day before to do 2 hour stints on cross-site ideas. We’ve been more passive. We have about 4 right now. There’s a concept paper around budget analysis around spending and investment of different types. We spent like 3 years talking about shared indicators. I think 15 partners have vital stats data. Or all the crime stuff. The idea would be for people to feed data in and then offer it after the project. It would be great to think of a project. I’m thinking in aggregate not raw data. There’s a lot of talk about social determinants of health and what the project is.

Coulton: That shouldn’t all fall on you.

Pettit: The best idea is for 3 or 4 people super interested and knowledgeable. I think NNIP has a lot to say about the internet of things. We just need people to get it together. We should have things on the shelf so when an opportunity knocks we can respond. There’s a whole other thing of how to do cross site projects better.

Coulton: And we had an application process with some vetting to make sure the idea fit the project and the capacity would be there to get it done on-time. I wanted to draw on another experience which might be a model for us with AISP. There’s some crossover with NNIP. The successful example from it is that there were 3 ideas of important policy issues that could be well addressed by neighborhood indicators data. The ideas were fleshed out a bit and it’s shopped around to other partners to say we generally think if we could look at housing and infant mortality and lead poisoning and if we had all the data we could formulate a good cross-site project and get funding for it. I think that would be a good way to go to tackle 3 ideas. Then it adds up to something. The workgroups are working on a different idea then at the end of years we tackle big questions and it isn’t perfect and you can’t do everything. We have 3 journal articles and policy briefs and full reports on how to do it.

Deitrick: Any evaluation done of the IDS project? We’ve had other opportunities like the UAA paper and other things. Did Casey come back with evaluation or questioning or anything?

Pettit: In Kids in Foreclosure we ran one regression model to get comparable data. The interpretation was different because the data was different, but in generally what percentage of mobility due to foreclosure crisis, specifically kids in rental units.

Coulton: It got published.

Pettit; The answer wasn’t what the foundation wanted. Residential instability of family was bad even before the foreclosure crisis.

Deitrick: Yeah but they learned.

Pettit: But they didn’t get the headline they wanted.

Coulton: Maybe they didn’t think a bump was worth advertising but you take these things and you begin to learn, so they should have been more interested.

Pettit: We should document the structure and ask the partners what worked.

Kingsley: What do you think of opportunities of bringing groups together for topical projects.

Pettit: Matter of time management. We need to replace Macarthur money urgently or the network will decline. We’ve pulled in general money starting with something specific. Starting with general funding is hard. My business model is foundations give money. Putting more emphasis on that seems good. Starting out with a short “we know X” could be a launching pad to see a cross-site idea.

Ahmed: What is the long term goal of NNIP, even informal.

Pettit: One concern and angst people have is managing growth. We have 8 new potential partners and some others that couldn’t be here. What happens when we get 50? This was our biggest meeting ever. What happens when the meeting gets to 200? Then do we need regional meetings? We’ll have up to 40 partners but not all really participated.

Ahmed: Do you aim for 200?

Pettit: Ideally every city should have NNIP. There are some small cities. We are not doing outreach because we need to get some of you over the finish line. There are some big cities like San Diego or the whole middle of the country. Phoenix. There’s a big area and likely capacity and we should do homework on that. Right now it’s all been who comes to us. If there’s not a local passionate person then it doesn’t matter if I want a NNIP partner in Phoenix.

Coulton: This question of growth. Right now bringing on a new city is a cost drain. Often when something grows the money grows, like people pay dues or cities fund NNIP. But I know that’s not the way we work. Unless we help a partner start up they can’t get funding.

Pettit: Not really. Amy has RWJ money. Houston has money. It feels like they’re bringing their money and assets. Our taking credit for Charlotte helps us. Funders want partner to pay dues. Even if it’s low, they want proof of value for the network. For me, showing up is enough.

Deitrick: They want dues due to show buy in. We’ve had growth but also lost partners so the growth it’s completely linear.

Schramm: The potential partner list is often former (dead) partners.

Pettit: Tom and I disagreed on this. We didn’t really ask partners to leave until I was in charge.

Kingsley: Onboarding takes resources and we can help them sell it.

Pettit: We’ve talked about an application fee. Not having registration for the meetings. Even if everyone pays 50 bucks it helps defer.

Coulton: Some people don’t care about paying and for some like the Fed it makes them feel legit.

SChramm: Do guest speakers pay?

Pettit: We have waived it sometimes. People were terrified of growth from 6 to 12 so we’ve been there.

Schramm: People have embraced NNIP.

Pettit: People have gotten upset about only 1 meeting when we tried it. Some of it is just financial.

Coulton: If the 2 meetings per year was taking so much out of the program budget that we weren’t able to do other things, like have better communication and cross-site projects, then the people advocate for 2 meetings need to understand.

Pettit: We should be more transparent about the money.

Urban: The 2nd meeting more automated in a way to cost less staff time to create.

Pettit: We could do one all unconference. The meetings are brain draining. We move topics every time. They move agenda on the content side. Or from unconference on topics. Other things?

Coulton: I have an idea on onboarding new sites. I wonder if a way of funding a meeting when we have an opportunity in a new site city where there are people in that city, funders, who would put up funding for the meeting because they would think it’s a good way to galvanize things. We had that experience here. In the planning key people trying to boost ideas put money in to have people attend. If I had known that could happen we could have raised more money if we started there.

Pettit: We have never sought sponsorships for meetings. Long term foundations are hesitant. But maybe sponsorship for a meeting with an idea.

Deitrick: It would help the NNIP brand.

Pettit: We don’t want to sell off the meetings. We don’t want someone else to decide what’s of interest to partners.

Kingsley: How obnoxious do people find that?

Ahmed: What is the role of partners in fundraising?

Pettit: None. The executive committee helps with this. So far not really. One time we had a funders meeting.

Deitrick: Remember when the funders came in early?

Pettit: Oh right. Or we had a funders meeting with the exec committee. We probably had 10 funders and they seemed happy to talk to each other. It wasn’t direct fundraising for the network but did support locals relationships with funders. Having successful partners saves us money. We’ve talked about other outreach.

Gradeck: Funders should know what they’re getting into.

Kingsley: Curious what people thought about data platforms and funders camp session.

Gradeck: They like shiny things and there needs to be an advocate for infrastructure.

Pettit: Need to tie NNIP to evidence based policymaking. Need to know how NNIP fits into the flavor of the month. Big data, market data, other random things.

Ahmed: What about media coverage?

Pettit: It all fell by the wayside. Let’s think about local media coverage.

Coulton: If you have a session on something topical.

Pettit: OK time to break. Thank you it's all helpful.

[End 11:24]